

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 33—JULY, 1895.

I. PRIMEVAL MAN.

DURING recent years the science of anthropology has made notable progress. Some workers in this field have been careful and conservative; others, perhaps, have been hasty and heedless. In certain quarters far-reaching conclusions are confidently announced, and but little regard is paid to what the sacred Scriptures have to say about some of its topics.

Great diversity of opinion has also been expressed in regard to some of the great questions with which anthropology is concerned. In reference to the length of time man has been upon the earth, as to whether there were races of men prior to the time of Adam, in regard to the relation of man to some brute species, and concerning man's actual primitive state, opinions differ widely. Some of these opinions, as set forth in recent books and periodicals, are evidently inimical to certain plain statements of Scripture. Hence, the theologian has important interests at stake on this field.

Of these questions, perhaps that of man's primeval condition is of greatest moment at the present day to the theologian in the light of modern science, and the purpose of this article is to discuss some of the problems raised by the inquiry concerning man's primitive status and endowments. In itself this inquiry is of absorbing interest; but its importance is greatly enhanced when we consider the fact that the conclusions to which we may be led by this inquiry will largely determine our opinions regarding the other questions just named. For if it be made out that man was at first a rude, untutored savage, it will be easy to establish his

great antiquity, and it would not seem so hopeless a task to prove his genetic connection with some lower animal form. But if it be shown that primitive savagism is not the true view to take of the earliest periods of human history, then it becomes exceedingly difficult to render even plausible some scientific theories concerning these other topics already mentioned.

The inquiry, then, is, What was man's primeval state and endowment? What was his general mental and moral status at his first appearance on the earth? How should we regard his religious attainments in the very early stages of his existence? Was he a rude, unlettered, and unthinking savage or barbarian, devoid of even the rudiments of mental, moral, and religious life, or was he possessed of such attainments in these respects as found expression in a suitable primitive civilization? Must we adopt the views of Lubbock, Spencer, Tylor, and a host of others who assure us quite 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 reasons, even on the side of science, for holding that man at the first was neither a rude barbarian nor an untutored savage, but that he was already a religious being fully endowed, and fairly well civilized? That an affirmative answer may be given to these questions will be the attempt of this article to justify.

At the outset a few things should be set down regarding the teaching of the Scriptures upon this subject. It is to be observed that this teaching is not adduced at this point to prove any theory as to man's primitive state; but it is presented simply as a matter of fact. It is assumed that the biblical narratives are historical and not mythological in their nature. These narratives, especially in the Book of Genesis, have something to say about man's early state, and it is proper to keep these utterances before us at the outset. Even if we do not take into account at all the inspiration of the biblical narratives, still, the general view which they present of primeval man cannot be disregarded in the study of this question.

In general, the impartial reader of Genesis must admit that the very first men there described possessed a good degree of intelli-

gence, and were capable of religious communion with God. The account of Adam in Paradise clearly proves this, and the offerings of Cain and Abel after the expulsion from the Garden in Eden confirms the same view. The narrative concerning Noah implies that he was surely no untutored savage, and that he evidently had even more than the rudiments of religion. Moreover, the sad state of the antediluvians was due to a lamentable moral degradation, which in itself implies a previous better state from which they had declined. The picture of the patriarchal ages after Noah, given in Genesis, exhibits the same general view of man's early state, and no fair reading of this account can justify any other verdict than that man was made in the image of God, was under conscious moral relations to his Maker, and possessed a goodly degree of mental, moral, and religious culture. By this it is not meant that man was then civilized in the sense which we now understand by that term. It is simply meant that his status in all essential respects was far above that of savage peoples, either ancient or modern.

A little reflection upon some simple facts noted in Genesis will greatly confirm this view. 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, are all alluded to in a way which implies a measure of civilization quite removed from savagery. In Noah's day the building of the ark implied considerable skill in several trades not known among barbarians. The tower of Babel and the city built by Nimrod point to the same conclusion. There is no possible way to evade this verdict unless we look upon the Scripture narratives as myths, or hold that there were pre-Adamic races of which the Bible knows nothing.

