

To-ro. <i>Banksia</i> sp.	Core-e-o. <i>Soft.</i>
To-ra. <i>Meat.</i>	Mal-yu. <i>Hard.</i>
Yeg-ga. <i>A stick.</i>	Ar-da. <i>Sulky (to pout).</i>
Wip-pa. <i>A stick for digging.</i>	Woo-ma ar-u-a. <i>To sharpen a</i> <i>wooma.</i>
Oo-be-ra. <i>Truth.</i>	At-to-a. <i>To cook.</i>
Mid-do. <i>Hut.</i>	Ou-e-la-da. <i>To gull or lie.</i>
Mou-lo mid-do. <i>White's house.</i>	Bee-ro-bar-dee. <i>To flow.</i>
To-ro-bar-de. <i>Boomrang.</i>	E-arr. <i>To dig.</i>
Ne-ra. <i>Throwing apparatus.</i>	We-gar-ra! <i>Be off! Go away!</i>
Way-run-jo. <i>Spear.</i>	Woor-ree-ar-ree. <i>To run.</i>
Nuk-ar-ro. <i>Sleep.</i>	E-gar-ru-eh! <i>Stop!</i>
Oo-to-bat-ta. <i>Belly-full.</i>	Do-ro e-ja. <i>Stay here.</i>
Tar-u. <i>Not eatable.</i>	Cow-de-bügh. <i>To swim.</i>
Co-al-lo. <i>A good thing.</i>	O-ke-jil-lu. <i>To fight.</i>
O-go. <i>Blunt.</i>	G'n ar-re-a. <i>To sleep.</i>
Mo-go-e-o. <i>Afraid.</i>	Yek-ka-cao-le. <i>To come.</i>
Wadju-lu-kan. <i>Thirsty.</i>	Do-ro-yek-ka. <i>To go.</i>
Ku-jil-lu-kan. <i>Hungry.</i>	Woo roo-waur. <i>Soon.</i>
Knack-o-wa. <i>Good to eat.</i>	Wee-garr. <i>Far away.</i>
Noy-au. <i>Raw.</i>	Aylo. <i>Near.</i>
Mee-ne. <i>Red.</i>	Oo-rung-o-wow-kan-a-go. <i>I saw</i> <i>it with my eyes, or It is the real</i> <i>truth.</i>
War-da. <i>Almost dead.</i>	
Ma-lo. <i>Dead.</i>	
Dur-na. <i>Quick.</i>	

XVII.—*Traditions, real and fictitious.* By the Rev.

F. W. FARRAR, M.A., F.E.S., etc.

(Read February 23rd, 1864.)

It is well known that many narratives which are found in the Bible, especially those which refer to the earliest history of the human race, may be paralleled by traditions which, sometimes truly and sometimes falsely, have been asserted to exist among various nations. This alleged prevalence of traditions, supposed to be identical in origin, or to point back to the same historical event, has been repeatedly used to establish some most important conclusions, of which at present I need only mention two, viz. :—the universality of the Deluge, and the Unity of the human race. On the extreme interest and importance of these conclusions it is unnecessary to dwell; nor is it necessary, in the present inquiry, to indicate any opinion respecting either of them. The more valid the conclusions may be supposed to be, the less desirable it is to support them by untenable or questionable evidence. That the evidence of traditions is *most* questionable, and that an importance wholly exaggerated has been attached to them, I hope to show in the following paper, in which it is my object to prove that the traditions appealed to are *not* universal; that in many instances

they are not *genuine*; and that in many others they lose all interest by being directly borrowed from the narrative which they are quoted to illustrate.

