

several pairs ; whereas, what is held by Professor Agassiz and several of the American naturalists is, that though the species be properly but one, it is according to the known analogies both of plants and animals that it should have originated in various centres,—a conclusion which the strongly-marked varieties of the race which occur in certain well-defined geographic areas serve, it is held, to substantiate, or at least to render the most probable.

It will be seen, that against this re-statement of the question many of the old facts and arguments do not bear. Theologically, however,—in every instance in which it assumes the positive form, and in which, building on its presumed analogies, and the extreme character and remote appearance of the several varieties of the species to which it points, it asserts that the beginnings of the race must be diverse, and its *Adams* and *Eves* many,—it is in effect the same. On the consequences of the result it can be scarce necessary to insist. The second Adam died for but the descendants of the first. Nay, so thoroughly is revelation pledged to the unity of the species, that if all nations be not “made of one blood,” there is, in the theological sense, neither first nor second Adam ; “Christ,” according to the Apostle, “hath not risen ;” conversion is an idle fiction ; and all men are yet in their sins. Further, that kind of brotherhood which unites the species by those ties of neighbourhood illustrated by our Saviour is broken ; and there are races of men reckoned up by millions and tens of millions, in which we may recognise our slaves and victims, but not our brothers and neighbours. Nay, why should we respect the life of creatures not of our own blood ? Bill Sykes tells Fagin the Jew, in “*Oliver Twist*,” that he wished he was his dog ; “for,” said he, “the Government that cares for the lives of men like you lets a man kill a dog how he likes.” But if these tribes be men not of our own blood,—men who did not spring from the same