This brief outline of the contents of the biblical narrative bearing upon man's early condition enables us to state clearly the real point at issue in this discussion. It is simply this: Did man begin his career in the world in a condition of ignorant barbarism or savage paganism, or was he from the first endowed with those essential elements of his nature which belong to a condition of

culture and comparative civilization? The debate upon this question assumes special importance at the present day from the fact that several anthropologists of note both in Britain and Germany, are pressing upon the scholarly world the view that man began his career in a very low state, that he was at first but little removed, and perhaps derived, from the brute, that he was in his early career as rude as modern savages, and that he only by slow degrees and by natural means acquired his culture. The main object of this article is to examine fairly and candidly some of the reasonings by which this view is supported, and to adduce some facts and arguments which may justify the contrary opinion. We first examine the reasonings in support of primeval savagism.

In the first place, we consider those radical theories in regard to man's primitive state which connect him wholly or in part with the lower animals. It is clear that all of these theories, if consistent, must maintain primeval savagism to have been man's first estate. If man has come by natural descent or ascent from the brute, then his first state could only be slightly removed from the brutal. For a long time the differences between man and his animal ancestors could not have been very marked.

This theory of natural descent for man, carrying with it primitive savagism, is set forth in various ways by the advocates of organic or biological evolution. Herbert Spencer seeks to find the principle of continuity in nature unbroken from the primitive homogeneous up to the highest type of civilized man. Wallace, and perhaps Huxley, confine the theory chiefly to the sphere of biology, and conclude that man's body is from the brute but his higher nature must come from another source. Romanes, and perhaps Darwin, seeks to bring man entirely under the scope of organic evolution. Drummond, in his last book, seems to take almost the same extreme position. These, and hosts of others who find man wholly or partly the product of mere natural organic evolution, are bound to hold that primitive, rude savagism marked his early stages. We cannot, therefore, allow the evolutionary origin of man to be assumed without careful scrutiny. This being the case, a few obvious things must be seriously considered.

If the hypothesis of continuity in nature be assumed, and

natural organic evolution be posited as the mode, if not the cause, of the upward, onward progress towards man, then several yawning chasms, yet unbridged, appear: First, the chasm between the inorganic and organic forms of existence must remain unbridged till spontaneous generation is proved, either as a fact now, or as having actually taken place long ago. Then the breaks between the vegetal and animal kingdoms, between the brute and man, between the physical and mental in man, and between the mental, moral, and religious in mankind are still impassible. Not only are the bridges not built, but the materials are not yet on the ground to construct the bridges. If, therefore, organic evolution be but an unproved hypothesis in regard to man's origin, it affords a very insecure basis upon which to rest a theory of his original state.

To confirm more fully what has just been stated, it is worth while noting some things that are ignored by those reasonings which seek to establish a genetic connection between different biological species, and especially between the highest animal and man. The evident fixity of species is, at least, ignored, and a purely artificial view taken of biological species. The radical differences between natural and artificial selection are also overlooked. Due regard is not paid to the fact that, when domestic birds or beasts are turned out into the state of nature, the tendency is to return to the original type. The fact seems to be forgotten that no really new species, but only varieties, have ever been produced by the hand and skill of man. The unyielding facts of hybridism and infertility between distinct species are admitted, even by Huxley, to be inexplicable by this theory. The 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. Rudimentary or nascent organs, together with the facts of atavism, or reversion to type, hinder rather than help the theory. Widely differing forms of living things, and the world of invisible life revealed by the microscope, are left unexplained in their genetic relations. There are facts in embryology and in the geological record which are not accounted for by this theory; and, above all, the theory can, at best, but

describe processes, and is never able to provide causal efficiency.

In the light of all this, we are surely justified in concluding that, if it has not yet been proved that organic evolution alone can account for the origin of new species, still less can it explain the genesis of man, and prove his origin to be from some brute form; and, if the theory has not been proved as to man's bodily organism, still less can it show that his intelligence is developed from animal instinct; and, when the higher facts of man's moral and religious nature are considered, the utter inadequacy of organic evolution to explain these is self-evident.

If, therefore, the theory of evolution be, at best, an unverified, and, perhaps, an unverifiable, hypothesis, it can never afford a solid basis upon which to advocate primeval savagism as to man's early condition. This consideration leaves without any stable foundation many reasonings in favor of the early barbaric condition of the human race.

