

THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

No. 2—NOV.—DEC., 1891.

I. LITERARY.

REV. PROF. C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.

BY REV. J. A. QUARLES, D. D., LL. D.

CHARLES CAMPBELL HERSMAN was born on a farm in the superb blue-grass section of Kentucky, in the neighborhood of Lexington, its equally superb city. This portion of the State is noted as having in it the very best blood of man and beast: short horn cattle, silken-haired racers and trotters, Clays, Breckinridges, Marshalls, Crittendens, Wickliffes, Shelys, Merrifee and Beck, Blackburns, Youngs.

Born in this most favored region, he was carried by his parents at an early age to Missouri, where they settled on a large farm in Monroe county. Here his father died when he was thirteen years of age, leaving ample means for the rearing and liberal education of his children. Charles was fond of books from early childhood, and availed himself of every opportunity which the neighborhood afforded of gratifying his love of reading. His primary education was conducted by the country school in the vicinity of the farm.

As his physical constitution was not robust, at the advice of the family physician, he remained at home on the farm until the spring of 1855, when he was sent to the Van Rensselaer Academy, an institution under the patronage of the Presbytery of Palmyra, and named for the philanthropic Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, a descendant of one of the Dutch patroons of New York. The academy at that time was managed by the Rev. J. P. Finley, D. D., afterwards a professor in Westminster College, one of the most godly of men. Here, in April, young Hersman began the study of Latin and Greek, and, by the close of the term in June, he had so far mastered the forms and the construction that he was able to read the "Life of Epaminondas," by Nepos, and "The Anabasis." Returning to the academy in the fall he continued his studies, but was compelled by his delicate health to return home the following April.

PRIMEVAL MAN. — I.

By PROF. FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

DURING recent years the science of Anthropology has made notable progress. Some workers in this fruitful field have been careful and conservative; others have been hasty and heedless in their work. In certain quarters radical conclusions are boldly stated, and little notice is taken of what the Bible has to say on several vital topics in this field. In regard to the length of time man has dwelt on the earth, concerning the supposition that there were races of men living before Adam's day, in reference to the relation of man to the brute species, and regarding man's actual primeval state we find great diversity of view among anthropologists. No one who has even slightly considered the opinions expressed in some recent books and periodicals can fail to see how inimical their relation is to the statements of the Bible. The theologian and student of the Sacred Scriptures has vast interests at stake in this field at the present day.

Of these questions, perhaps the last named is of the deepest moment in the light of modern science; and it is the purpose of this paper, and perhaps of one or two others, to discuss the problems raised by an enquiry into man's primeval state. In itself this enquiry is of absorbing interest; but its importance is greatly enhanced by the fact that the conclusions reached concerning this question must in a measure prepare the way for like conclusions regarding the other topics stated above. If it be made out that man was at first a rude, untutored savage, it will be easier to establish his great antiquity, and it will not seem so hopeless a task to make out a genetic connection between man and brute. But if primitive savagism is not the true view of the earliest stages of the human race, then it becomes far more difficult to render even plausible close organic connection between man and the brute, or to require vast ages to secure man's advance to the civilized state.

The enquiry, then, is, What was man's primeval state and endowment? What was his condition at his first appearance on the face of the earth? How should we regard his mental, moral and religious attainments in the very earliest stages of his existence? Was he a rude, unlettered and unthinking

barbarian, devoid of even the rudiments of civilization, or was he possessed of a well developed mental, moral and religious constitution, which expressed itself in a suitable primitive civilization? Are we to adopt the views of Lubbock, Tylor, and certain writers in *The Popular Science Monthly*, who assures us very confidently that primitive savagism was man's original state, and that his upward progress from this low barbaric condition has been slowly effected in a purely naturalistic way? Or have we good reason on the side of science for rejecting such views, and for holding, with well grounded assurance, that man on his first appearance was neither a rude barbarian nor an untutored savage, but already a religious being, fully endowed and fairly well civilized? We believe that an affirmative answer should be given to the last question, and we proceed to open up the considerations which justify this answer.

At the outset a few things should be said in regard to the general teaching of the Bible on this question. This teaching is not adduced at this point as proof of any theory of man's primitive state, but it is presented merely as a matter of fact. The biblical narratives are held in this discussion to be truly historical, and hence not mythological in their nature. As historical these narratives, especially that of Genesis, speak to the subject of man's primeval state, and it is proper to keep before us what these utterances are. Even if we do not take into account the distinctly divine nature of the biblical narratives, the general view they give of the state of primeval man cannot be disregarded in the consideration of this question.

In general the impartial reader of Genesis must admit that the first men it knows anything about were possessed of a comparatively high degree of intelligence, and capable of religious communion with God. The account of Adam in Paradise proves this, and the offerings of Cain and Abel after the expulsion from the Garden in Eden confirms the same conclusion. The narrative concerning Noah implies that he was by no means an untutored savage, and that he must have had more than the rudiments of religion in his possession. Moreover, the sad state of the antediluvians was due to a lamentable moral degradation which implies a previous better state from which they had declined. The representation of the early patriarchal ages after Noah given in Genesis, supplies the same general picture of man's early state, and no fair reading of the biblical account of these ages can justify any

other verdict than that man was then, as made in the likeness of God and under moral relations to God, possessed of a considerable degree of mental, moral and religious endowment. By this it is not meant that according to the Bible, man was civilized in the sense that we now attach to modern civilization, and that he was thus familiar with the arts and sciences as we are at this day. It is simply meant that his state in all essential respects, was far above that of the average modern savages, and his endowments much greater than theirs.

If we pay a little attention to some simple facts noted in Genesis in an incidental way this view is greatly confirmed. It is said that Cain tilled the field and Abel tended the flock. Both of these occupations denote a stage of human progress in advance of pure barbarism. The sons of Cain originated several mechanical arts. Thus tents, harps, organs, brass and iron ore all alluded to in a way that clearly implies a measure of civilization quite removed from savagism. The men who were working in these several mechanical arts could not have been ignorant, untutored savages, but must have had good heads and skillful hands. In Noah's time the building of the ark implied a high degree of skill and ability in several trades, which have no place among rude barbarians; and so the tower of Babel, and the building of a city by Nimrod, all point to the same conclusion. The only way to escape this conclusion is to say, that the Scripture narratives are myths, or that there were preadamite races of whom the Bible says nothing. The former of these alternatives is rejected when we assume, as we do in this discussion, the historicity of the book of Genesis, and the latter is not raised by the Bible at all, but must be discussed on other grounds.

