Names of number among Malayan and Polynesian tribes may be referred to as a proof of degeneracy. The sound "man" is 10,000 among the natives of Samoa and Tonga, as it is in Chinese, but it is 4,000 in the Sandwich Islands, and 1,000 in New Zealand. Islanders avoid high numbers, and allow the significance of a name of high numbers to sink. This is proof of degradation. The reason why the arithmetical faculty among the New Zealanders has become weaker than elsewhere is because of their enormous distance from the continent of Asia. Samoa and Tonga are much nearer, and accordingly in those islands the religious traditions, *e.g.* circumcision, resemble those of Asia very closely. The Polynesians formerly had a decimal arithmetic, now it has sunk in Australia to quaternary or quinary arithmetic. In Ponape, one of the Caroline group, and comparatively near to the continent, *apuki* is 100 of men, trees, or yams, but 1,000 of eggs, cocoanuts, or stones. In Chinese *pak* is 100. After centuries of use high numbers fluctuate in value, because the intellect of islanders declines in power as the effect of long-continued isolation. The ideas, names, and usages of civilisation are gradually lost, and with them the human intellect becomes dwarfed.

Prof. F. Müller, after showing that the Polynesians could originally count to 100, adds, "Dies ist gewiss ein Zeugnis für die geringe geistige Begabung und frühzeitige Entwicklung dieser Völker." * The Polynesians, then, have sunk in power, and were, when visited by Capt. Cook, in a state of progressive degradation.

The question raised by Mr. Tylor was only—"Did Dr. Martins change his opinion about the degeneracy of Brazilian tribes?" Dr. Peschel thinks he did, but has not yet given sufficient proof. While I venture to think that the question—"Is savage man a degenerated being?" can be solved in the affirmative by the careful comparison of facts, without our needing to know that each scientific traveller holds this view, it would be most interesting to be assured that all such men are agreed upon it.

JOSEPH EDKINS

Disuse as a Reducing Cause in Species

IN a letter of mine (*NATURE*, vol. ix. p. 361), entitled "Natural Selection and Dysteleology," there occurs a footnote upon the above subject. As this footnote was rather carelessly written, I wish to explain my meaning more clearly.

In the first place, it is evident that the fact of disuse causing atrophy in individuals is no proof that it likewise causes atrophy in species; for if it does so, the laws under which it operates in the two cases must be quite different—the one set being as exclusively related to Inheritance, as the other set are independent of this principle. The primary question therefore is: Does inheritance here reproduce the character of immediate ancestors, as in congenital atrophy, &c.; or of distant ancestors, as in mutilations, &c.? I think there can be no reasonable question that it does the former, and so have no doubt that disuse is a cause of atrophy in species. The question as to degree, however, remains.

One sentence in the footnote I am explaining may be taken to imply that the effects of disuse are exhausted in a few generations. Nothing can be further from my meaning. If disuse acts at all in species, its *modus operandi*, as just stated, must be that of causing variations which are capable of being inherited; consequently, if disuse acts thus at all, it is impossible to assign limits to its operation in time. The question, however, is, In what proportion are the effects of disuse in the parents reproduced in the offspring? Variations caused by disuse certainly differ from congenital variations, in that they are not fully inherited; and it is the degree in which they are inherited that must determine the rate at which disuse here operates. This degree, however, is unknown: we only know that it is something very small. Now as disuse is in competition with other reducing causes, the rapidity of its action is an important factor in the estimation of its probable effects.

By the omission of the word "proportional" near the end of the footnote, I appear to institute an absolute comparison between the effects of disuse in wild and in tame species. This, of course, would be absurd. What I mean is, that supposing disuse to be the chief cause of atrophy in wild species, it has not produced so much effect in tame species as we should antecedently expect; for, although the facts are very scanty, so far as they go they tend to prove, that when an organ is disused for several generations only, the rate of its reduction is much greater than it ought to be, supposing disuse to be the main

cause of atrophy in our domestic animals, and supposing the action of this cause to be uniform.