In the second place, the pre-Adamite hypothesis is used to establish the low and savage state of man in his first stages of existence. In general, this theory argues that all existing races of men have not descended from Adam, or even from Noah; that the dark-skinned races especially are not Adamic. It claims that the time from the biblical Adam is too short to have secured the wide dispersion of the races which we find in early ages. Adam, it maintains, was not the first man, for there were men on the earth before his time, and from among these Cain got his wife. Some further contend that Adam was the first white man, and the father only of the white races; and some of the advocates of this theory, as, for example, Winchell, discover, as they think, the cradle of the human family in a continent named Lemuria, now submerged in the Indian Ocean.

This theory, it is claimed, explains facts which cannot be explained otherwise, and from this theory it is argued that primeval savagism was man's first estate among the early pre-Adamic races. We are told that what the Bible says has reference to Adam and his descendants alone, and that they were, no doubt, intelligent, religious, and to a degree civilized. But in the case

of the pre-Adamites, there must have been a long period of low barbarism, from which, by a slow and difficult process, they by degrees emerged. In this way the whole theory is made very plausible, and is even said to explain some things in the Bible better than the other view. Quite recently a minister of the gospel in this country published a book on Anthropology, in which this view is advocated and made the basis of a plea not to send the gospel to these pre-Adamic peoples, for they were not concerned in Adam's sin, and have no need of the gospel, and are not even included in the command to preach it to all men.

No thorough examination is here possible, so that only a few things are mentioned. It is, at best, an hypothesis built on hypotheses, and has neither history nor tradition in its favor. It assumes that race-distribution is not possible in the Adamic period, and in this even Darwin is against the theory. It assumes, without proof, that the deluge was partial, even so far as the races of men are concerned. The submerged continent is a mere creature of an excited fancy. To suppose that Adam was the first white man is not to speak sober sense, and to provide a wife for Cain is scarcely sufficient to support such a theory. Then, too, the unity of the human races, as taught in Scripture and as confirmed by science, is a refutation of pre-Adamitism. It need only be added that, if so many men belong to another race, or set of races, it is strange that, as we trace back the streams of history, of tradition, of language, and of religion, these streams seem to converge towards one common source. These things tell forcibly against pre-Adamitism, and against the diversity of origin implied therein, so that we feel justified in removing it from the list of proofs for primeval savagism.

In the third place, various forms of reasoning, based on certain facts, and used to prove man's early savage state, will be considered. In some cases the facts now to be adduced are taken first to prove man's great antiquity, and, by implication, to establish his primitive imperfection in culture. As a matter of fact, it is not easy to keep the questions of antiquity and of his primitive condition entirely separate. If his high antiquity be proved, then more time is afforded for him to rise from his first savage state.

This enables the advocate of primitive barbarism to render his views more plausible. Then, on the other hand, if primeval savagism be established, high antiquity is indirectly confirmed, so that these questions run into each other, though they should be kept apart in our discussion of them.

The first class of facts here adduced by the advocates of the theory now under review consists in the remains of various sorts of implements and utensils made and used by men long years ago. These are usually termed archæological human remains. No full account of them can possibly be given in this article. A few descriptive outlines may suffice to exhibit the general character of these remains.

The most abundant of these remains consist in different sorts of flint and stone implements. These are of great diversity in size and shape, and they were evidently used for various purposes. 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 bones are to be included also. These remains consist of arrows, hammers, scrapes, axes, spear-heads, clubs, awls, pots, pins, needles, in endless variety. They seem to have been used as implements, utensils, weapons, and ornaments.

Many of these remains are found about the lakes of Switzerland, Ireland, and other places in Europe. The lake dwellings on the shores of these lakes have supplied many of the remains of which we are now speaking; and the refuse heaps of Holland have yielded many similar relics. From peat-bogs, in many places in Europe, like remains have been brought to light. The Indian mounds of America, and alluvial and drift deposits, are also interesting sources of the remains now under consideration.

From the nature and apparent uses of these remains, it has been concluded by many observers that the men who made and used them must have been in a very primitive condition of culture: At the same time, it is quietly assumed that these rude, untutored men were the first or earliest men. In some cases writers grow quite eloquent in their descriptions of man's early career in this state. Eking out a precarious existence, contending with the

stubborn elements of nature, and fighting with the wild beasts of the forest, the rude, half-naked, early man is minutely described in a vivid way. He had no knowledge of the arts of life, his moral nature had scarcely taken form at all, and his religious sentiments were not even awakened. He was simply a rude savage, little better than the wild beasts with which he so often had to contend. What shall we say to these reasonings?