This brief outline of the substance of the biblical narrative bearing on man's early condition as therein described, enables us to state clearly and sharply the real point of this discussion. It is simply this:—Did man begin his career in the world in a condition of ignorant barbarism and pagan savagism, or was he from the first fully endowed with the essential mental, moral and religious elements which pertain to an estate of comparative civilization? The debate upon this question is made exceedingly important just now by the fact that several anthropologists of note, both in Britain and Germany, are pressing the opinion on us that man began his history in a very low state, in which he was but little removed, if not indeed derived,

from the brute; that in this state he was at least as rude as the average modern savage races; and that he has only been slowly rising by natural means to the civilized state. Our main task is to examine some of the reasonings and estimate them fairly and candidly, in order to see whether these recent anthropological hypotheses are well founded in the light of the assured conclusions of sober and reliable science.

In the first place, taking the most radical of the theories in regard to man's primitive state, we must consider those views which in various ways connect man genetically with the lower animals. All these must, if consistent, maintain that man's primitive state was utter savagism. If man has come gradually by natural descent from the brute, then his original estate and capacity must have been only very slightly removed from that of the brute. For a long time the differences could not have been very great, and it could only be after passing through a long era of savagism that he rose to the ordinary stages of an average civilization. This theory of descent for man, carrying with it primitive barbarism, is presented in various ways by different advocates of organic or biological evolution. Those who, like Herbert Spencer, advocate the principle of Continuity, find an unbroken chain of existence with increasing differentiation from the homogeneous to the highest specimen of civilized man. Others who, like Wallace and Huxley, confine the theory chiefly to the sphere of Biology, conclude that the body of man may be derived by descent from the lower animals, but the mental and moral faculties cannot be so derived. And still others who like Romanes and perhaps Darwin, seek to bring man entirely under the scope of this theory, argue that the higher powers of man are also an outgrowth in a natural way from certain facts in animal life. These and other shades of opinion upon this great subject, however they differ in regard to the manner and extent of the application of the theory of man's genetic relation to, and descent from, the brute, wholly or in part only, all agree in holding that, in his early stages of really human existence, as man was slowly but surely emerging from his animal ancestry, he must have been for a long time in a very low scale of civilization. Hence, this great hypothesis in Biology has its important bearings upon the question now under discussion in the department of Anthropology, inasmuch as its truth is assumed by many writers who discuss at length man's primeval state.

The reader will at once perceive that if the hypothesis of organic evolution be established regarding man's origin, it necessarily carries with it the acceptance of some phase of primeval savagism. This being the case, we must present some considerations in regard to this phase of the subject. No complete discussion of organic evolution, or of the theory of descent in relation to man can be entered on in the limits of this article, but a few things must be said which may go to show that the bold claims of some anthropologists are entirely without justification by the facts in the case.

If the hypothesis of continuity be assumed, and natural evolution be posited as at least the *mode*, if not the *cause*, of the upward progress *towards* man, *to* man, and *of* man, then several wide breaches yet unabridged appear. First, the chasm between the inorganic and organic forms of existence is still impassible, and must remain so till it is shown that spontaneous generation of life is a fact, or did actually occur at some time in the remote past in nature's laboratory. Then the breaks between the vegetal and animal kingdoms, between the animals and man, and between the physical and mental elements in man, are by no means satisfactorily bridged. Till this is done, and the work accepted by science generally as permanently done, it is vain for a few men to assume that the whole question is settled, and to hold that the law of continuity and the process of natural evolution is established as scientific fact. If this thorough-going form of the theory breaks down, then it cannot be taken as a secure basis to rest a doctrine of primeval savagism upon. And this is all we claim at this stage. Primitive savagism and gradual natural elevation of man cannot be supported by an unproved hypothesis. The way, therefore, is open to consider other opinions as to man's original state and endowments.

Again, if we take any one of the many phases of the theory of descent which confine organic evolution almost entirely to the realm of biology, we shall find as great difficulties almost in the way of its acceptance. Nor does it matter which of the so-called laws according to which the modification of living things is produced, and various animal species, and finally the human species, are generated, there are objections and difficulties on every hand. If the law of use and disuse is relied on chiefly, as was done by La Marck, there are facts not explained; if the law of natural selection be given prominence,

as it is by Darwin, there are other facts which stubbornly refuse explanation thereby; or if the chief place is given to the law of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, as is the case with H. Spencer, there are still other facts which absolutely refuse to yield submission to the law. Nor is any combination of these laws able, in the present stage of the enquiry, to establish the general conclusion that distinctly new biological species, capable of reproducing their own kind continuously, and no longer permanently fertile with individuals of other species, and this between different species in the animal kingdom, have ever been naturally produced. If this hypothesis be not clearly established in the case of the genetic relation of animal species to each other, still less can we hold that, in the present state of the case, it is made out in regard to the origin of the human species, even on the physical side of its nature. Only an unpardonable ignoring of the facts renders such a conclusion possible.

It may be worth while noting some of the things that are ignored by the advocates of the theory of descent, as between animal species, and between the highest animal and man. The fixity of species, as a fact in nature, is ignored, and a purely artificial view taken of biological species. It overlooks the fact that there is a vast difference between Natural and Artificial selection; for it does not follow that because certain marked modifications may be effected under the hand and skill of man, that therefore similar or greater changes have ever taken place at any time in nature. It does not give due weight to the fact that if domestic birds or beasts are turned out into a state of nature the tendency is to unity of type. It has to face the stern fact that not really new biological species, but only varieties, have ever been produced by man's skill, nor has any good explanation of the genesis of the sexes ever been given. The unyielding facts of hybridism and infertility in general between distinct species are admitted even by Huxley to be inexplicable by this theory. Then transitional forms, by which the passage has been made from one species to another, are not found, either now existing or in fossil form in the record of the rocks. In like manner widely separated forms of animal life, and the world of living things revealed by the microscope are left unexplained in their genetic relation. Rudimentary or nascent organs, together with the facts of atavism, or reversion to type, and of animal instinct hinder rather than help

the theory. There are facts also in embryology, and in the geological record, which are not accounted for by the theory. Above all, these laws one and all are not of causal efficiency, but are only processes at best. Hence something else is needed than these laws.

Applying all this to the case of the human species, we are justified in concluding that if it is not yet clearly proved that organic evolution explains the origin of new species, still less can this theory fully explain the origin of man, and prove his genesis, even as to his bodily organism, from the brute in any form. And still less can human intelligence be developed from animal instinct and powers of perception; and when the moral and religious facts of man's nature and conduct are considered the attempt to explain the facts by means of organic evolution becomes all the more futile, and even utterly hopeless, so far as present knowledge extends.

