

Rate of Adaptive Evolution under Blending Inheritance

Alan R. Rogers*

August 3, 2021

Abstract

In a population of size N , adaptive evolution is $2N$ times faster under Mendelian inheritance than the rate implied by Victorian theories of heredity and evolution.

Unfortunately we have no means of determining, according to the standard of years, how long a period it takes to modify a species.

Charles Darwin (1872, p. 270)

In the latter half of the 19th century, evolutionary time seemed limited. Victorian science suggested that the earth was not much older than 100 million years (Jackson, 2001; Thomson, 1862). Was it really plausible that so much evolution could have happened in this interval? Evolutionists had no answer. In part, this was because the question was quantitative—involving rates and intervals—yet evolutionary theory was at that time merely qualitative. It was impossible to say how much time was needed, because (as Darwin laments in the quote above), no one had a clear understanding of the rate of evolution.

Well, almost no one. In 1871, A.S. Davis (1871) published the first coherent, quantitative model of evolution. But no one noticed for over a century, until the article was finally discovered by Morris (1994) and Bulmer (2004). In the paragraphs that follow, I ask what Davis might have concluded about the rate of adaptive evolution, had he pursued the matter.

Victorians assumed that heredity involved blending the hereditary material of the parents, and there were at least two theories of blending (Bulmer, 2004). For some, blending was like mixing paint. For others, it was consistent with an underlying particulate heredity (Galton, 1889, p. 12). Following Davis (1871), I assume the paint-pot model of blending inheritance.

Blending inheritance probably doesn't exist in the real world. Yet it is important in history, because for half a century it encouraged skepticism toward natural selection. Blending implied that selection, if worked at all, must be very slow, for blending destroys the variation that makes selection possible. How slow? The Victorians had no answer. Yet they could have answered the question had they tried. This note will provide

*Dept. of Anthropology, 270 S 1400 E Rm 102, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112. rogers@anthro.utah.edu

that answer, by building a model from Victorian premises. It will not be a modern model, for it will not be particulate, and it will not incorporate the stochastic effects that we now see as central to evolution. It will be a model that A.S. Davis might have built, had he put his mind to it. It will show that adaptive evolution is far faster under Mendelian inheritance than the rate implied by Victorian views.

To measure the rate of adaptive evolution, I focus on the rate of increase in the mean Darwinian fitness of a population. This requires comment, because it is not clear that mean fitness does increase. Each adaptive improvement may generate an increase in population size, which increases competition for resources and leaves the population no better off than before. We therefore study the marginal effect on mean fitness, ignoring such compensatory effects as density-dependent population regulation (Frank and Slatkin, 1992; Grafen, 2003; Plutynski, 2006; Price, 1972).

Suppose that individuals vary in Darwinian fitness, interpreted as the probability of surviving from birth to reproductive maturity. As a cohort matures, its mean fitness rises as selection culls individuals with low fitness. To measure this effect, let W denote an individual's absolute fitness. The mean fitness of adults exceeds that of newborns by¹

$$\Delta\bar{W} = V/\bar{W} \quad (1)$$

where where \bar{W} and V are the mean and variance of fitness among newborns. This describes

¹If p_W is the fraction of newborns with fitness W , then the corresponding fraction among adults is Wp_W/\bar{W} , where $\bar{W} = \sum Wp_W$ is the mean fitness among newborns. The mean fitness of adults is $\sum W^2p_W/\bar{W} = V/\bar{W} + \bar{W}$, where V is the variance in fitness among newborns. Subtracting \bar{W} gives Eqn. 1, the fitness difference between newborns and adults (Price, 1970).

changes within a generation, so it does not depend on the mechanism of inheritance. It works as well with blending as with Mendelian inheritance.

Let us approximate Eqn. 1 as a differential equation:

$$d\bar{W}(t)/dt = V(t)/\bar{W}(t) \quad (2)$$

Under blending inheritance, the variance is halved each generation (Fisher, 1930):

$$dV(t)/dt = -V(t)/2 \quad (3)$$

This equation captures the effect of blending on variance but not that of selection. Unless selection is very strong, however, its effect on variance will be negligible compared with that of blending. Eqn. 3 implies that

$$V(t) = V_0e^{-t/2} \quad (4)$$

where V_0 is the variance in fitness immediately after the mutation.