First, it must be shown that the races of men from whom these remains came were connected with the first members of the human species at its original centre of dispersion. Sufficient evidence must be presented to justify the belief that the races of Europe and America, whose status of culture is represented by these relics, are to be connected with the first men. And further, it must be made clear that the culture of the races which have left behind these remains is the exact counterpart of the civilization of primitive man. Unless these things are done, no assured conclusion can be drawn from these remains regarding the actual culture of the human species in its earliest stages. If, for example, about 1500 B. C., Egypt, Chaldea, Phœnicia, and perhaps India and China, were far in advance of the rude peoples who were then in Europe in mental and moral culture, some explanation of the difference must be given. Have both come from a common stage of culture or savagism, marked by progress in the one case and decline in the other? That there has been no real decline in the case of the lower, and real progress in the case of the higher, must be established by the advocates of primitive savagism. Moreover, we find really no such rude remains of human art in Egypt and Chaldea similar to those found in Europe. The chief remains which recent research is bringing to light in oriental lands indicate an early civilization of comparatively high order, and this fact tells against early barbarism, at least at those early scenes of human habitation. Migration from these oldest scenes of man's abode, and decay in culture, together afford a natural explanation of the culture represented by the remains found in Europe and America.

Secondly, the doctrine of *autochthony* must be proved before these archæological remains can be taken to prove primitive

savagism. This doctrine asserts in general that the races now found on the different continents are indigenous to their several localities, and that no general migration has ever taken place. The men of early Europe were always there, and so with the aborigines of Africa and America. Men in these several regions began and developed their career in the countries where they are now found. Now, it is evident that this theory must be proved in order to establish primitive barbarism, for it may be that these very remains in Europe are the product not of the first men there, but of men who came there, and whose original culture in the lands whence they came was formerly very much higher. Autochthony, then, must be proved, and many scientists are unwilling to accept it as true. At this point, and in very many instances in this discussion, the utmost care is necessary to make sure of the facts, and equal caution is needed not to make our conclusions wider than our facts. We fear that not a few anthropologists of some repute forget this. 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 surely have our faith in the accuracy of such a writer greatly shaken, for neither of these statements is correct.

A second general class of facts used to prove primeval savagism consists in fossil human remains. By fossils we mean either actual human remains or petrefactions of the same. Here we find many interesting facts. Human skeletons entire, or almost entire, skulls and scattered bones of men who lived long ago, have been found in many places. Skeletons from the caves and shelters of Canstadt, Cro-Magnon and Furfooz, and skulls from Eugis and Neanderthal, have been carefully examined and fully described. Fossil men, or parts thereof, have been found in limestone rocks and coral reefs, in alluvial and drift deposits, and under lava beds.

From these skeletons, skulls, and bones, it is argued that the men represented by them were rude and uncultured. It is claimed that since these human remains are found in caves that seem to have been used as dwellings, they must represent men whose condition was quite rude. This conclusion, it is said, is

confirmed by the fact that the remains of extinct animals, together with rude stone implements, are found beside the human remains.

In estimating the bearing of these fossil human remains on man's primitive state, what was stated in regard to archæological remains has force. Autochthony must be proved, or the relation of the cave men to the original centres of distribution must be shown, before any solid conclusions in favor of primeval savagism can be made. In addition, it need only be remarked that so far as these skulls and skeletons are concerned, there is no proof of the savage or barbaric condition of the men they represent. These fossil remains are usually well developed, and but little different from the skeletons and skulls of existing civilized races. The Eugis 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. The same is true of the cave men of Caustadt, Cro-Magnon and other places. None of these skeletons are radically different from existing races in Europe. This being the case, no evidence is provided by these fossil men, whatever their antiquity may have been, in favor of primeval savagism. In addition, it may not be forgotten that the men represented by these fossil remains may have lived long centuries after the origin of the human species, and if this be the case, then still less do these cave remains prove anything in regard to man's primitive condition of culture or savagism as the case may be.