If the theory thus breaks down on the side of science so completely, it cannot be taken as solid ground to advocate primeval savagism as the true view of man's 'original state. And since very much of the reasoning in the writings of some modern anthropologists in favor of primeval savagism has proceeded upon the assumption that organic evolution, in the form of the theory of natural descent from some animal forms, and as the true principle which guides man's upward progress to the highest stages of civilization, is fully established, if it be shown, as we believe it can be most clearly, that this evolutionary hypothesis cannot explain all the facts, then all the inferences drawn therefrom in regard to man's necessary primeval savagism are invalid and without foundation. Hence, again, the way is open for some other theory on the field of science than that man was, in his original state, a barbarian, or a savage little better than a brute.

In this article we have only space to notice another theory upon which reliance is placed to establish primitive savagism and to avoid all conflict with the biblical narrative. This theory is usually known as the preadamite hypothesis, and it must be briefly explained and criticised as it is held by some eminent scholars.

In general this theory maintains that all the existing races of men have not descended from Adam or even Noah. All the dark skinned races, and perhaps some others, are not Adamic. It maintains that the time since the biblical Adam is too short

to have secured the wide dispersion of the races which we find in early historic ages, and to produce the widely different race features of the various branches of the human family. Adam was not the first man, for there were men on the earth before his time, and of these Cain got his wife. Adam, some further say, was the first white man, and so the progenitor of all the white races. Moreover, it is also held by some of the advocates of this curious theory that the cradle of the human family was on a great continent, now submerged under the Indian Ocean, and that the Deluge was not universal even as far as the races of men are concerned.

This theory it is asserted explains many facts which cannot be explained otherwise, and from this general theory the facts of primeval savagism in the case of man are said to be clear and unquestioned. What the Bible says has reference to Adam and his decedents, who were no doubt intelligent, religious, and possessed of a degree of civilization. But in the case of the preadamites there must have been a long period of low barbarism from which men only slowly emerged, and from which many modern races have not yet really risen. The condition of modern savages can be thus explained without assuming race degeneration of any kind. In this way the whole theory is made very plausible, and it even professes to explain certain things in the Bible better than any other view. We can only offer a few brief remarks upon it.

It is based on frequent assumptions; indeed it is an hypothesis built on hypotheses, and has neither history nor tradition to support it. It assumes that race distribution is not possible from the Biblical Adam, whereas even Darwin thinks that the world could have all been peopled in the time from Adam. It assumes without proof that the Deluge was partial, even so far as man is concerned; and it assumes, in an utterly unscientific way, the existence long ago of a submerged continent. To suppose that Adam was the first white man is a mere fancy, and to help Cain to get a wife is scarcely sufficient support in itself of such a theory. Then the fact that the unity of the races of mankind is generally taken to be not only the teaching of Scripture, but also the well founded conclusion of science tells against this hypothesis with great effect, so that all the proofs in support of racial unity go to refute preadamitism, and the phase of primeval savagism based on it. These proofs need not be now adduced; it is enough to state the fact

in this connection. And it need only be added that if so many of the races of men belonged to another parentage than Adam, how comes it to pass that as we trace history, and tradition and language, and religion back the streams seem to converge to one common source? This surely tells against the diversity of origin implied in preadamitism, hence we feel justified in setting this theory aside also, and so removing it from the lists of the supporters of the theory of primeval savagism regarding man's original state.

But the limits of this article are already exceeded. The next article in this series proposes to discuss some other reasonings in support of primeval savagism; and in the third and last article an outline of the positive arguments against primeval savagism and in support of the main thesis of the whole discussion will be (D. V.) given. Meantime we surcease.

Columbia S. C.



UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

NO. 3—JAN.-FEB., 1892.

I. LITERARY.

AUGUSTINE'S CONFESSIONS.*

“WILLIAM G. BLAIKIE, EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND”.

It has long been matter of anxious thought to me whether in my lectures on Pastoral Theology, I might not do something to bring the subject of experimental religion under the notice of fourth year's students. It is certain that one of the most vital, delicate, and difficult of the duties which you may have by and by to perform, will be to guide the more earnest and spiritual of your people in the ways of holy living and dying; to encourage in them the habit of personal communion with God; to show them how such communion may be maintained, and how it may be lost; and to bring under their notice such books, ancient and modern, as are most useful for that end. The question has often presented itself to me, Ought not a course of Pastoral Theology to provide some guidance, or at least furnish some hints, on this vital subject? But I have usually dismissed the question with the thought, It is not a subject for lectures. Even if I were so familiar with it myself as to believe that I could teach it (of which I have great doubts), of what use would that be, seeing that if men do not learn it from their own experience, it is vain to dream of their learning it from the instructions of another? Nay, might it not be a snare to them, making them think they know the whole when they only know some of its signs or formula? Of all things to be deprecated, in connection with the pulpit, the worst is, preachers inculcating an experience which is not their own. Would not this be a probable, or at least a possible, result of a course of lectures on the life of the soul? But as often as the question has been dismissed in that form, it has come up in another. Without lecturing on it, might not one

*Delivered before the Class of Pastoral Theology, New College, Edinburgh, December 4th, 1891.

PRIMEVAL MAN. II.

PROF. FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

In a former article some remarks were offered on the subject of man's primitive state, and promise was then made that other articles would continue the discussion of this most interesting topic. That promise is now, in part at least, to be redeemed by the brief and somewhat popular consideration of some other opinions and reasonings on the subject.

In the article in the last issue of this magazine the scope of the debate regarding man's primeval state was outlined, and brief allusion was made to the statements and implications found in the Bible upon the subject. Then, in the main part of the article, two theories which agree in holding the opinion that "savagery" was man's primitive condition were briefly considered. First, Those who connect man genetically with the brute, and maintain that by means of some sort of natural evolutionary process man came out of some brute species, must necessarily believe that at first, in the early stages of his human existence, man must have been in a low, untutored condition. Secondly, others, who do not apply organic evolution to the origin of man, set forth the curious opinion usually known as the preadamite hypothesis. According to this theory it is held that there were men before Adam, and that early savagism pertained only to these races, while from the first the Adamic races were marked by considerable advance in culture.

These opinions were both examined at no great length, and considerations were presented, which, if not justifying a rejection of both on scientific grounds, yet gave good reason for a suspension of judgment in favor of primeval savagism, in the light of the facts before us at present.

Other lines of reasoning and speculation remain to be considered in this article. These opinions all agree in asserting that man in his early state was very low in the scale of intellectual, moral and religious attainment. His first condition, it is said, was his rudest stage. The views to be presented and examined also agree in maintaining that by a slow upward development of some kind, which is almost, if not entirely, natural in its character, the human species has gradually improved,

and will go on improving until his perfect estate is reached. In this way modern civilization has been the natural product of all the ages, but at the outset man was in a state of great poverty in regard to all that culture or civilization implies. That the human species is improving slowly but surely is a fact that we believe and rejoice in, but that this improvement is purely natural, or that man's original state was barbaric, may be seriously doubted on scientific grounds, apart from any conclusions based on theological doctrines.

