

Allow me to refer to a very recent example, where the caution which I recommend would have been wisely adopted. Some of our zoölogists have advanced views respecting the specific unity and unity of origin of the human race, that are in conflict with the common understanding of revelation ; and at once able divines took the ground that such views are irreconcilably opposed to the whole scheme of the Bible. They may be so ; but why declare it before the subject has been more thoroughly discussed, and we are sure that we understand it? It may turn out—and such is my own conviction—that the zoölogists have too hastily decided this question, because they judged of it chiefly from facts in the limited field of their own science. Suppose it should appear that eminent naturalists are divided in opinion on the subject. Suppose that, when they assert that there are several species of men, they are unable to tell us what constitutes a species, and cannot draw a line of distinction between species and varieties. Suppose that we should find zoölogists entirely disagreed on the subject of hybridity. Suppose it should appear that the laws of distribution in the species and varieties of the lower animals, which is the grand argument for proving a diversity of origin in the case of man, should be found greatly modified in respect to him, by his cosmopolite character and ability, through superior mental endowments, to adapt himself to different circumstances. Suppose we should find examples of varieties of men, who have passed from the highest to the lowest races, save in color, through the influence of deteriorating causes long acting. Suppose it should appear that ethnology and psychology are entitled to as much weight in their testimony on this subject as zoölogy, and that they should pronounce in favor of a unity of origin. Suppose it should be found that many other elements of this most difficult subject