A third set of facts, not, indeed, entirely different from some of those mentioned already, remains to be briefly considered. This brings before us the theory of the *archæological ages*, which are supposed to have successively appeared in pre-historic periods of the human race. According to this theory, as expounded by Lubbock, Lartet, Tylor, and others, there are certain periods of human culture wherein the earliest was the rudest. The facts upon which this theory is founded consist in different kinds of implements used by men in successive ages. The ages named are sometimes three—the stone, the bronze, and the iron ages respectively. Lubbock mentions four ages—palæolithic, neo-

lithic, the bronze and iron ages. Lartet makes five ages—the drift, the glacial, the neolithic, the bronze, and iron ages. In each case the distinction of the ages is based upon the kind of utensils, weapons, and implements men seem to have used during these successive ages. Some advocates of this theory are able confidently to tell us how long each of these ages lasted, as, for example, Lubbock does. Others are more cautious and speak only in general terms. The point in the theory which bears upon the subject under discussion is, that the earliest in time was the rudest in form. Hence, when rude, unpolished stone implements are found to be earliest in any given place, they represent a rude degree of culture among the men of that early age and place. From this initial primitive barbarism and lack of culture men have by slow degrees been raised up till the dawn of history is reached.

A remark or two is all that is necessary to enable us to make a general estimate of the truth of this theory, and consequently of the strength of the inference for primeval savagism which is based upon it. The advocates of this theory do not claim for it, as a rule, universal application. Lubbock is careful to say that it applies chiefly to Europe, and Lartet and Tylor are ready to admit that these periods may not always be regularly successive. These admissions weaken the argument built upon the theory of the *ages* in favor of primeval savagism. History, too, tells against this theory, so far at least as its general application is concerned. These supposed ages are not historically successive in any large area, much less in regard to the race as a whole. Suppose that it was the stone age in Europe in 1000 B. C., at that date it was bronze and iron age in Egypt, Chaldea and Phœnicia, and in these countries there are few traces of the stone age itself. When America was discovered over four centuries ago, it had been bronze and iron age in Europe for centuries. Such being the case, no proof of man's primitive savagism can be found at this point. And, in addition, the whole theory of the ages is artificial and often arbitrary. It is freely admitted that men at various stages of their career used stone, bronze and iron implements, but that the use of these implements indicates everywhere a settled

order of human progress may be seriously questioned. The way in which these stone and other weapons are arranged in museums is often artificial and quite misleading. To place the rough and polished stones first in order, to be followed by the bronze and iron may be a very pretty sight to the eye, but unless this order reproduces the real order it has no scientific value. To put a flint arrow-head from America and one from the Somme Valley together simply because they are stone and shaped alike may be an ornamental arrangement, but it proves nothing more than that men at a certain time in a certain country used those weapons. It proves little about the successive ages of prehistoric culture, and still less does it establish primeval savagism.

Having thus far examined some of the main lines of reasoning used to prove man's primeval savagism, we proceed in the remainder of this article to exhibit some considerations which go far to establish the opposite conclusion concerning man's early estate. This is the second part of our task, as indicated at the outset of this paper.

In the first place, it is necessary to understand as precisely as we can what particular kind and degree of culture or civilization is to be connected with the status of man as he first appeared on the scene. This is no easy thing to do, owing to our exceedingly limited sources of information upon this subject. This being the case the temptation to indulge in flights of fancy is very great. As a matter of fact the Sacred Scriptures give us more definite and reliable information regarding man's early condition and endowments than is to be discovered anywhere else. Even unbelieving science is compelled to acknowledge that the biblical account of man's primitive state is the most ancient historical narrative bearing upon the question. The Book of Genesis, therefore, may be regarded as our most important source of information upon the subject now in hand. Secular history nowhere goes back to the cradle of the race, tradition may give some hints, but cannot afford clear proof, and the human remains already described in this article, always being of uncertain antiquity, can never speak with certain assurance regarding the actual state of the first men.

