

THE ROLES OF MUTATION, INBREEDING, CROSSBREEDING  
AND SELECTION IN EVOLUTION

*Sewall Wright, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois*

The enormous importance of biparental reproduction as a factor in evolution was brought out a good many years ago by EAST. The observed properties of gene mutation—fortuitous in origin, infrequent in occurrence and deleterious when not negligible in effect—seem about as unfavorable as possible for an evolutionary process. Under biparental reproduction, however, a limited number of mutations which are not too injurious to be carried by the species furnish an almost infinite field of possible variations through which the species may work its way under natural selection.

Estimates of the total number of genes in the cells of higher organisms range from 1000 up. Some 400 loci have been reported as having mutated in *Drosophila* during a laboratory experience which is certainly very limited compared with the history of the species in nature. Presumably, allelomorphs of all type genes are present at all times in any reasonably numerous species. Judging from the frequency of multiple allelomorphs in those organisms which have been studied most, it is reasonably certain that many different allelomorphs of each gene are in existence at all times. With 10 allelomorphs in each of 1000 loci, the number of possible combinations is  $10^{1000}$  which is a very large number. It has been estimated that the total number of electrons and protons in the whole visible universe is much less than  $10^{100}$ .

However, not all of this field is easily available in an interbreeding population. Suppose that each type gene is manifested in 99 percent of the individuals, and that most of the remaining 1 percent have the most favorable of the other allelomorphs, which in general means one with only a slight differential effect. The average individual will show the effects of 1 percent of the 1000, or 10 deviations from the type, and since this average has a standard deviation of  $\sqrt{10}$  only a small proportion will exhibit more than 20 deviations from type where 1000 are possible. The population is thus confined to an infinitesimal portion of the field of possible gene combinations, yet this portion includes some  $10^{40}$  homozygous combinations, on the above extremely conservative basis, enough so that there is no reasonable chance that any two individuals have exactly the same genetic constitution in a species of millions of millions of individuals persisting over millions of generations. There is no difficulty in accounting for the probable genetic uniqueness of each individual human being or other organism which is the product of biparental reproduction.

If the entire field of possible gene combinations be graded with respect to adaptive value under a particular set of conditions, what would be its nature? Figure 1 shows the combinations in the cases of 2 to 5 paired allelomorphs. In the last case, each of the 32 homozygous combinations is at one remove from 5 others, at two removes from 10, etc. It would require 5 dimensions to represent these relations symmetrically; a sixth dimension is needed to represent level of adaptive value. The 32 combina-




FIGURE 1.—The combinations of from 2 to 5 paired allelomorphs.

tions here compare with  $10^{1000}$  in a species with 1000 loci each represented by 10 allelomorphs, and the 5 dimensions required for adequate representation compare with 9000. The two dimensions of figure 2 are a very inadequate representation of such a field. The contour lines are intended to represent the scale of adaptive value.

One possibility is that a particular combination gives maximum adaptation and that the adaptiveness of the other combinations falls off more or less regularly according to the number of removes. A species whose individuals are clustered about some combination other than the highest would

move up the steepest gradient toward the peak, having reached which it would remain unchanged except for the rare occurrence of new favorable mutations.

But even in the two factor case (figure 1) it is possible that there may be two peaks, and the chance that this may be the case greatly increases with each additional locus. With something like  $10^{1000}$  possibilities (figure 2) it may be taken as certain that there will be an enormous number of




FIGURE 2.—Diagrammatic representation of the field of gene combinations in two dimensions instead of many thousands. Dotted lines represent contours with respect to adaptiveness.

widely separated harmonious combinations. The chance that a random combination is as adaptive as those characteristic of the species may be as low as  $10^{-100}$  and still leave room for  $10^{800}$  separate peaks, each surrounded by  $10^{100}$  more or less similar combinations. In a rugged field of this character, selection will easily carry the species to the nearest peak, but there may be innumerable other peaks which are higher but which are separated by "valleys." The problem of evolution as I see it is that of a mechanism by which the species may continually find its way from lower to higher peaks in such

a field. In order that this may occur, there must be some trial and error mechanism on a grand scale by which the species may explore the region surrounding the small portion of the field which it occupies. To evolve, the species must not be under strict control of natural selection. Is there such a trial and error mechanism?

