

tenderest leaves of plants, and the soft integuments of many animals. Works of art, moreover, composed of the most indestructible materials, would have outlasted almost all the organic contents of sedimentary rocks. Edifices, and even entire cities, have, within the times of history, been buried under volcanic ejections, submerged beneath the sea, or engulfed by earthquakes; and had these catastrophes been repeated throughout an indefinite lapse of ages, the high antiquity of man would have been inscribed in far more legible characters on the framework of the globe than are the forms of the ancient vegetation which once covered the islands of the northern ocean, or of those gigantic reptiles which at still later periods peopled the seas and rivers of the northern hemisphere.*

Dr. Prichard has argued that the human race have not always existed on the surface of the earth, because "the strata of which our continents are composed were once a part of the ocean's bed"—"mankind had a beginning, since we can look back to the period when the surface on which they lived began to exist."† This proof, however, is insufficient, for many thousands of human beings now dwell in various quarters of the globe where marine species lived within the times of history, and, on the other hand, the sea now prevails permanently over large districts once inhabited by thousands of human beings. Nor can this interchange of sea and land ever cease while the present causes are in existence. It is conceivable, therefore, that terrestrial species might be older than the continents which they inhabit, and aquatic species of higher antiquity than the lakes and seas which they people.

Doctrine of successive development not confirmed by the admission that man is of modern origin.—It is on other grounds that we are entitled to infer that man is, comparatively speaking, of modern origin; and if this be assumed, we may then ask whether his introduction can be considered as one step in a progressive system, by which, as some suppose, the organic world advanced slowly from a more simple to a more perfect state? In reply to this question, it should first be observed, that the superiority of man depends not on those faculties and attributes which he shares in common with the inferior animals, but on his reason, by which he is distinguished from them. When it is said that the human race is of far higher dignity than were any pre-existing beings on the earth, it is the intellectual and moral attributes only of our race, not the animal, which are considered; and it is by no means clear that the organization of man is such as would confer a decided pre-eminence upon him, if, in place of his reasoning powers, he was merely provided with such instincts as are possessed by the lower animals.

If this be admitted, it would by no means follow, even if there had been sufficient geological evidence in favour of the theory of progressive development, that the creation of man was the last link in the same chain. For the sudden passage from an irrational to a rational

* See ch. 49.

† Phys. Hist. of Mankind, vol. ii. p. 594.