With the Scriptures as our main guide we frankly admit, on the negative side, that primitive man was not civilized in precisely the same sense as advanced modern nations are civilized. Modern civilization is complex and implies that knowledge of the various arts and sciences which the most progressive nations possess, and which is not entirely the product of any single age, but, in part at least, is a heritage from past ages. In maintaining man's early culture we do not undertake to show that Adam, Seth, Cain, Enoch, Noah, and the men of their time, were acquainted with the inventions and discoveries which make up so large a part of modern civilization. Nor do we maintain that society was then as definitely organized as now, or that social culture had become so complex as it is to-day. Still with all these admissions we are prepared to argue that man at first was not a barbarian, but was endowed with mental, moral, and religious qualities which place him far above the savage state.

On the positive side, we undertake to defend the view that man had from the beginning of his career substantially the same mental endowment, moral sentiments, and religious instincts which separate him so widely from the brute, and lift him above the savage. We are prepared to establish the position that man did not begin his history in a condition scarcely intellectual, and alike non-moral and non-religious. It is freely granted that from age to age man has, in some directions, been adding to his stores of knowledge, but it does not follow from this that man's first estate was rude, simple, barbaric or savage.

In the second place, it is worth while asking how far scientific research can really go in dealing with the question before us. This is important in itself, and its significance becomes the greater when we observe that most of the arguments in favor of primeval savagism are drawn from the resources of scientific inquiry. It is necessary to know how far science is competent to deal with a question like this. Strictly speaking science has to do only with facts which lie before it for observation. It may ascertain the facts, and explain and classify them, and it may within proper limits make inferences from these facts. It must be scrupulously careful not to manufacture its facts, and it must refuse to trans-

mute mere working hypotheses into truths of science till they are fully verified.

Now in regard to man's early condition and degree of culture, science manifestly finds serious difficulty in getting at the facts. Her difficulty is all the greater if she ignores the Scriptures, as is only too often the case. No written record has been left by primitive man, and history does not take us back to the beginnings of the race, so that no definite historical data are in our hands. Then when we enter the fields of archæology, ethnology, philology, and geology the difficulty of getting at the actual facts always stares the scientist in the face. It is not enough to get facts which indicate a low stage of culture, but this low stage must also be shown to have been the earliest stage in the history of the human race. The facts of a thousand years from the genesis of the race are not competent to reveal the degree of primitive culture which man first possessed, for these facts may be the product, to a large extent, of degeneration. To make inferences regarding man's early state from his supposed genetic relation with the brute, or from his high antiquity, or based upon the pre-Adamite theory, or upon fossil and other human relics can lead to no certain results, so long as these questions are subject of debate in the scientific circle itself. To build a theory of man's first estate upon unproved hypotheses is entirely unscientific. Keeping this in mind, science, apart from the Scriptures, has indeed scanty materials to use in its reasonings, and she should certainly not assume an air of dogmatic omniscience.

And, further, science has no right to find fault with the teaching of the Scriptures upon this topic. If she objects to the biblical statements about man's first estate and leans upon her own understanding, she can never be perfectly sure that she is not dealing with anthropological remains that are newer by twenty centuries than the men the book of Genesis speaks of. Instead of evidences of what man was at first, the scientist may be dealing with relics of a state of culture when degeneration had done its dreadful work. To say the least, the scientist who ignores the Scriptures, and who would prove primeval savagism with an old bone in one hand and a flint arrow in the other, should be quite

modest, and when he enters a cave in the Somme Valley or stands upon the site of an old lake-dwelling in Switzerland, he should be clothed with humility. Science, therefore, cannot impugn the Book of Genesis at this point without going quite beyond her proper bounds, and pronouncing a verdict when she cannot produce the facts.

In the third place, mythology and its proper interpretation has important bearing upon this subject. No outline even of so vast a theme as that of mythology can be now given, nor need we stretch the various theories set forth to explain its origin. For our present purposes it will not affect the conclusions we reach whether we hold the euhemeristic, the animistic or fetichistic theory of the origin of mythology. The conclusions we reach in reference to man's original state of culture depend rather upon the facts of mythology as they exist, than upon any theory of their origin. It is clear that if we hold that all mythologies are the result of decline in various ways from monotheism, then a case is made out against primeval savagism. We are inclined to think, however, that our case can be established no matter what view is taken of the origin of mythology among pagan peoples. In the mythologies of Egypt, India, Greece, and Rome, two important facts which cannot be easily reconciled with primeval savagism appear:

First, mythology shows that in very early times men had reached the notion of a spiritual element in man. This is shown by the place which the belief in the transmigration of souls has in mythology, and by the strong hold which ancestor worship has upon masses of people whose religion contains a large mythological element. Along with all this, we find a sense of moral responsibility involved in the doctrine of transmigration, inasmuch as the dignity or degradation of the soul in its various changes is a reward or a punishment for its conduct in this life. All this surely shows a stage of moral culture quite removed from a purely savage state, and it is to be observed that this mythological element is found in the most ancient peoples.