At this point let us consider briefly the situation with respect to a single locus. In each graph in figure 3 the abscissas represent a scale of gene frequency, 0 percent of the type genes to the left, 100 percent to the right. The elementary evolutionary process is, of course, change of gene frequency, a




FIGURE 3.—Random variability of a gene frequency under various specified conditions.

practically continuous process. Owing to the symmetry of the Mendelian mechanism, any gene frequency tends to remain constant in the absence of disturbing factors. If the type gene mutates at a certain rate, its frequency tends to move to the left, but at a continually decreasing rate. The type gene would ultimately be lost from the population if there were no opposing factor. But the type gene is in general favored by selection. Under selection, its frequency tends to move to the right. The rate is greatest at some point near the middle of the range. At a certain gene frequency the opposing pressures are equal and opposite, and at this point there is consequently equilibrium. There are other mechanisms of equilibrium among evolutionary factors which need not be discussed here. Note that we have here a theory

of the stability of species in spite of continuing mutation pressure, a continuing field of variability so extensive that no two individuals are ever genetically the same, and continuing selection.

If the population is not indefinitely large, another factor must be taken into account: the effects of accidents of sampling among those that survive and become parents in each generation and among the germ cells of these, in other words, the effects of inbreeding. Gene frequency in a given generation is in general a little different one way or the other from that in the preceding, merely by chance. In time, gene frequency may wander a long way from the position of equilibrium, although the farther it wanders the greater the pressure toward return. The result is a frequency distribution within which gene frequency moves at random. There is considerable spread even with very slight inbreeding and the form of distribution becomes U-shaped with close inbreeding. The rate of movement of gene frequency is very slow in the former case but is rapid in the latter (among unfixated genes). In this case, however, the tendency toward complete fixation of genes, practically irrespective of selection, leads in the end to extinction.

In a local race, subject to a small amount of crossbreeding with the rest of the species (figure 3, lower half), the tendency toward random fixation is balanced by immigration pressure instead of by mutation and selection. In a small sufficiently isolated group all gene frequencies can drift irregularly back and forth about their mean values at a rapid rate, in terms of geologic time, without reaching fixation and giving the effects of close inbreeding. The resultant differentiation of races is of course increased by any local differences in the conditions of selection.

Let us return to the field of gene combinations (figure 4). In an indefinitely large but freely interbreeding species living under constant conditions, each gene will reach ultimately a certain equilibrium. The species will occupy a certain field of variation about a peak in our diagram (heavy broken contour in upper left of each figure). The field occupied remains constant although no two individuals are ever identical. Under the above conditions further evolution can occur only by the appearance of wholly new (instead of recurrent) mutations, and ones which happen to be favorable from the first. Such mutations would change the character of the field itself, increasing the elevation of the peak occupied by the species. Evolutionary progress through this mechanism is excessively slow since the chance of occurrence of such mutations is very small and, after occurrence, the time required for attainment of sufficient frequency to be subject to selection to an appreciable extent is enormous.

The general rate of mutation may conceivably increase for some reason. For example, certain authors have suggested an increased incidence of cosmic rays in this connection. The effect (figure 4A) will be as a rule a spreading of the field occupied by the species until a new equilibrium is reached. There will be an average lowering of the adaptive level of the species. On the other hand, there will be a speeding up of the process discussed above, elevation of the peak itself through appearance of novel favorable mutations. Another possibility of evolutionary advance is that the spreading of the field occupied may go so far as to include another and




FIGURE 4.—Field of gene combinations occupied by a population within the general field of possible combinations. Type of history under specified conditions indicated by relation to initial field (heavy broken contour) and arrow.

higher peak, in which case the species will move over and occupy the region about this. These mechanisms do not appear adequate to explain evolution to an important extent.

