great difficulty is to conceive how they could emerge from that ſtate, and become at laſt enlightened and ci­vilized. The modern advocates for the universality of the ſavage ſtate remove this difficulty by a number of inſtincts or internal ſenſes, with which they ſuppoſe the human mind endowed, and by which the ſavage is, without re­flection, not only enabled to dillinguiſh between right and wrong, and prompted to do every thing neceſſary to the preſervation of his exiſtence, and the continuance of the ſpecies, but alſo led to the diſcovery of what will con­tribute, in the firſt inſtance, to the eaſe and accommoda­tions of life. Theſe inſtincts, they think, brought man­kind together when the reaſoning faculty, which had hi­therto been dormant, being now rouſed by the colliſions of ſociety, made its obſervations upon the conſequences of their different actions, taught them to avoid ſuch as experience ſhowed to be pernicious, and to improve up­on thoſe which they Found beneficial; and thus was the progreſs of civilization begun. But this theory is oppoſed by objections which we know not how to obviate. The bundle of inſtincts with which modern idleneſs, un­der the denomination of philoſophy, has ſo amply ſurniſhed the human mind, is a mere chimera. (See In­stinct. ) But granting its reality, it is by no means ſufficient to produce the conſequences which are derived from it. That it is not the parent of language, we have ſhown at large in another place (ſee Language, no 1—7. ); and we have the confeſſion of ſome of the ableſt advocates for the original ſavagiſm of man, that large ſocieties muſt have been formed before language could have been invented. How ſocieties, at leaſt large ſocieties, could be formed and kept together without language, we have not indeed been told; but we are aſſured by every hiſtorian and every traveller of credit, that in ſuch ſocieties only have mankind been found ci­vilized. Among known ſavages the ſocial ſtorge is very much confined; and therefore, had it been in the firſt race of men of as enlarged a nature, and as ſafe a guide, as the inſtinctive philoſophers contend that it was, it is plain that thoſe men could not have been ſavages. Such an appetite for ſociety, and ſuch a director of conduct, inſtead of enabling mankind to have emerged from ſa­vagiſm, would have effectually prevented them from ever becoming ſavage; it would have knit them together from the very firſt, and furniſhed opportunities for the progenitors of the human race to have begun the proceſs of civilization from the moment that they dropt from the hands of their Creator. Indeed, were the modern theories of internal ſenſes and ſocial affections well founded, and were theſe ſenſes and affections ſuffi­cient to have impelled the firſt men into ſociety, it is not eaſy to be conceived how there could be at this day a ſavage tribe on the face of the earth. Natural cauſes, operating in the ſame direction and with the ſame force, muſt in every age produce the ſame effects; and if the ſocial affections of the firſt mortals impelled them to ſociety, and their reaſoning faculties immediately commenced the proceſs of civilization, ſurely the ſame affections and the ſame faculties would in a greater or leſs degree have had the ſame effect in every age and on every tribe of their numerous offspring; and we ſhould everywhere obſerve mankind advancing in civilization, inſtead of ſtanding ſtill as they often do, and ſometimes retreating by a retrograde motion. This, however, is far from being the caſe. Hordes of ſavages exiſt in almoſt every quarter of the globe; and the Chineſe, who have undoubtedly been in a ſtate of civilization for at leaſt 2000 years, have during the whole of that long period been abſolutely ſtationary, if they have not loſt ſome of their ancient arts. (See Porcelain). The origin of civilization, therefore, is not to be looked for in human inſtincts or human propenſities, carrying men forward by a natural progreſs; for the ſuppoſition of ſuch propenſities is contrary to fact; and by fact and hiſtorical evidence, in conjunction with what we know of the nature of man, muſt this great queſtion be at laſt decided.

In the article Religion, no 7. it has been ſhewn that the firſt men, if left to themſelves without any inſtruction, inſtead of living the life of ſavages, and in proceſs of time advancing towards civilization, muſt have periſhed before they acquired even the uſe of ſome of their ſenſes. In the ſame article it has been ſhown (n⁰ 14—17. ), that Moſes, as he is undoubtedly the old- eſt hiſtorian extant, wrote likewiſe by immediate inſpiration; and that therefore, as he repreſents our firſt pa­rents and their immediate deſcendants as in a ſtate far removed from that of ſavages, it is vain to attempt to deduce the originality of ſuch a ſtate from hypothetical theories of human nature. We have, indeed, heard it obſerved by ſome of the advocates for the antiquity and univerſality of the ſavage ſtate, that to the appeal to revelation they have no objection, provided we take the Moſaic account as it ſtands, and draw not from it conclulions which it will not ſupport.

They contend, at the ſame time, that there is no ar­gument fairly deducible from the book of Geneſis which militates againſt their poſition. Now we beg leave to remark, that beſides the reaſoning which we have al­ready uſed in the article juſt referred to, we have as much poſitive evidence againſt their poſition as the nature of the Moſaic hiſtory could be ſuppoſed to afford.

We are there told that God created man after his own image; that he gave him dominion over every thing in the ſea, in the air, and over all the earth; that he appointed for his food various kinds of vegetables; that he ordained the Sabbath to be obſerved by him, in commemoration of the works of creation; that he pre­pared for him a garden to till and to dreſ; and that, as a teſt of his religion and ſubmiſſion to his Creator, he forbade him, under ſevere penalties, to eat of a certain tree in that garden. We are then told that God brought to him every animal which had been created; and we find that Adam was ſo well acquainted with their ſeveral natures as to give them names. When too an helpmate was provided for him, he immediately ac­knowledged her as bone of his bone, fleſh of his fleſh, and called her *woman,* becauſe ſhe was taken out of man.

How theſe facts can be reconciled to a ſtate of ig­norant ſavagiſm is to us abſolutely inconceivable; and it is indeed ſtrange, that men who profeſs Chriſtianity ſhould appeal to reaſon, and ſtick by its deciſion on a queſtion which revelation has thus plainly decided againſt them. But it is agreeable to their theory to believe that man roſe by flow ſteps to the full uſe of his reaſon­ing powers. To us, on the other hand, it appears equally plauſible to ſuppoſe that our firſt parents were created, not in full maturity, but mere infants, and that they went through the tedious proceſs of childhood and