

of the argument which is made to rest on analogy. We have, however, more than exhausted our space, and merely remark that it is not at all a settled point that the analogies are in favour of creation in a plurality of centres. Linnæus and his followers in the past, and men such as Edward Forbes in the present, assert exactly the contrary ; and, though the question is doubtless an obscure and difficult one,—so much so, that he who takes up either side, and incurs the *onus probandi* of what he asserts, will find he has but a doubtful case,—the doubt and obscurity lie quite as much on the one side as the other. Even, however, were the analogies with regard to vegetables and the lower animals in favour of creation in various centres, it would utterly fail to affect the argument. Though the dormouse and the Scotch fir had been created in fifty places at once, the fact would not yield us the slightest foundation for inferring that man had originated in more than a single centre. Ultimately, controversies of this character will not fail to be productive of good. They will leave the truth more firmly established, because more thoroughly tried, and the Churches more learned. Nay, should such a controversy as the present at length convince the Churches that those physical and natural sciences which, during the present century, have been changing the very face of the world, and the entire region of human thought, must be sedulously studied by them, and that they can no more remain ignorant without sin than a shepherd can remain unarmed in a country infested by beasts of prey without breach of trust, it will be productive of much greater good than harm.—*July 13, 1850.*