Various phases of this theorizing are based on different classes of facts. In many cases these facts are taken to prove man's great antiquity on the earth, and along with his antiquity to conclude in favor of his early imperfect, or positively savage state. In the reasonings upon this subject it is not easy to keep the questions of antiquity and primitive condition entirely separate. If high antiquity be proved then more time is given for man to have risen up from his supposed early savage natural state. This may enable the advocates of primeval savagism to present their views in a more plausible manner, and so place a temptation in their way to do some special pleading. On the other hand, if the evidence is found rather to favor the opinion that man's origin is of comparatively recent date, the time will be too short for the evolutionary processes to do their work, and a temptation is placed in the path of the opponent of early savagism to put in some special pleas in favor of his views. We shall seek to resist the temptation on both sides, and deal as directly as we can with the one topic of man primeval state in itself considered. Three lines of additional reasoning upon the subject will now be stated and examined with care.

The first class of facts relied on by many advocates of early savagism consists in various remains of different sorts of implements and utensils made and used by men long ago. To use the technical term, these are archæological human relics, as distinguished from fossil remains of man to be described afterwards. No full account of these can possibly be given in our present limits; still a few descriptive outlines may suffice to show the general character of these remains, and to point out the nature of the reasonings based upon them in regard to man's early state and endowments.

The most numerous of these remains consist in various kinds of flint and other stone implements of great diversity in size

and shape. They are found in almost every country, but especially in Europe and America. Among these are also many fragments of pottery, sun-dried or fire-baked, and not a few remnants of bone are also to be included here. These remains consist of arrows, hammers, scrapers, axes, spear-heads, clubs, pots, awls, pins, needles, in endless variety. In some cases they seem to have been used as implements for hunting, in others as utensils for cooking, in others still as weapons of defense, and in yet others as ornaments for the person.

Many of these remains are found in the lake villages of Switzerland, Ireland and other places in Europe. These little villages were built upon platforms laid on piles, which were driven into the soft mud of the bottom of these lakes. They were located near the shore so as to be connected with it by a bridge or gangway. On the sites of these many of the relics above described have been found, and are now exhibited in museums. In the curious refuse heaps of Belgium and other places called "kitchen middens," many of these remains are found among the shells and bones and other refuse of which these heaps are almost entirely composed. Here various sorts of rude articles used in procuring and cooking the food used by the people who dwelt in villages near these refuse heaps are found. In peat bogs in many places in Western Europe and in Britain, similar remains have been found. Sometimes these are not far from the surface and evidently quite recent, but in other cases they are deeply buried and supposed to be much older and ruder. In the mounds of the mound builders of America in limited number these remains are also found. And finally in alluvial deposits in several places and in the so-called "drift" remains in different localities many of these archæological remains have been found. Almost every museum is enriched by the discoveries which have been made in all the situations named above.

. From the nature and uses of these remains it has been concluded by many observers and writers that the men who made these implements and utensils and used them must have been in a very primitive state of culture indeed. They must have been rude and untutored, we are told, when even the stern necessities of their case were not sufficient to call forth any better results than these rude remains illustrate. Some writers grow quite eloquent in their descriptions of man's early estate, eking out a precarious existence, contending with the stubborn ele-

ments of nature, and fighting with the beasts of the forest. These men we are further told represent man in his first stage, and hence the verdict is given in favor of primeval savagism for that stage. He had no knowledge of the arts of life, his moral nature was scarcely formed at all, his religious instincts were perhaps not even awakened; in a word, he was a rude savage little better than the beasts with which he often contended.

Now, what shall we say to these reasonings, and how shall we interpret the facts? Are we shut up to the interpretation which the supports of "savagism" give as above outlined, or are there considerations which require at least a suspension of judgment on the question? We incline decidedly to the opinion that the latter is the proper view to take of the present state of the question, in the light of the assured results of science.

In estimating the bearing of these remains on man's primitive state, we may pass by the opinion of some eminent men which is to the effect that the flint chips found in many gravel deposits are not the product of man's hand at all, but the result of some of nature's processes. We also waive for the present all expression of opinion as to the antiquity of these various archaeological remains, and consider a few things which may show their meaning in regard to men's original lack of culture.

In the first place, it must be shown that the races of men from whose hands these relics came were connected with the first members of the human species at its original centre of dispersion. Reasonable evidence must be presented leading us to believe that the races of Europe and America whose status of culture is represented by these remains are to be connected with the first men. Then too, it must be further made clear that the culture of the races which have left behind these remains is the exact representative of the civilization of primitive men. Unless this is done no conclusion of any great force can be drawn from these remains, regarding the actual state of the human species in its earliest stages. If at 1500 B. C., Egypt, Chaldea, and Phoenicia, and perhaps India and China were much in advance in mental and moral culture of the rude people in Europe about that time, some explanation of this difference and of the relation between these two conditions must be given. Have both come from a common stage of cul-

ture or savagism, but in one case making progress and in the other none? Or, has there been decline in the case of the lower races? That there has not been decay in their case must be shown by the advocates of "savagery," and this will be difficult to show. In Egypt and Chaldea, there are no similar remains to those found in West Europe, indicating a low state of culture. The remains which are now brought to light in vast numbers in oriental lands all indicate an early civilization of a comparatively high order. And as ethnologists generally agree that these are the most ancient scenes of human habitation, the evidence of the remains found there tells against primeval barbarism in man's first estate. Migration from these oldest regions of man's abode, and decay in culture may afford a natural explanation of the men of West Europe and America who used these remains.

And, in the second place, another consideration closely connected with the one just stated is to be taken into account. The doctrine of *autochthony* must be proved before these archaeological remains can be taken to establish primitive savagism. This doctrine asserts that in general all the races now found on the different continents are indigenous to their several localities, and that there has never been migration on a large scale from a single centre. Thus the early men of Europe, it is said, were always there, so with the aborigenes of Africa and America. Men in various regions began their history and developed it in the places where they are now found, so that in prehistoric times the men of West Europe sprang up on that soil, and developed then up to the historic period. Now our contention here is that if this theory is not proved, the remains found in West Europe may mean very little in regard to man's primitive state. At present the majority of Anthropologists pronounce against autochthony. They only show in a general way what the state of these races was at a certain unknown period of their existence; and unless we are sure that these races have their whole history confined to these regions, primeval savagism of the species as a whole cannot be concluded. Here, as so often, care must be taken not to draw conclusions wider than the facts justify, and great care must be taken to see that the facts are facts. When we find Tylor stating that the negroes at Savannah, Ga., are exempt from yellow fever, and that the French in Canada are dying out, we

have our faith in many other alleged facts stated by this writer greatly shaken.

