The Mark Lane Express and Agricultural Journal.

LONDON, MONDAY, MAY 22ND, 1871.

About this time the world was created. So wrote the critic in the margin, when about half-way down the family tree of his Welsh friend; and so one feels very much inclined to write when about half way through Mr. Darwin's new work on the DESCENT OF MAN. For proof here we are compelled to travel far beyond the bounds of accepted tradition or reliable record. "Man is descended from some lowly organized form"—because he is shaped very much as a monkey, or because certain animals exhibit very logical instincts. But when did the transition from a lower to a higher order of intelligence first occur? Clearly, at some period before the world was created. "There can hardly be a doubt that we are descended from barbarians"—but this is a very different thing from being descended from monkeys. The Greeks called the Romans barbarians, and this nation in turn passed the compliment on to the Gauls, who regarded every new country in the same light. In fact, the advance and spread of civilization are to be traced in the rise and fall of Empires. Man became equal to and gradually the superior of his fellow man as he became more civilised. The luxurious excesses of the nobles had often a brutalizing or "reverting" effect; and the mere savage called upon to exhibit himself for their amusement had as the event proved the more mind of the two, and so became in turn the conqueror. Mr. Darwin shuddered at the sight of the Fuegians, "naked and bedaubed with paint, their long hair tangled, and their expression wild, startled, and distrustful;" and yet this is almost word for word the description of his own ancestors when they were first invaded. So far we are safe, but no further. The lowest type of barbarian is still a man; that is, a creature with a mind capable of cultivation and development, if only taken sufficiently early. But no system of "selection," however careful or however gradual, can imbue a dog or a horse or a monkey with reasoning powers. We may, as we do and have done, improve the appearance and increase the strength of these animals, but we can make little or no perceptible advance in the amount of their intelligence. The pointer or the turnspit may be partly bred and more thoroughly tutored to his purpose; we may succeed in obtaining more nose or more speed, but there is not the slightest proof that by selection in breeding we attain to more *sense* or even to any higher range of instinct. On the contrary, it is doubtful whether the thorough-bred horse reared for many generations on the most scientific principles possesses as much intelligence or instinct as the mountain pony, which has been bred almost as wild as the rabbit or the rat. Here, then, we are enabled to draw the great divisional line. The savage is capable of civilization, the mere animal is not. Take the chain from the leg of a monkey who has seen the world, and he will be as dangerous a brute as if only fresh caught.

Mr. Darwin's favourite argument is, of course, selection. By the law of battle the best and strongest males amongst birds, beasts, and fishes can command their choice of the females, and he extends this theory or principle fairly enough to savage nations, where the braves have the handsomest wives; the main exception to the rule being, of course, amongst civilised people, where the considerations of rank and wealth too often interfere—a not very flattering inference. Everything, however, is sacrificed to selection. Thus, "with our domesticated animals, when a foreign breed is introduced into a new country it is found, after several generations, to have undergone, wherever the means of comparison exist, a greater or less amount of change. This follows from an unconscious selection during a long series of generations." We should be very much inclined to doubt the force of this proposition. With animals of precisely the same breed those introduced into a new country would be found, after several generations, to have undergone a change not so much from unconscious selection as from change of food and climate. The texture of the sheep's fleece will vary as you transplant him from one country to another, as will the courage of the dog, and the size of the horse. The English race-horse goes directly back to the Arabian, and, as we are assured, not to the best Arabians either; and yet the English horse is now in every way infinitely superior to his desert-born ancestor. This can scarcely be altogether attributable to selection, as the Arabs are known to breed their horses with great care, and most probably from better material than we could in the outset command. Climate and keep have, of course, a vast deal to do with the appearance and value of any animal, as of even man himself; and yet Mr. Darwin passes over such considerations as these as apparently of little or no consequence. In parenthesis to a sentence we have already quoted he says, "When a native breed is long and carefully attended to, either for use or ornament," it also in time exhibits some change, or at least it should, for the better. And selection no doubt has much to do with any such improvement, although in many cases this is by no means the sole cause. Taking our choicest kinds of stock at this moment, there are many of these where the suspicion of a clever cross exists in a nearer or remote degree. Even the Shorthorn or the Southdown is not held to be quite free from alloy. Nevertheless, selection must be the A B C of breeding, and we only quarrel with the theory when carried to the lengths to which it is in THE DESCENT OF MAN.

The book is altogether rather an interesting than a convincing one. Great labour has been employed in making a collection of facts bearing upon natural history, which only tend to disappoint us in their application. Thus the anecdotes of instinct, of memory, and affection displayed by animals have really little or no weight when put in the balance against the human understanding. Any little lad who could not reason as well as the most intelligent retriever or most highly educated monkey would assuredly be regarded as an idiot; and here we see in a moment the invincible barrier which separates the several races. Still, Mr. Darwin has his followers, and no question but that in the scientific world it is fast becoming the fashion to go rather beyond the time when the world was created. Some year or so since we had the pleasure of hearing Professor Huxley lecture on the Pedigree of the Horse; not of Kingcraft, or Macgregor, although it was just previous to the Derby, nor even deigning to notice the Godolphin or the Darley Arabian. Admitting in the outset that the horses and asses of a remote period, long before any indications of the existence of man had been found, resembled in nearly every respect the horses and asses which now run wild in many parts of Asia and Africa, the Professor proceeded to trace these to the hipparion, an animal with two little hoofs or fingers, and thence to his "hypothetical ancestor," the anchitherium, with three toes in the fore-limb; or further back yet, to the plagiolophus minor, "which differs from the horse only in degree, and not in kind." The Professor here brought his pedigree to a point, triumphantly asking if the horse did not succeed the hipparion, was it created afresh out of nothing? Of course, this kind of argument might be extended *ad infinitum*, as, for instance, was the plagiolophus minor created out of nothing? or how was his origin brought about? Mr. Huxley is a disciple of Mr. Darwin, who, as we have endeavoured to show, traces the pedigree of man back in much the same way to some lowly organised material, although without the same connecting links to his story. A horse may have been originally a plagiolophus minor, but if we are to put any faith in the first chapter of Genesis, man in the outset held dominion over every other living thing. And this dominion was the man's *mind*, which Mr. Darwin builds up from some inferior foundation!