Secondly, mythology reveals the fact that in the very earliest ages men exhibited the phenomena of religion. We find an all

but universal belief in some sort of deity or deities, and we observe also that this belief expresses itself in various religious rites and ceremonies. Sometimes the belief is very vague, and the rites utterly rude, still the roots of religion are there in every case. Now, no man, however rude, could ever have called a stock or a stone, a carved image or a natural object, his dead ancestor, or a great hero his god, unless he had in his mind already the notion of deity. The very existence of this notion and belief indicates primitive culture of a somewhat advanced stage. If in the earlier stages of his career man had no such notion, 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 stage of belief and practice. Still further, the pagan mythologies show again and again that there has been decline or decay in the type of religious belief and practice, for it often appears that the older beliefs and practices are purer and nobler than the later. Indeed, a strong case can be made out for primeval monotheism in such lands as Egypt, Persia, and India. In that case the argument for a comparatively high culture among primitive men is absolutely unanswerable.

In the fourth place, those peculiar traditions concerning a *golden age* which prevail among so many nations are full of meaning in relation to the question under discussion. This tradition appears in various forms among many peoples, but all forms of it agree in representing that at the dawn of the history of man on the earth, the general condition was far better than it came in later ages to be. It was a bright and happy day, long before history really began, when the earth was more fertile and the seasons were more kindly, when the beasts of the field were not so fierce and the heavens were not so stormy, and when men were more gentle, the earth was full of joy and peace, and the gods held familiar converse with men. Such in general is the description of the golden age which is found in the traditions of many pagan races. Even the rudest peoples have sometimes this tradition, and in more advanced pagan peoples it has a large place in their literature, as is the case in Greece, Rome, and India.

Now, it is evident that all these interesting traditions have

great force against primitive savagism. They may not amount to positive proofs, yet they are clear indications of a wide-spread belief which cannot be well reconciled with original barbarism. If it be said that these traditions are a dim reflection from the glory of the biblical paradise, we may justly say that the biblical narrative is confirmed and primeval savagism is refuted. This enables us to place, prior to the iron, bronze, and stone ages, a glorious golden age, when men were in no sense barbarians. Then the decline from this age, which the tradition implies, also agrees with what the Scriptures have to say about man's sad apostasy and decline in religious culture prior to the deluge. Did space permit extended illustration of this tradition, great force would be added to the argument against primeval savagism.

In the fifth place it is important to consider what the natural law of race development among men really is. Most advocates of primitive savagism make much of natural development, and of man's latent capacity for improvement. Human progress is mere natural development. But is this the true philosophy of race improvement among men as we find them on the earth? Let us consider a moment.

It is freely admitted that men have made, and are still making, progress in culture generally. Still we are prepared to believe that this development is not purely natural, but is the result of the supernatural, redemptive, and rejuvenating agencies which Christianity has introduced into the sphere of humanity. This is the secret and the source of all true human progress. At the same time we are prepared to defend the position that the law of man's merely natural development is *degeneration*. Tylor in his *Primitive Culture*, a work of real ability, argues that improvement is the law and degeneration is the exception in human progress. We are inclined to reverse the statement. The uplift which Christianity has given to the world is the grand exception to the great natural law of degeneration. History confirms this at every turn. The terrible religious decline which induced the deluge, and the decay of so many ancient pagan nations, clearly prove this law of natural degeneration. Even where there is promise of mental progress, as in Greece and Rome, moral decay sets in,

and soon the tide ebbs to low water mark again. In this law the philosophy of the decline and fall of nations is to be found. So potent is this law that even the church has at times suffered from its blighting effects, till radical reformation became necessary to save her from ruin.

Making application of this law to the subject of man's primitive state, it is evident that it must have been the very reverse of primitive savagism, and in like manner the true philosophy of the genesis of modern savages is to be discovered in the operation of this law.