A second general class of facts are now to be described and examined. These consist in fossil human remains, as distinguished from those just described. By fossils we here mean either actual human remains or petrefactions of the same. Here many very interesting facts come before us, but only a brief description of a few can be given, as samples of the whole. Many human skeletons, entire or almost entire, have been discovered. In other cases skulls only, and scattered bones supposed to be human have been unearthed. Geologists and Anthropologists have given us descriptions of many of these which are full of interest.

Skeletons from the caves and shelters of Canstadt, Cro-Magnon, Furfooz, and skulls from Engis and Neanderthal have been carefully examined, and fully described. Fossil men, or parts of skeletons thereof, have been found in the limestone rocks of Gaudaloupe, in the coral reefs of Florida, in the alluvial deposits at the mouth of the Mississippi, in gravel deposits under lava beds in California, in Brazil, and other places. Space forbids any account of these fossil men.

From these skeletons, skulls and bones it is argued that the men represented by these must have been of a rude and uncultured race or stage of culture. It is pointed out that these remains are found in caves which were evidently used as dwellings, and that the various stone and other remains found beside these skeletons indicate primitive culture. From these and other considerations the conclusion is drawn from the nature of these fossils, that primitive man existed in a savage state. To make this conclusion the more secure, very high antiquity is given to these fossil remains of men, so that proof of their state of culture may at least be made all the more difficult, if the evidence for primitive barbarism cannot be made very convincing.

In estimating the bearing of these fossil human remains on man's primitive state, both of the points adduced in connection with archaeological remains have force. Autochthony must be proved, or the connection of the races before us with men at the original centre of dispersion must be shown before any conclusions of value in favor of early savagism can be maintained. Neither position is yet established.

In addition, it need only be remarked that so far as these skeletons and skulls are themselves concerned, no necessary inference in favor of primeval savagism can be justly made from them. And this chiefly for the reason that it is admitted on nearly all hands that these fossil remains are well developed, and in no way radically distinct from the skeletons of existing races. The Engis skull may have been "that of a savage or a philosopher," while the Neanderthal skull is generally supposed to have been abnormal, but not more so than that of many idiots at the present day. So with the Troglodytes, or cave men, represented by the skeletons found in Canstadt, Cro-Magnon, Furfooz and other places. These skeletons are not radically different from existing races. Some are like the modern Lapps and Finns, and others are more like the Mongoloid races, but none show such differences as to justify any inferences in favor of primitive savagism. Even if the high antiquity of these fossil men be proved, little aid is given to the theory under consideration; for, if so very long ago the human skeleton had the same form as now, and the skull almost the same size and shape, the reasonable inference is against rather than in favor of primeval savagism. Moreover, it is worthy of notice in passing that the arguments in favor of man's great antiquity, in proportion as they show likeness between the skeleton of fossil and modern men, tell against the descent of man from any brute species by a gradual process of transmutation. For if it took, say 40,000 years, to effect the simple changes from fossil to modern man, pray how long must it have taken for any brute species to have become human even on the physical side?

A third set of facts and reasonings remain to be noted in this article. These are very closely related to those already considered, and yet the prominence given to the theory which underlies the inferences here made justifies a separate consideration of them. The theory alluded to is that of the several "Archæological Ages," which successively appear among certain human remains in prehistoric periods. According to this theory, set forth by Lubbock, Lartet, Tylor and a host of others, there must have been certain periods of culture, wherein the earliest was the rudest, and hence man's earliest stage must have been very low in the scale of culture. The facts on which this great theory is based are found in the different kinds of

implements and weapons which supposed primitive men used. They have their history of progress.

This theory is presented in various forms, all of which agree in principle and general application. Some content themselves with saying in a general way that in some countries at least three ages—stone, bronze and iron—seem to have appeared. Others, like Lubbock, make the theory much more definite in form. They make at least four “ages.” The first is the palaeolithic, or rough stone age; the second the neolithic, or smooth stone period; the third is called the bronze age; and the fourth the iron age. Lartet and many others make five successive ages. First, the Drift or rough stone age; second, the Glacial, or Reindeer age; third, the neolithic or polishid stone era; fourth, the bronze; and fifth, the iron age. In each case the distinction is based on the nature of the weapons and utensils used by men, as shown in various relics they have left behind them. Some of the advocates of these opinions speak with the utmost confidence of those various periods, and a few even go so far as to prescribe how long each age lasted. Others are more careful, and say that these ages are found distinctly marked only in Europe, that the periods often overlap each other, and in some localities the stone age continues to the present day. In every case, however, a definite theory in regard to the mode of human progress in prehistoric times is presupposed. That theory is to the effect that the earliest in time is the lowest in form. Hence, when rude stone implements are found to be the earliest, they are supposed to belong to the earliest men, who must therefore have existed at first in a very primitive state indeed. And from this lowest stage he gradually advanced through various periods till the dawn of history finds him generally in the bronze and iron ages. Space forbids further explanation of these theorizings, and of the facts upon which they rest.

A few brief remarks may enable us to set a proper value upon this theory of the “ages” of culture through which it is supposed that man has gradually passed.

First, it is worthy of note that the advocates of this general theory do not usually claim universal application for it. Even Lubbock is careful to say that it applies chiefly to Europe, and does not appear in other countries so clearly. Lartet and Tylor are also ready to admit that the periods are not always successive, but may often coexist. All these admissions

weaken any conclusions in favor of primeval savagism very much, inasmuch as it is not made evident what the relation of the "ages" is to each other, or which really marks the first men.

In the second place, history tells against this theory so far as its general application to the human species as a whole is concerned. These ages are not historically successive in any country, much less in regard to the human races as a whole. Suppose it was "stone age" in West Europe in 1000 B. C.; at that time it was bronze and iron ages in Egypt, Phoenicia and Chaldea. In these latter countries there are but few traces of a stone age ever prevailing there. So in the case of America, when it was discovered four hundred years ago it was stone age thereon, but in West Europe it had been iron age for centuries. So in India and China there are few signs of these ages. Such being the case historically, it is unscientific to base any theory of man's primitive state, or of the mode of his development, from such uncertain data as these.

In the last place, this whole theory of the ages, as pushed to an extreme by many of its advocates, is arbitrary and artificial. That such implements of various kinds and grades have been used by men is freely admitted, but that they indicate everywhere a settled order of human progress, or presuppose rude savagism at the first, may be seriously questioned. The way in which these stone, bronze and iron implements are arranged in museums is often quite misleading. To put the rough stone relics first, and the smooth ones next, to be followed by the bronze and iron, may make a very pretty sight; but, unless this order reproduces the actual order in which the very remains were found, it has no scientific value whatever. Many museums are at fault in this very particular, and the utmost care must be taken lest we are misled. To put a flint arrow-head from America and a similar object from the Somme valley together, simply because they are stone weapons, may look very well by way of ornamental arrangement, but it proves nothing more than that men at a certain age in these countries used such weapons. It proves very little about the successive ages of the human species, and still less does it prove primeval savagism of the race as a whole. The problem is a far wider one, and a satisfactory solution must apply to man in every habitable region.