The effects of reduced mutation rate (figure 4B) are of course the opposite: a rise in average level, but reduced variability, less chance of novel favorable mutation, and less chance of capture of a neighboring peak.

The effect of increased severity of selection (also 4B) is, of course, to increase the average level of adaptation until a new equilibrium is reached. But again this is at the expense of the field of variation of the species and

reduces the chance of capture of another adaptive peak. The only basis for continuing advance is the appearance of novel favorable mutations which are relatively rapidly utilized in this case. But at best the rate is extremely slow even in terms of geologic time, judging from the observed rates of mutation.

Relaxation of selection has of course the opposite effects and thus effects somewhat like those of increased mutation rate (figure 4A).

The environment, living and non-living, of any species is actually in continual change. In terms of our diagram this means that certain of the high places are gradually being depressed and certain of the low places are becoming higher (figure 4C). A species occupying a small field under influence of severe selection is likely to be left in a pit and become extinct, the victim of extreme specialization to conditions which have ceased, but if under sufficiently moderate selection to occupy a wide field, it will merely be kept continually on the move. Here we undoubtedly have an important evolutionary process and one which has been generally recognized. It consists largely of change without advance in adaptation. The mechanism is, however, one which shuffles the species about in the general field. Since the species will be shuffled out of low peaks more easily than high ones, it should gradually find its way to the higher general regions of the field as a whole.

Figure 4D illustrates the effect of reduction in size of population below a certain relation to the rate of mutation and severity of selection. There is fixation of one or another allelomorph in nearly every locus, largely irrespective of the direction favored by selection. The species moves down from its peak in an erratic fashion and comes to occupy a much smaller field. In other words there is the deterioration and homogeneity of a closely inbred population. After equilibrium has been reached in variability, movement becomes excessively slow, and, such as there is, is nonadaptive. The end can only be extinction. Extreme inbreeding is not a factor which is likely to give evolutionary advance.

With an intermediate relation between size of population and mutation rate, gene frequencies drift at random without reaching the complete fixation of close inbreeding (figure 4E). The species moves down from the extreme peak but continually wanders in the vicinity. There is some chance that it may encounter a gradient leading to another peak and shift its allegiance to this. Since it will escape relatively easily from low peaks as compared with high ones, there is here a trial and error mechanism by which in time the species may work its way to the highest peaks in the general field. The rate of progress, however, is extremely slow since change of gene

frequency is of the order of the reciprocal of the effective population size and this reciprocal must be of the order of the mutation rate in order to meet the conditions for this case.

Finally (figure 4F), let us consider the case of a large species which is subdivided into many small local races, each breeding largely within itself but occasionally crossbreeding. The field of gene combinations occupied by each of these local races shifts continually in a nonadaptive fashion (except in so far as there are local differences in the conditions of selection). The rate of movement may be enormously greater than in the preceding case since the condition for such movement is that the reciprocal of the population number be of the order of the proportion of crossbreeding instead of the mutation rate. With many local races, each spreading over a considerable field and moving relatively rapidly in the more general field about the controlling peak, the chances are good that one at least will come under the influence of another peak. If a higher peak, this race will expand in numbers and by crossbreeding with the others will pull the whole species toward the new position. The average adaptiveness of the species thus advances under intergroup selection, an enormously more effective process than intragroup selection. The conclusion is that subdivision of a species into local races provides the most effective mechanism for trial and error in the field of gene combinations.

