

generic connection, which, as it were, marry together dissimilar races; but it furnishes no genealogical link to show that the existences of one race derive their lineage from the existences of another. The scene shifts, as we pass from formation to formation; we are introduced in each to a new *dramatis personæ*; and there exist no such proofs of their being at once different and yet the same, as those produced in the *Winter : Tale*, to show that the grown shepherdess of the one scene is identical with the exposed infant of the scene that went before. Nay, the reverse is well nigh as strikingly the case, as if the grown shepherdess had been introduced into the earlier scenes of the drama, and the child into its concluding scenes.

The argument is a very simple one. Of all the vertebrata, fishes rank lowest, and in geological history appear first. We find their remains in the Upper and Lower Silurians, in the Lower, Middle, and Upper Old Red Sandstone, in the Mountain Limestone, and in the Coal Measures; and in the latter formation the first reptiles appear.* Fishes seem to have been the master existences of two great systems, mayhap of three, ere the age of reptiles began. Now fishes differ very much among themselves: some rank nearly as low as worms, some nearly as high as reptiles; and if fish could have risen into reptiles, and reptiles into mammalia, we would necessarily expect to find lower orders of fish passing into higher, and taking precedence of the higher in their appearance in point of time, just as in the *Winter's Tale* we see the infant preceding the adult. If such be not the case — if fish made their first appearance, not in their least perfect, but in their most perfect state — not in their nearest approximation to the worm, but in their nearest approximation to the reptile — there is no room for progression, and the argumen

* See Note B.