SPENCER AND DARWIN

After it has grown to a certain size, the body sometimes divides into two distinct animals; but sometimes it splits up (like some simple water-weeds) into a colony of zoospores, which closely resemble the similarly named zoospores of many low plants.

in

al.

dy

ut

h-

to

by

u-

at

n

is

at

se

il,

m

W

15

)e

ıd

ıy

er

<u>у</u>-

er

C-

st

ſt,

es

or

(e

m

es

n

15

10

s.

et 1e **r**ıd nıl. d

ıy tr-

of

10

is

all

le.

Nevertheless, even in this very rudimentary animal form we get the "promise and potency" of all higher For example, there is already types. the foreshadowing of a mouth in the thin receptive region; and the body is rudely divisible into two layers, an outer and an inner (skin and muscle), the folding inward of the outer layer as it envelops its prey suggesting the origin of the future stomach and intestinal canal. A zoospore which once takes to living on other zoospores or fragments of plant would already, in all essentials, be an animal organism.

In this way, as it seems to me, we may conjecture that animals took their rise from the motile germs of very low plants.

Let me add two needful comments, by way of precaution against misconception.

In the first place, I do not suppose that in the existing world (where all organisable material has long since been used up over and over again for the manufacture of organisms) we can get anything like either the primitive plant The illustraor the primitive animal. tions and examples here employed must regarded in the most shadowy be

symbolical light only. All I mean to suggest is, that early animals may perliaps have arisen from locomotive spores of early plant organisms, which, instead of developing chlorophyll and producing plant-material under the influence of sunlight, happened to strike out accidentally a new mode of life for themselves, by absorbing external protoplasmic or carbonaceous material, and using it up in locomotive energy. The mental picture I form of the process myself is one of the most studiously vague and generalised character.

In the second place, I wish to add (against possible criticism) that I do not regard this suggestion as in any way affording the slightest explanation of any higher characteristics of animal life. Especially do I not regard it as casting any light whatever upon the origin (if any) of sensation, consciousness, thought, or human subjectivity. How consciousness came to exist, or for the matter of that how protoplasm or chlorophyll came to exist, I no more know or even conjecture than I know or conjecture how oxygen, or nitrogen, or nebular tracts came to exist, or why there is a universe at all, material or spiritual. I offer the suggestion in the historical spirit alere; merely as a hint of how a particular step in the evolution of existing life from pre-existent matter may, perhaps, have taken place, and as such I attribute to it a conjectural value only.

SPENCER AND DARWIN

It is a familiar observation with people who have reached middle age that their chronological conception of their own time is often far more defective than relative dates of Pharsalia and Philippi; their chronological conception of written | they may be clearly aware of just how

history in which they have not themselves participated. Men of our own generation may remember exactly the