It need scarcely be pointed out that with such a mechanism complete isolation of a portion of a species should result relatively rapidly in specific differentiation, and one that is not necessarily adaptive. The effective intergroup competition leading to adaptive advance may be between species rather than races. Such isolation is doubtless usually geographic in character at the outset but may be clinched by the development of hybrid sterility. The usual difference of the chromosome complements of related species puts the importance of chromosome aberration as an evolutionary process beyond question, but, as I see it, this importance is not in the character differences which they bring (slight in balanced types), but rather in leading to the sterility of hybrids and thus making permanent the isolation of two groups.

How far do the observations of actual species and their subdivisions conform to this picture? This is naturally too large a subject for more than a few suggestions.

That evolution involves nonadaptive differentiation to a large extent at the subspecies and even the species level is indicated by the kinds of differences by which such groups are actually distinguished by systematists. It

is only at the subfamily and family levels that clear-cut adaptive differences become the rule (ROBSON, JACOT). The principal evolutionary mechanism in the origin of species must thus be an essentially nonadaptive one.

That natural species often are subdivided into numerous local races is indicated by many studies. The case of the human species is most familiar. Aside from the familiar racial differences recent studies indicate a distribution of frequencies relative to an apparently nonadaptive series of allelomorphs, that determining blood groups, of just the sort discussed above. I scarcely need to labor the point that changes in the average of mankind in the historic period have come about more by expansion of some types and decrease and absorption of others than by uniform evolutionary advance. During the recent period, no doubt, the phases of intergroup competition and crossbreeding have tended to overbalance the process of local differentiation, but it is probable that in the hundreds of thousands of years of prehistory, human evolution was determined by a balance between these factors.

Subdivision into numerous local races whose differences are largely nonadaptive has been recorded in other organisms wherever a sufficiently detailed study has been made. Among the land snails of the Hawaiian Islands, GULICK (sixty years ago) found that each mountain valley, often each grove of trees, had its own characteristic type, differing from others in "nonutilitarian" respects. GULICK attributed this differentiation to inbreeding. More recently CRAMPTON has found a similar situation in the land snails of Tahiti and has followed over a period of years evolutionary changes which seem to be of the type here discussed. I may also refer to the studies of fishes by DAVID STARR JORDAN, garter snakes by RUTHVEN, bird lice by KELLOGG, deer mice by OSGOOD, and gall wasps by KINSEY as others which indicate the role of local isolation as a differentiating factor. Many other cases are discussed by OSBORN and especially by RENSCH in recent summaries. Many of these authors insist on the nonadaptive character of most of the differences among local races. Others attribute all differences to the environment, but this seems to be more an expression of faith than a view based on tangible evidence.

An even more minute local differentiation has been revealed when the methods of statistical analysis have been applied. SCHMIDT demonstrated the existence of persistent mean differences at each collecting station in certain species of marine fish of the fjords of Denmark, and these differences were not related in any close way to the environment. That the differences were in part genetic was demonstrated in the laboratory. DAVID THOMPSON

has found a correlation between water distance and degree of differentiation within certain fresh water species of fish of the streams of Illinois. SUMNER's extensive studies of subspecies of *Peromyscus* (deer mice) reveal genetic differentiations, often apparently nonadaptive, among local populations and demonstrate the genetic heterogeneity of each such group.

The modern breeds of livestock have come from selection among the products of local inbreeding and of crossbreeding between these, followed by renewed inbreeding, rather than from mass selection of species. The recent studies of the geographical distribution of particular genes in livestock and cultivated plants by SEREBROVSKY, PHILIPTSCHENKO and others are especially instructive with respect to the composition of such species.

The paleontologists present a picture which has been interpreted by some as irreconcilable with the Mendelian mechanism, but this seems to be due more to a failure to appreciate statistical consequences of this mechanism than to anything in the data. The horse has been the standard example of an orthogenetic evolutionary sequence preserved for us with an abundance of material. Yet MATHEW's interpretation as one in which evolution has proceeded by extensive differentiation of local races, intergroup selection, and crossbreeding is as close as possible to that required under the Mendelian theory.

