

wisdom. But when he reached maturity, did he exercise the essentially human faculties that had been latent during infancy? If he did we find in him a true man; if he did not and was still a speechless savage of the lowest type, how did he differ from his simian congeners?

The following extract quoted by Prof. Drummond shows his views regarding primitive man:—

"For his successful progress as far as the savage state man has been largely indebted to those qualities which he shares with the ape and the tiger. That stage reached, for thousands and thousands of years, before the origin of the oldest known civilizations men were savages of a very low type. They strove with their enemies and their competitors; they preyed upon things weaker or less cunning than themselves; they were born, multiplied without stint and died for thousands of generations alongside the mammoth, the urus, the lion, the hyaena, whose lives were spent in the same way; and they were no more to be praised or blamed, on moral grounds, than their less erect and more hairy compatriots. Life was a continual free fight. . . . The human species, like others, plashed and floundered amid the general stream of evolution, keeping its head above water as best it might and thinking of neither whence nor whither."

Here evidently Professor Huxley is speaking of the *race* of mankind; but what of the individual first man. Had he progeny? And was that progeny human? Was there a first female child? or were many first male and female babes born? Was there no pairing between the higher simian races and the lowest savages? Have all men descended from one first pair, as scientific research is making more and more likely? If so, how did monogamy come to be? Simians are not monogamous. Among savages polygamy and polyandry prevail. Even among civilized races, where Christianity has not power, monogamy is not the rule. Why then should Prof. Drummond's first man, a savage of the lowest type, be monogamous?

Man has been by naturalists placed in a *genus* of his own. He is not a sub-species of the simian genus. And the appearance of a new genus is much more than passing by insensible degrees from a lower to a higher species at a birth. These questions, however, must be left while we consider the assumption so fundamental to the theory.

#### WAS THE FIRST MAN A SAVAGE?

The ground for this assertion seems insufficient; rather the dictum appears a necessary corollary from a previous