In this connection, it is worth while to emphasize the fact that the dire results of moral evil in man must not be overlooked in this discussion. It is a striking fact that the leading supporters of primitive savagism either ignore or minimize the influence of moral evil. But scientific method demands that all the facts are to be taken into account. It is not necessary to hold any definite theological doctrine regarding sin, but any adequate theory of human progress must give due place to the dark facts of moral evil, which have scattered such sad wreckage on the shores of time.

Many modern treatises on history, sociology, and ethics are entirely defective 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 not one of these writers gives any proper place to moral evil. Their conclusions are all one-sided and are almost valueless. If, on the other hand, the historian, ethnologist, and moralist be true to the facts, he will give moral evil its proper place; and, if he does so, he can explain race-degeneration, account for modern savages, and refute primeval savagism.

In the sixth place, the exact status of modern savages must be clearly defined in this discussion. Are modern savages the exact types of primitive men? Much of the reasoning in favor of early barbarism assumes that they are. In fact, we are all but assured that when we now look upon a rude, half-naked savage, we have a fair sample of what man was at first. Books on sociology take this for granted, without giving any proof whatever. Spencer is often guilty of this oversight. We do not hesitate to affirm that

this is unwarranted, and that proof may properly be demanded at Spencer's hands. Moreover, as man's primeval condition is the very question in debate, we ought not to begin by assuming that modern savages represent the first men. If race-decline has taken place, modern savages may be much lower than the earliest men. If race-progress, as the result of Christianity, has taken place, modern men may, in certain respects, be in advance of primitive men. If some races thus decline and others advance, the difficulty of finding anywhere now the counterpart of primitive man must be encountered. If any peoples have maintained stable equilibrium, and we could know what these peoples are, then we might discover our type of the earliest men. This cannot be proved of any existing race, and so the analogy between modern savages and ancient men fails entirely.

In the last place, some interesting facts connected with race-distribution cannot be easily reconciled with primeval savagism. We have only space to note some of these very briefly. Near the sources of the most ancient historical races we find the remains of the highest civilization which belongs to the earliest ages. On the other hand, we find the lowest savages at the utmost ends of the continents, with no remains of an early civilization found where they now are. Think of Egypt, Chaldea, and Phœnicia, on the one hand, and of Patagonia, Zululand, and Malacca, on the other. If primeval savagism be the true doctrine of primitive man, migration must have taken place from the lowest, which were the earliest, and that would be from the ends of the earth to the centres of ancient civilization. That would be from Patagonia to Phœnicia, from Zululand to Egypt, and from Malacca to Chaldea. Now, as a matter of fact, almost everything points to the conclusion that the migration has taken place the other way, and with migration came degeneration.

There are social, historical, and linguistic considerations, which might properly be adduced in this connection, against primeval savagism. What Tylor calls "survivals" of what once had a place among early races of men, the purer traditions which men evidently brought with them from some older abode, the relation of languages to each other, and the fact that the oldest races known

to history were in a measure civilized, all go to indicate the direction in which race-distribution has likely moved, and thereby indirectly to refute the view that men were at first rude, untutored, and devoid of religious sentiments. Then, too, if men were at first in this low stage of culture, and if mere natural evolution is the principle of their development, the time is not long enough to produce the degree of civilization found in the early centres of human activity. Egypt in 2700 B. C., Chaldea in 2500 B. C., and Phœnicia in 2000 B. C. had many marks of civilization which could not have been the product of natural development, unless we assume a much greater antiquity for man's origin than either science or the Bible requires. This consideration has weight against certain forms of the theory under discussion.

In conclusion, we point out the fact that all the facts and reasonings which have been adduced are to be treated as a cumulative argument. If this be done, we venture to think that any candid reader will be prepared to give a verdict against primeval savagism. This verdict will agree with what is gathered from Scripture, wherein it is said that man was made in the image of God, that sin has introduced a principle of degeneracy, and that redemption has brought in an agency of recovery. It will also be found that man was not a rude savage or a wild barbarian, but that his genealogy is correctly given in the Scriptures, which assert that Seth was the son of Adam, and that Adam was the son of God. The meaning and function of redemption is also suggested, inasmuch as it comes in to restore man to the golden age of his estate, wherein 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. FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Kentucky.