

particular animals and plants may have been given solely with a view to the connexion which it was foreseen would exist between them and man — especially when we see that connexion to be in many cases so intimate, that the greater number, and sometimes, as in the case of the camel, all the individuals of the species which exist on the earth are in subjection to the human race.

We can perceive in a multitude of animals, especially in some of the parasitic tribes, that certain instincts and organs are conferred for the purpose of defence or attack against some other species. Now, if we are reluctant to suppose the existence of similar relations between man and the instincts of many of the inferior animals, we adopt an hypothesis no less violent, though in the opposite extreme to that which has led some to imagine the whole animate and inanimate creation to have been made solely for the support, gratification, and instruction of mankind.

Many species, most hostile to our persons or property, multiply, in spite of our efforts to repress them; others, on the contrary, are intentionally augmented many hundred fold in number by our exertions. In such instances, we must imagine the relative resources of man and of species, friendly or inimical to him, to have been prospectively calculated and adjusted. To withhold assent to this supposition, would be to refuse what we must grant in respect to the economy of nature in every other part of the organic creation; for the various species of contemporary plants and animals have obviously their relative forces nicely balanced, and their respective tastes, passions, and instincts so contrived, that they are all in perfect harmony with each other. In no other manner could it happen that each species, surrounded, as it is, by countless dangers, should be enabled to maintain its ground for periods of considerable duration.

The docility of the individuals of some of our domestic species, extending, as it does, to attainments foreign to their natural habits and faculties, may, perhaps, have been conferred with a view to their association with man. But, lest species should be thereby made to vary indefinitely, we find that such habits are never transmissible by generation.

A pig has been trained to hunt and point game with great activity and steadiness\*; and other learned individuals, of the same species, have been taught to spell; but such fortuitous acquirements never become hereditary, for they have no relation whatever to the exigencies of the animal in a wild state, and cannot, therefore, be developments of any instinctive propensities.

*Influence of domestication.* — An animal in domesticity, says M. F. Cuvier, is not essentially in a different situation, in regard to the feeling of restraint, from one left to itself. It lives in society without constraint, because, without doubt, it was a social animal; and it conforms itself to the will of man, because it had a chief, to which, in a wild state, it would have yielded obedience. There is nothing

\* In the New Forest, near Ringwood, Lodge. I have conversed with witnesses Hants, by Mr. Toomer, keeper of Broomy of the fact.