There are other minor reasonings taken to support the opin-

ion that man did not begin his career in possession of a measure of intellectual and religious attainment, but as some of these will be touched upon indirectly in dealing with the positive proofs of such attainment, nothing will be said of them at this stage of the discussion. The main reasonings in favor of primeval savagism have been examined, and on the side of sober and conservative science found wanting. The limits of this article are already exceeded. In the next, which will be the closing one of the series, direct or positive proof will be given of the true doctrine, as we believe, of man's primitive state. These will also constitute a double refutation of primeval savageism, and of mere natural evolution or self-development as the true principle of all human progress.



THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

NO. 4—MARCH-APRIL, 1892.

I. LITERARY.

DR. LATIMER AS KNOWN BY UNION SEMINARY STUDENTS.

PROFESSOR T. C. JOHNSON.

OUR Seminary has sustained a great loss in the death of Dr. James Fair Latimer. His long illness terminated mortally March 31st. This fact will have ceased to be news to the general public long before this page reaches the reader's eye. And our religious weeklies, as well as daily papers, will have given accounts of the important events in Dr. Latimer's life, as well as various characterizations of him.

Accordingly, we confine ourselves to what *we* saw in the man, as a teacher, as a preacher, as a friend of students, as a member of the community, in his family, and as a man with a life to live for God and man.

In what we shall say of him regarded in these several particulars, we shall try to avoid exaggeration of Dr. Latimer's excellences on the one hand, and failure of appreciation on the other. We shall speak as far as possible, not simply out of the experience of one student, but of many, and those not of any one class, but of five or six classes.

1. *As a teacher* Dr. Latimer was remarkable for power to enthuse the student with love to the branch of study which he taught, for sympathetic adaptability to the individual student's standing-point and ready appreciation of the student's difficulties, for both breadth and depth of acquaintance with the subjects which he treated, for the confidence which he inspired in

PRIMEVAL MAN. III.

PROFESSOR FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Two articles in former issues of this MAGAZINE set forth various lines of reasoning which are taken to support the conclusion that some phase of primeval savagism was the original state of the human race. The first of these articles considered two of these lines of reasoning, and the second reviewed three additional arguments in favor of primitive savagism. These three arguments are drawn from the fields of geology and archaeology, and they are based respectively on relics of man's presence and activity, on actual fossil human remains, and on the meaning of the stone, bronze, and iron ages of primitive culture. Only brief criticism of these reasonings was made, yet enough was said to justify the rejection of the conclusions based thereon.

It remains in this, the third and last article of the series, to give a brief statement of the positive proofs which may be adduced against the theory of primeval savagism, and in favor of the opposite opinion. An attempt will now be made, therefore, to give a very brief yet somewhat comprehensive outline of the arguments which lead us to reject all phases of primitive savagism, and to hold quite confidently that man on the earth commenced his career in a state far in advance of barbarism or savagery. In this way substantial confirmation of the view the Bible gives of man's early state and endowment will be supplied.

I. In the first place, it is necessary to understand as precisely as possible what particular kind and degree of culture or civilization are to be associated with the actual condition of the first men who appeared upon the earth. This is a very difficult thing to do, because our sources of information are exceedingly limited concerning this matter. Then, too, the temptation to indulge in flights of fancy is very great. As pointed out in the first article the Scriptures give us more information which appears to be definite and reliable than is to be discovered anywhere else, so that we may regard the biblical account of man's early state as the most ancient historical narrative bearing on the question. Assuming, as we now do, that the

Scripture narrative accurately describes the state and endowments of primitive man, and assuming also that it has not yet been proved that there were men before Adam, or that there was more than one creative origin for the races of mankind, we may regard the account in the book of Genesis as our most definite source of information upon the subject. History does not go back anywhere else to the cradle of the race, tradition may give hints but cannot afford clear proof, and various human remains must always be regarded as of uncertain antiquity, and they can never speak definitely regarding the state of culture which they represent. Taking all these things into account, may the state of primitive culture which we propose to support be described ?

Negatively, we may frankly admit that primitive man was not civilized in precisely the same sense as the most advanced modern nations are civilized. Modern civilization includes that extensive knowledge of the various arts and sciences which the most progressive nations possess, and which is not all the product of a single age, but in part at least the heritage of past ages. We do not undertake to show that Adam, Seth, Cain, and the antediluvians were acquainted with the inventions and discoveries which make up so large a part of modern culture and civilization. Nor need we maintain that society was then as highly organized as now, or that social culture had assumed definite proportions. But with all these admissions it does not follow that primitive man had rudimentary intellectual, moral and religious endowment, and that his general condition was one that may be fairly represented by modern savages.

Positively, as against primeval savagism, we simply undertake to defend the view that man from the beginning of his history had substantially the same mental endowment as now, and that he possessed those moral sentiments and religious instincts which separate him so widely from the brute, and remove him a long way from the state of savagery. It is simply to be made out that man did not commence his career in a low intellectual state, and that he was not at first non-moral and non-religious. That from age to age he added to his original store of knowledge, and that each generation profited by the labors of those preceding it is freely granted, but it does not follow from this that his first estate was rude, simple or savage.

II. In the second place, it is worth while inquiring with some care, how far scientific research can really go in dealing with the question before us. This is important in itself and its importance is all the greater when we observe that most of the reasonings in favor of primeval savagism are drawn from the resources of scientific inquiry. It is proper, therefore, to note carefully how far science can go in the matter. Science has to deal only with facts which lie before it for observation. In considering these facts it may undertake to explain and classify them, and it may make any legitimate inferences from the facts. It must be careful not to manufacture its facts, nor must it regard hypotheses as truths of science till they are thoroughly verified.

Now, in regard to man's early condition and degree of culture, science manifestly has great difficulty in getting at the actual facts. No written record has been left by primitive man, and history does not go back to the beginnings of the race, so that no definite historical data lie to our hands. Then when we come to study the other data in archæology, ethnology, philology and geology, the great practical difficulty which science has always to face is in regard to the precise age of these data. It is not enough to make out that various relics of man indicate a low state of culture; it must also be clearly shown that these data stand directly connected with man's original state, and not with some much later stage of his history, which may be very different from his first stage. If the archæological remains which science takes to prove primitive savagism be removed many centuries from the beginning of the human race, they may be the product of actual degeneration, and of no value at all in determining anything regarding the degree of culture early man possessed.