It will be asked, If we thus in part reject this cause, what other have we to substitute? This, of course, is a collateral issue; but as it is an important one, it may here be discussed. I would suggest the cessation of selection (see *NATURE*, vol. ix. p. 440) as a co-operating cause, for it seems to me that this *must* have acted here to some extent, and if no other causes have been at work, this extent must be the complement of the effects due to disuse. For the sake of definition, therefore, we shall assume disuse to be in abeyance. Now, on this assumption, we should expect to find that atrophy proceeds more rapidly during the initial stages of reduction than subsequently. But without dwelling upon this point, what may we infer from the existing degree of atrophy in the affected organs of our domestic animals? Supposing the cessation of selection to be the only cause at work, what degree of atrophy should we here expect to find? Before I turned to the valuable measurements given in the "Variation," I concluded (Cf. *NATURE*, vol. ix. p. 441) that from 20 to 25 per cent. is the maximum of reduction we should expect this unassisted principle to accomplish, in the case of natural as distinguished from artificially-bred organs. Now on calculating the average afforded by each of Mr. Darwin's tables, and then reducing the averages to parts of 100, I find that the highest average decrease is 16 per cent., and the lowest 5; the average of the averages being rather less than 12. Only four individual cases fall below 25 per cent., and of these two should be omitted (Cf. "Variations," p. 272). Thus, out of eighty-three examples, only two fall below the lowest average expected. Moreover, we should scarcely expect disuse alone to affect in so similar a degree such widely different tissues as are brain and muscle. The deformity of the sternum in fowls also points to the cessation of selection rather than to disuse. Further, the fact that several of our domestic animals have not varied at all is inexplicable upon the one supposition, while it affords no difficulty to the other. We have seen that disuse can only act by causing variations; and so we can see no reason why, if it acts upon a duck, it should not also act upon a goose. But the cessation of selection depends upon variations being supplied to it; and so, if from any reason a specific type does not vary, this principle cannot act. Why one type should vary, and another not, is a distinct question, the difficulty of which is embodied by the one supposition, and excluded by the other. For, to say that disuse has not acted upon type A, because of its inflexible constitution, while it has acted on a closely allied type B, because of its flexible constitution, is merely to insinuate that disuse having proved itself inadequate to cause reduction in the one case, it may not have been the efficient cause of reduction in the other. But the counter-supposition altogether excludes the idea of a casual connection, and so rests upon the more ultimate fact of differential variability, as not requiring to be explained. Lastly, it is remarkable that those animals which have not suffered reduction in any part of their bodies are likewise the animals which have not varied in any other way, and conversely; for as there is no observable connection between these two peculiarities, the fact of the intimate connection between them tends to show that special reduction depends upon general variability, rather than that special variability depends upon special reducing causes.

Dropping, however, our argumentative assumption, it will be remembered that I deem it in the last degree improbable that disuse should not have assisted in reducing the unused organs of our domestic animals; and the effect of this remark is to show that the cessation of selection is not able to accomplish so much reduction as I antecedently expected. On the other hand, it seems to me no less improbable that the cessation of selection should not have here operated to some extent; but in what degree the observable effects are to be attributed to this cause, and in what degree to disuse, I shall not pretend to suggest.

No doubt the above considerations are of a very vague description; but this only follows from the scarcity of the data at our disposal, and it is to this very scarcity that I am principally desirous of calling attention; for although it is with reluctant diffidence that I venture thus, even in part, to dispute the doctrine of one whom most of living men I venerate, yet, for the reason just given, I cannot help feeling that the time has not yet arrived for a final quantitative decision upon this subject. However, as before remarked, "the question thus raised is of no practical importance; since whether or not disuse is the principal cause of atrophy in species, there is no doubt that atrophy accompanies disuse."

GEORGE J. ROMANES

* "Reise der Novara." Linguistischer Theil, 1867, p. 287.