

our race, and that the biblical account of it contains the testimony of trustworthy witnesses.

I propose in the present paper to summarize the geological and archeological facts bearing on the question, and then to inquire as to the illustrations which they afford of the biblical narrative.

It may be accepted as a fair deduction from the anatomy and physiology of man, and more especially from his dentition, and from his want of natural weapons of attack and defense, that he must at first have been frugivorous, and must have originated in a region of such a character as to supply him with suitable food, and to enable him to dispense with clothing; and where he would be exempt, in the first instance at least, from the attacks of formidable beasts of prey. This is only applying in the case of man the requirements which we have reason to believe were essential in the introduction of all new forms of life in geological time, and is quite independent of any theoretical views as to the causes of such introduction whether by creation or evolution. Hence Haeckel, the great German naturalist and apostle of agnostic evolution, in his "Natural History of Creation," after rejecting as unsuitable all those regions in which the lowest races of men exist, finds himself obliged to trace the affiliation of the species back to a temperate region of southwestern Asia, in which also he finds the probable place of origin of many of the plants and animals most useful to mankind. In this he agrees with Genesis, which places the original home of man at or near the confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris, and furnishes the district with trees "pleasant to the sight and good for food." This conclusion, based on natural facts by a well-informed and thoroughly able naturalist who attaches no value whatever to the biblical history, shows at the least that the author of Genesis could not well have arrived at a safer conclusion, if he had had before him all the modern discoveries in physical geography. It is true that Haeckel thinks that the land of southern Asia extended farther into the Indian Ocean than at present when man first appeared, which, as we shall find, is a supposition not altogether contradictory to Genesis. It would be easy to show that those theories of the origin of men, or of portions of them, which would place their beginning in other regions, are either destitute of satisfactory evidence, or relate to the post-diluvian times and confound these with the proper origin of our race. The bearing of this as illustrative of the geographical relations of the deluge in Genesis is apparent, and will be noticed in the sequel.

When we turn to the geological history of man, we find that, as in Genesis, he is a being of late origin, appearing only toward the close of the last of the great periods into which the development of the earth and its inhabitants may be divided. We may, with some geologists, designate this period as that of the later Tertiary or early modern deposits, or may with others call it the Quaternary Period. The fact remains the same. For our present purpose we may use the name