Consider the effect of a single new mutation, whose fitness is $1 + s$ times W_0 , the fitness of a normal individual. The initial population consists of a single mutant and $N - 1$ normal individuals. The initial variance in fitness is

$$V_0 = W_0^2s^2 \left(\frac{1}{N} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) \approx W_0^2s^2/N \quad (5)$$

ignoring terms of order N^{-2} .

Equations 2-5 imply that mean fitness will evolve toward an asymptote at which $\bar{W}_\infty^2 = W_0^2 + 4V_0 = W_0^2(1 + 4s^2/N)$. This implies that $\bar{W}_\infty/W_0 \approx 1 + 2s^2/N$. A single mutation causes a proportional increase,

$$\frac{\bar{W}_\infty - W_0}{W_0} \approx 2s^2/N \quad (6)$$

in mean fitness. Using a different argument, Davis derived this result in 1871 for the special case in which $s = 1$.

Let us define mutation rates so as to equalize mutational inputs under blending and diploid Mendelian inheritance. To this end, assume for blending that each of the N individuals mutates with probability $2u$, so that $2Nu$ new mutants arise per generation, each with selective advantage s . The rate of proportional increase in mean fitness is $2Nu \times 2s^2/N = 4us^2$ under blending inheritance.

Under Mendelian inheritance, the corresponding theory is well known. Let u represent the probability per generation that a single gene mutates to a new allele, whose heterozygous carriers have fitness $1 + s$ times that of normal individuals. There are on average $2Nu$ such mutations per generation, of which a fraction $2s$ is eventually fixed (Haldane, 1927). If gene effects are additive, so that homozygous mutants have fitness $1 + 2s$, then each fixed mutation increases mean fitness by $2s$. The product, $8Nus^2$, of these quantities, is the rate of proportional increase in mean fitness under Mendelian inheritance.

This is $2N$ times the rate under blending inheritance. In a population of 10,000 individuals, adaptive evolution would be 20,000 times slower under blending than under Mendelian inheritance, given equal mutational inputs.

Late in the 19th century, two misconceptions undermined the debate about evolutionary time. One of these—the age of the earth—has been widely discussed. Yet by comparison, its effect was minor. Victorians underestimated the age of the earth by 1 or 2 orders of magnitude. The error implied by their theory of heredity was much larger.

Evolutionists have long known that Mendelian

inheritance solved a fundamental evolutionary problem—the maintenance of variation—and also that evolutionary rates depend on variance. We have not, however, fully understood the overwhelming advantage in speed that Mendelism gave to evolution.

Acknowledgements I am grateful for comments from Guillaume Achaz, Thomas Bataillon, Elizabeth Cashdan, Stephen Downes, Steven Gaubin, and Sergey Kryazhimskiy.

References

- Bulmer, M. 2004. Did Jenkin's swamping argument invalidate Darwin's theory of natural selection? *The British Journal for the History of Science* 37:281–297.
- Darwin, C. 1872. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. 6th ed. John Murray, London.
- Davis, A. S. 1871. The "North British Review" and the Origin of Species. *Nature* 5:161.
- Fisher, R. A. 1930. *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Frank, S. A., and M. Slatkin. 1992. Fisher's fundamental theorem of natural selection. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 7:92–95.
- Galton, F. 1889. *Natural Inheritance*. Macmillan, London.
- Grafen, A. 2003. Fisher the evolutionary biologist. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series D* 52:319–329.

- Haldane, J. B. S. 1927. A mathematical theory of natural and artificial selection, part V: Selection and mutation. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 23:838–844.
- Jackson, P. N. W. 2001. John Joly (1857–1933) and his determinations of the age of the earth. Pages 107–119 *in* C. Lewis and S. Knell, eds. *The Age of the Earth: from 4004 BC to AD 2002*, vol. 190 of *Special Publications*. Geological Society of London, London.
- Morris, S. W. 1994. Fleeming Jenkin and *The Origin of Species*: A reassessment. *The British Journal for the History of Science* 27:313–343.
- Plutynski, A. 2006. What was Fisher’s fundamental theorem of natural selection and what was it for? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 37:59–82.
- Price, G. R. 1970. Selection and covariance. *Nature* 227:520–521.
- . 1972. Fisher’s “fundamental theorem” made clear. *Annals of Human Genetics* 36:129–140.
- Thomson, W. 1862. On the secular cooling of the earth. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 23:157–170.