

ture, or the cultivation of cereals as it was undoubtedly restricted to in our early civilization, provides food in sufficient quantities and adapted to the use of man, that it should be considered the parent of horticulture ; while those on the other side, take the ground that historically, at least, agriculture appears in the natural course of events to have been evolved from the art of gardening, and claim that the latter, therefore, should enjoy the distinction of parentage.

#### EVOLUTION OF HORTICULTURE.

It would seem reasonable to suppose, however, that at first there was little differentiation. That those plants, cereal or fruit-bearing, which most readily yielded food and supplied the wants of man were used at first, and cultivated later—contemporaneously. We should remember, as DeCandolle points out, that “between the custom of gathering wild fruits, grain and roots, and that of the regular cultivation of the plants which produce them, there are several steps.” The history of the cultivation of those plants which have ministered to the wants of man as food producing agents is most interesting. This history is given by Alphonse de Candolle in his “Origin of Cultivated Plants.” To those interested in the evolution of agriculture, I would recommend this work as a reference book and one filled with a vast array of historical facts. If we cannot claim for horticulture, priority over agriculture with satisfactory assurance, we can at least claim that it is what we may term the fine art of common life, because it supplies luxuries—and luxuries within the reach of all. In this way it is eminently republican.

The causes which have in the past promoted on the one hand, or retarded on the other, the cultivation of a particular plant have been various. If easily grown and yielding a product which was, or soon became a necessity, its propagation and popularity was assured. “In the same way\* the various causes which favour or

---

\*De Candolle.