In like manner, to make inferences from man's high antiquity, or from the preadamite hypothesis, or from man's genetic connection with the brute, in favor of primeval savagism cannot, in the present state of opinion upon these topics, be regarded as scientific procedure, for none of these positions are proved. To build a theory of man's primitive state of culture upon unproved hypotheses is entirely unscientific. Hence, much as science has done to give a knowledge of the prehistoric life of man, and to point out the path he has followed in reaching his present fully civilized state, it is at the same time almost helpless to pronounce a definite verdict on the actual

degree of culture he possessed in his early stages of residence on the earth.

And especially is science unable to find fault with the evident teaching of the Bible on this point. If she does object to the biblical statements about man's first estate of culture, she can never be perfectly sure that she is not dealing with anthropological remains which are a thousand years more recent than the first men the Bible speaks of. Instead of having relics of man in his primitive state science may be unconsciously dealing with the remains which express the culture of a stage when degeneration has done its dreadful work. To say the least, the scientist who would prove primeval savagism with an old bone in one hand and a flint arrow in the other should be very modest; and when he enters a cave in the Somme valley or stands upon the site of an ancient lake dwelling in Switzerland he should be clothed with humility till he makes sure that he is dealing with the remains which show what primitive man actually was in regard to culture. If the first men the Bible describes were older than the civilization that is now being unearthed in the Nile valley and in the land of Shinar, may not the estate of the earliest men have been as high, if not higher, in the degree of culture they possessed as those who built the pyramids or made the bricks of old Chaldea? Science, therefore, cannot, without going beyond her proper sphere of ascertained fact, impugn the book of Genesis and its implications upon the subject of man's primitive state.

III. In the third place, mythology and its proper interpretation has important bearings upon the subject before us, and brief notice will now be taken of this topic and its relation to man's primitive condition. No complete statement of so vast a theme as mythology will be attempted, nor need we give any outline of the various theories advanced to explain its origin. For the purposes of the present argument it does not affect the conclusions we draw, whether we hold the euhemeristic, the animistic, or the fetichistic theory of the origin of mythology. The conclusions concerning man's primitive state, based on mythology, do not depend on the way in which mythology originated, but on the facts which appear in mythology as it exists. Of course, if we hold that all mythologies are derived by decay and degeneration from primitive monotheism, then the case will be made out against primeval savagism. We are

inclined to think, however, that our case can be established no matter what view of the origin of mythology among pagan nations is held.

Take the mythologies of Egypt, Greece, Rome, and the Hindoos, and two important facts which cannot easily be reconciled with primeval savagism appear :

First, mythology shows in the very earliest times that men had reached the conception of a spirit or reality of some kind pertaining to man. This is shown by the place which the belief in the transmigration of souls holds in mythology, and by the strong grasp which ancestor worship has had upon so many peoples, whose religion has such a large mythological element in it. Along with this we find a sense of moral responsibility involved in the idea of transmigration, for the dignity or degradation to which the soul attains in its various changes is really a reward or a punishment for the conduct of this life. All this shows a stage which is quite removed from the lowest savage state—little better than a brute, and it is to be observed that this mythological element is found in the very oldest peoples.

Secondly, mythology reveals the fact in very many and very different ways that men in the very earliest times exhibited the phenomena of religion. Here we find an all but universal belief in deity or deities in some form, and along with this there appear religious rites and ceremonies of all conceivable kinds. Sometimes the belief in deity is exceedingly vague, and the religious rites utterly rude, still the roots of religion are there in every case. No man, however rude, could call a stock or a stone, or a carved image, or his dead ancestor, his *god*, unless he already had in his mind the conception of deity in some form. And the very existence of this conception indicates a comparatively advanced stage in the primitive culture of men. If at an earlier stage it is agreed that men had no such concept, then the advocate of primeval savagism is bound to show how primitive man was able to pass from a non-theistic to a theistic state of mind, or from a non-religious to a religious condition of belief and practice. Then pagan mythologies show again and again that there has been decay in the type of belief exhibited. Often the older beliefs and traditions are purer and nobler than later beliefs and practices. Indeed, in Egypt, Persia, and India, a strong case can be made out in favor of primeval monotheism ; and, in that case, the argument

for a comparative high culture among primitive men is substantially unanswerable.

IV. In the fourth place, those peculiar traditions concerning a *golden age* which are found among many nations are full of meaning in connection with the question now under discussion. This tradition appears in various forms among different peoples, but all forms of it agree in representing that at the early dawn of the existence of the races of mankind on the earth, their state and surroundings were far better than in later times it came to be. In that bright and happy day, long before the beginning of history, the earth was more fertile, the beasts of the field were not so fierce, the seasons were more kindly, the heavens not so stormy, men were mild, and the earth was the abode of peace and joy; and to crown all the gods held fellowship on quite familiar terms with men. In this connection, the tradition that men were descended from the deities is worthy of mention, for if they were so descended they would not likely be primitive savages. Space entirely forbids any enumeration of the forms in which the tradition of an early *golden day* exists, or of the people among whom it appears. Even the rudest savage tribes often have such a tradition, and in more civilized peoples it often enters into their literature as is seen in the case of Greece and Rome, as well as in India.

Now all these interesting traditions tell forcibly against primeval savagism. They may not be positive proofs, yet they are indications of a widespread belief which, if it has any reasonable foundation in fact, cannot be reconciled with primitive low culture. If it be said that this tradition of a golden age at the dawn of human history is a dim and distant reflection from the biblical narrative concerning Paradise, we may reply that even so it surely goes to confirm the biblical account of primitive man, and so indirectly to refute primeval savagism. Taking this view, the traditions of the golden age tell us that long before the stone, bronze and iron ages were reached man lived in a glorious golden age, and was fitted in every way for his dwelling place. Then the decay, which the tradition implies from the golden age to a lower state, agrees fully with what the Bible has to say about the fall of man, and of the decline in moral and religious culture which is seen among the antediluvians. Did our space admit extended reference to the nature and import of this tradition, additional interest and

force would be added to this argument against primeval savagism. We have only shown how the tradition bears upon the question before us in this article.

V. In the fifth place, it is necessary to consider with some care what the natural law of race development among men really is. Most advocates of primeval savagism make much of natural development, and of man's native latent capacity for improvement. Human progress, and even the high state of modern culture among civilized nations, are the results of the the slow but sure race improvement, which takes place in a purely natural way. Is this the true philosophy of race improvement among men ?

It is freely admitted that certain races have made and are still making progress in culture. But we are prepared to maintain that this development is not natural, but the result of the supernatural, redemptive and rejuvenating influences and agencies which Christianity has introduced into the sphere of humanity. This is the secret and source of all true abiding human progress in all that goes to mark man's improvement.

