"The Origin of Species," but all they account for is the origin of varieties. These are traced to "selective breeding," which means breeding exclusively from an animal whose formation is in some respects a departure from other animals of its kind. Mr. Huxley gives some interesting examples of this, and he shows how a six-fingered and six-toed race of men might have been produced; not, however, by "natural selection," but by arbitrary selection, by means of which the greatest number of differences are produced amongst animals which are derived from a common stock, as in the case of the horse, the dog, and the pigeon. Return to natural selection, by allowing these animals to become wild, and the ultimate result would be, not the increase, but the reduction of their differences. But, to return to the difficulty, different varieties, which are known to have been derived from a common stock, are fertile with one another, and their offspring are so; but this is not the case with different species; so that the natural inference is that they were not so derived, but had separate origins.

I will leave Mr. Huxley to state the difficulty in his own words. After expressing the opinion that selective breeding would be sufficient to account for the *structural* differences of animals, he says: "But in addition to their structural distinctions, the species of animals and plants, or at least a great number of them, exhibit physiological characters—what are known as distinct species, structurally, being for the most part either altogether incompetent to breed one with another; or if they breed, the resulting mule, or hybrid, is unable to perpetuate its race with another hybrid of the same kind." And again: "Our acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis must be provisional so long as one link in the chain of evidence is wanting; and so long as all the animals and plants