Summing up: I have attempted to form a judgment as to the conditions for evolution based on the statistical consequences of Mendelian heredity. The most general conclusion is that evolution depends on a certain balance among its factors. There must be gene mutation, but an excessive rate gives an array of freaks, not evolution; there must be selection, but too severe a process destroys the field of variability, and thus the basis for further advance; prevalence of local inbreeding within a species has extremely important evolutionary consequences, but too close inbreeding leads merely to extinction. A certain amount of crossbreeding is favorable but not too much. In this dependence on balance the species is like a living organism. At all levels of organization life depends on the maintenance of a certain balance among its factors.

More specifically, under biparental reproduction a very low rate of mutation balanced by moderate selection is enough to maintain a practically infinite field of possible gene combinations within the species. The field actually occupied is relatively small though sufficiently extensive that no two individuals have the same genetic constitution. The course of evolution through the general field is not controlled by direction of mutation and not directly by selection, except as conditions change, but by a trial and error

mechanism consisting of a largely nonadaptive differentiation of local races (due to inbreeding balanced by occasional crossbreeding) and a determination of long time trend by intergroup selection. The splitting of species depends on the effects of more complete isolation, often made permanent by the accumulation of chromosome aberrations, usually of the balanced type. Studies of natural species indicate that the conditions for such an evolutionary process are often present.

## LITERATURE CITED

- CRAMPTON, H. E., 1925 Contemporaneous organic differentiation in the species of *Partula* living in Moorea, Society Islands. *Amer. Nat.* **59**:5-35.
- EAST, E. M., 1918 The role of reproduction in evolution. *Amer. Nat.* **52**:273-289.
- GULICK, J. T., 1905 Evolution, racial and habitudinal. *Pub. Carnegie Instn.* **25**:1-269.
- JACOT, A. P., 1932 The status of the species and the genus. *Amer. Nat.* **66**:346-364.
- JORDAN, D. S., 1908 The law of geminate species. *Amer. Nat.* **42**:73-80.
- KELLOGG, V. L., 1908 Darwinism, today. 403 pp. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- KINSEY, A. C., 1930 The gall wasp genus *Cynips*. *Indiana Univ. Studies.* **84-86**:1-577.
- MATHEW, W. D., 1926 The evolution of the horse. A record and its interpretation. *Quart. Rev. Biol.* **1**:139-185.
- OSBORN, H. F., 1927 The origin of species. V. Speciation and mutation. *Amer. Nat.* **49**:193-239.
- OSGOOD, W. H., 1909 Revision of the mice of the genus *Peromyscus*. *North American Fauna* **28**:1-285.
- PHILIPTSCHENKO, J., 1927 Variabilität and Variation. 101 pp. Berlin.
- RENSCH, B., 1929 Das Prinzip geographischer Rassenkreise und das Problem der Artbildung. 206 pp. Berlin: Gebrüder Borntraeger.
- ROBSON, G. C., 1928 The species problem. 283 pp. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd.
- RUTHVEN, A. G., 1908 Variation and genetic relationships of the garter snakes. *U. S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* **61**:1-301.
- SCHMIDT, J., 1917 Statistical investigations with *Zoarcetes viviparus* L. *J. Genet.* **7**:105-118.
- SEREBROVSKY, A. S., 1929 Beitrag zur geographischen Genetic des Haushahns in Sowjet-Russland. *Arch. f. Geflügelkunde, Jahrgang* **3**:161-169.
- SUMNER, F. B., 1932 Genetic, distributional, and evolutionary studies of the subspecies of deer mice (*Peromyscus*). *Bibl. genet.* **9**:1-106.
- THOMPSON, D. H., 1931 Variation in fishes as a function of distance. *Trans. Ill. State Acad. of Sci.* **23**:276-281.
- WRIGHT, S., 1931 Evolution in Mendelian populations. *Genetics* **16**:97-159.