At the same time, we are prepared to defend the position that the law of natural development for man is *degeneration*, not improvement. Tylor, in his *Primitive Culture*, a work of real ability, argues that improvement is the law of human progress and degeneration the exception. We are inclined to reverse this statement, and say that degeneration is the law and improvement, apart from the influence of Christianity, the exception. Illustrations and confirmations of this position may be found in history at every turn. The decay and religious decline of the antediluvians show this. The history of the mighty nations of antiquity in succession tell the same story and confirm the natural law of degeneration. Even where for a time there has been remarkable *intellectual* progress, as in Greece and Rome, there has been *moral* decay, and in the course of time the tide of intellectual splendor fell to the low water mark of the moral life of the people. In this fact the philosophy of the decline of nations is to be found ; and so potent is this law that even the Christian church itself, because of the imperfections of the lives of its members, has more than once suffered in a measure the blighting effects of this law, and declined till radical reformation became a necessity.

Making an application of this law to the subject of man's

primeval state, it is evident that his first state must have been his best state, and the very reverse of primeval savagism must have been his first condition. In like manner modern savages have their condition explained by the operation of this law.

VI. In the sixth place, the sad and terrible effects of moral evil—sin—upon the human race must be allowed for in any adequate discussion of this topic. It is a strange yet striking fact that nearly all the leading supporters of primitive savagism make little or no allowance for the hurtful influences of moral evil upon man, and yet there are facts in human experience and history which cannot be explained, if the operation of moral evil be left out of view. We do not need to hold any well-defined theological doctrine of sin, of the fall of man, or of hereditary evil, but any sufficient theory of human history and progress must give some account of, and grant due weight to, the dark facts of moral evil, which lie on the very surface of human history, or are scattered as sad wrecks on the shores of time. If we make proper allowance for this dark and mysterious fact, then primeval savagism cannot make good its contention, and if we wish any theory to be truly scientific it must take into account all the facts.

Many modern treatises on history, sociology, and ethics, are entirely defective just at this point. Lecky writes a history of European Morals, Tylor gives an elaborate account of primitive culture, and Spencer unfolds an extensive scheme of sociology, and no one of these writers gives any adequate account of moral evil, or of its influence upon human life and experience. Consequently all conclusions drawn from such one-sided theories can never have validity. But, on the other hand, if the historian, or the anthropologist, or the moral philosopher gives a suitable and necessary place for the effects of moral evil in his theory, then all the facts of race degeneration can be explained, the sad condition of modern savages can be accounted for, and the true theory of man's primitive state can be upheld, and at the same time, primitive savagism refuted in a satisfactory manner.

VII. In the seventh place, the exact status of modern savage tribes must be understood in this discussion. Are modern savages the exact representatives of primitive men? Much of the reasoning in certain quarters assumes that they are, so that when we now look upon a rude half-naked savage we

have a fair sample of what man at first was. Books by the score on anthropology and sociology simply take this for granted, without ever once examining the soundness of the analogy. Spencer, above all, is guilty of this oversight in a most remarkable degree. Without any hesitation he argues from modern savages to the state and endowment of primitive man. We have no hesitation in saying that to do this is entirely unwarranted, for the advocates of primeval savagism must first prove beyond doubt that modern savages are fair samples of the first men. This, from the nature of the case, is an exceedingly difficult task. If race depreciation has taken place, then modern savages may be a great deal lower in the scale of culture than primitive men, but if race progress has taken place, as the advocates of primitive savagism allege, then modern savages may be a great deal better than the first men. Then if some races have advanced and others declined, the difficulty of pointing out those now in the savage state which represent man's first estate, must be encountered. The analogy only holds good in the case of races, if there be such, which have remained in a state of stable equilibrium all along the ages. This cannot be proved of any race or tribe now existing on the earth. In a word, the analogy fails to be of any practical service in reasoning regarding man's first estate. Primitive man may have been better, or he may have been worse, than modern savages, and consequently the reasoning based on the analogy between primitive man and modern savages is not valid. A sound philosophy of modern savages, which regards them as the result of race degeneration, is an effective refutation of primitive savagism.

VIII. In the eighth place, some facts connected with race distribution tell against primeval savagism. We have space only to note some of these very briefly. Near the centres of the most ancient historical races, we find in earliest times remains of a higher civilization than we find anywhere else. On the other hand, the lowest savages are found at the utmost ends of the continents. Think of Egypt, Chaldea and Phœnicia, on the one hand, and Patagonia, Zululand and Malacca, on the other hand. Now, if primeval savagism be the true theory of human progress, then the migration must have been from the lowest to the highest, from the ends of the earth to the centres of early empire and civilization, from Patagonia to

Phoenecia, from Zululand to Egypt, and from Malacca to Chaldea. But, as a matter of fact, almost everything points to the conclusion that the migration has taken place the other way, and that gradually the races pushed out further and further from their original centre, always driving the weaker to the wall, and finally sending them to the very extremities of the habitable dry land.

In connection with this, many facts and traditions, as well as historical and linguistic considerations, might be adduced to give this line of reasoning very great weight. What Tylor terms "survivals" among modern men of what once had a place in earlier generations, the traditions which ruder races evidently brought with them from an older abode, the relation of the languages of different races to each other, and the fact that the oldest historical races are the most highly civilized, all go to show the direction in which race distribution has likely moved, and the bearing of these facts is entirely antagonistic to primeval savagism. In regard to the last-mentioned consideration, it may be pointed out that the time from the creation of man till the beginning of ancient historic nations, such as Egypt and Chaldea, is not long enough to give time for a rude savage to develop into a fairly well-civilized man. This consideration has special weight against purely natural evolutionary views of the development of man, and against all forms of primeval savagism it has considerable weight. Egypt 2700 B. C., and Chaldea 2500 B. C., that is about 4500 years ago, had many marks of civilization, and they had less than 2000 years in which to acquire it.

But we must conclude; and in doing so will only ask the reader to put the considerations outlined so briefly in this article together, and then treat them as a cumulative argument. If this be done, we are sure that the candid reader will give his verdict in favor of the early comparatively cultured condition of man, and against primeval savagism. This verdict will agree with what is to be gathered from Scripture, where it is said that man was made in the image of God, that sin has introduced a principle of degeneracy, and that redemption has introduced a principle of recovery. It will be found that man was not at first a rude savage, or a wild barbarian, little better than a beast, but that his genealogy is correctly given in the Gospel, which asserts that Seth was the Son of Adam and Adam the Son of God. The true meaning and function of redemp-

tion also emerges when we see that it comes to restore to man the golden age of his estate, when the paradise of the covenant of grace is more glorious than the paradise of the covenant of works. Milton's *Paradise Lost* may be a grander poem than his *Paradise Regained*, but the paradise which grace regains for sinful man is grander far than the paradise which by the FALL he lost.

