

ferent from itself? Can the flea develop itself into a larger flea, or into a lion? Does the frog develop itself into a larger frog, or into a kangaroo? Was the mouse ever known to develop itself into a rat? Who has found that the flying-fish or squirrel flies faster than it did a thousand years ago?

But what is "The Testimony of the Rocks" on this subject? Hugh Miller has shown that the first animals were the magnates of the species.

The whole conception of this view of development is an absurdity.

In nature we cannot find any thing by which to account for man. Let us go outside of nature then. Let us go to the Bible and acknowledge that God formed man. But *what was man* created? And here comes in the question—Was he created a savage? Here again comes in the idea of development. Was he once *inferior* in mental groundwork, and has since grown and increased in power and capacity?

Those who make this supposition tell us that at first the elephant having a short clumsy neck, was troubled to eat grass; but by continued exertions lengthened out his proboscis so as to reach the grass. But the question is, How did he live until this was accomplished? We ask the same of man, if created without the natural instincts, how could he have lived and provided for his wants until his powers were developed?

Those who hold to this doctrine, speak of man as in a *state of nature*, as if a state of nature was necessarily a savage state. A state of nature is rather one in which a man is placed in that situation in which his every capacity is capable of the highest development. This is far from being a savage state. We do not say that he was originally highly cultivated, but he was a *man* with all his high capacities, with none of that baseness which we find him possessed of now. There is a vast difference between a state of *simplicity* and a state of barbarism.

Consider Abraham—his courtesies—when he bowed himself toward the ground to the three strangers; see his hospitality when he hastened to prepare them food; see his bravery when he pursued his enemies unto Hobah and smote them, "and brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot and his goods, and the women also and the people;" his generosity when he would not partake of the spoil; his faith when called upon to slay his son. He was a man in all the true dignity of manhood. Compare him with a "ne plus ultra" of modern civilization, of some of our large cities. Civilization may exist without any true manhood, and how much of our civilization does thus exist, nay, how much of it is utterly base and revolting? Man is lower in *such*