

when no injury is perceptible from moderately close interbreeding, yet, to quote the words of Mr. Coate (who five times won the annual gold medal of the Smithfield Club Show for the best pen of pigs), "Crosses answer well for profit to the farmer, as you get more constitution and quicker growth; but for me, who sell a great number of pigs for breeding purposes, I find it will not do, as it requires many years to get anything like purity of blood again."²⁴

Almost all the animals as yet mentioned are gregarious, and the males must frequently pair with their own daughters, for they expel the young males as well as all intruders, until forced by old age and loss of strength to yield to some stronger male. It is therefore not improbable that gregarious animals may have been rendered less susceptible than non-social species to the evil consequences of close interbreeding, so that they may be enabled to live in herds without injury to their offspring. Unfortunately we do not know whether an animal like the cat, which is not gregarious, would suffer from close interbreeding in a greater degree than our other domesticated animals. But the pig is not, as far as I can discover, strictly gregarious, and we have seen that it appears eminently liable to the evil effects of close interbreeding. Mr. Huth, in the case of the pig, attributes (p. 285) these effects to their having been "cultivated most for their fat," or to the selected individuals having had a weak constitution; but we must remember that it is great breeders who have brought forward the above cases, and who are far more familiar than ordinary men can be, with the causes which are likely to interfere with the fertility of their animals.

The effects of close interbreeding in the case of man is a difficult subject, on which I will say but little. It has been discussed by various authors under many points of view.²⁵

²⁴ Sidney on the Pig, p. 36. See also note, p. 34. Also Richardson on the Pig, 1847, p. 26.

²⁵ Dr. Dally has published an excellent article (translated in the 'Anthropolog. Review,' May, 1864, p. 65), criticising all writers who have maintained that evil follows from consanguineous marriages. No doubt on this side of the question many advo-

cates have injured their cause by inaccuracies: thus it has been stated (Devay, 'Du Danger des Mariages,' &c., 1862, p. 141) that the marriages of cousins have been prohibited by the legislature of Ohio; but I have been assured, in answer to inquiries made in the United States, that this statement is a mere fable.