That I am not fighting against shadows will be sufficiently obvious to any one who will take up the first Biblical commentary or primeval history that comes to hand. In the books of very many travellers, and very many historians;—in nearly every theological critic;—in Grotius,¹ in Heidegger, in Stillingfleet, in Shuckford, in Stackhouse, in Faber, in Hartwell Horne, down to Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, completed but the other day, —in every commentator from Calmet down to Kalisch;—nay more, in almost every geologist, from Cuvier and Scheuchzer down to Dr. Pye Smith, Professor Hitchcock, and Hugh Miller,—“*crambe repetita placebit*,”—the same stories will be found repeated, and in nine cases out of ten, the same inferences deduced from them. The strongest instance, though not the most modern, may be found in the *Mythology of Jacob Bryant*. That learned writer makes a distorted tradition of the deluge the source of all Mythology, and all Polytheism. He identifies Noah with Janus, with Kronos, with Zeus, with Dionysus, with Prometheus, with Atlas, with Xuthus, with Osiris, and with multitudes of others, both legendary and historical. It is perhaps a proof that these absurdities are not exploded, that we find Bryant's crude vagaries quoted with approbation, and at full length, in the very last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, finished only last year. And if Bryant be regarded as obsolete, and forgotten, let it be remembered that in works comparatively recent, a naturalist so celebrated as Andreas Wagner,² and a philologist so eminent as Louis Benlowe³ appeal to these traditions as a proof of our descent from a single pair: and a scholar and critic so justly renowned as Heinrich von Ewald denies the autochthony of the North American Indians, on the ground of the Mexican traditions about the deluge from which Coxcox was saved!

Some examination of the traditions which have been quoted, has left on my mind a strong impression that their weight, as evidence, is almost valueless, and that they may fairly be ranged under five heads—viz.: I. Independent natural beliefs, wholly unconnected with the Bible. II. Similar allegoric representations of common catastrophes. III. Vague and grotesque legends forced into an unreal resemblance with Biblical narratives. IV.

¹ Grot., *De Veritat.*, i, 16; Heidegger, *Hist. Patr.*, i, 551, seq.; Buttmann, *Mythol.*, i, 180, seqq.; A. Wagner, *Gesch. der Urwelt.*, 544, seqq.; Shuckford, *Connection*, i, 15; Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sacrae.*, iii, 4; Faber, *Hor. Mos.*, i, 93-101; Taylor's *Calmet*, *Fragm.* dx-dxvii; Bryant, *Anc. Mythol.*; Vern. Harcourt, *Doctrine of Deluge*; Hugh Miller *Test. of Rocks*, etc., *passim*.

² *Geschichte der Urwelt.*, p 555.

³ *Rech. sur l'origine des noms*, p. 87.

Mere echoes and plagiarisms: and, V. Absolute fictions and inventions.

As time would not allow me to enter fully upon so wide a field, I must here content myself with indicating rather than developing the grounds for these conclusions, and although in reading this paper I cannot stop to quote authorities, I may observe that I have noted the source of every fact which I shall adduce.

I. Under the first head of *independent natural beliefs*, wholly unconnected with revelation, though constantly referred to it,—I would class, for instance, the Greek, the Indian, and the Icelandic conception of the rainbow as a promise of hope. In Homer¹ the rainbow is spoken of as a prodigy, and as a sign of the divine presence and favour. In the Indian mythology it is the sign which Indra, the sun-god, displays when he has defeated the water-giants. In the Icelandic³ Eddas it is the bridge Bifrost, over which the demi-gods pass to the earth. Who does not see that these are transparent and spontaneous allegories, needing no other explanation than the appearance of the glowing arch as it rests on earth, and covers heaven with the seven-fold perfection of divided light? Or, again, when we are referred to the Bible to explain the sacredness of the dove in the Egyptian, Assyrian, or other traditions, is not the sacredness quite as easily explained by the exquisite gentleness and loveliness of the bird, and still more by the fact that the speed and instinct of the carrier-pigeon were known and employed in the earliest times³ by many nations, and that the use of them, which has been assigned by tradition to Semiramis, has been traced also back by Lepsius to a period of 3000 years B.C.? Or, once more, setting aside the fact of ophiolatry and the positive veneration in which the serpent has often been held, why have we been so often told that the story of the Fall explains the enmity⁴ of mankind to the serpent, when such detestation arises at once from its deadly venom, small dull eye, and hideous aspect?

To this same head, for similar reasons, we refer the universal belief in a past golden age,⁵ the innocent Paradaisical childhood of humanity, the supposed connection between the growth of civilisation⁶ and the growth of wickedness, the creation of woman

¹ Hom., *Il.*, xi, 27, xviii, 547. ² See Wislicenus, *Die Bibel.*, § 54.

³ Bastian, *Der Mensch.*, i, 411; Max Perty, *Anthropol. Vorträge.*, § 28; Bochart, *Hierozoicon*, II, i, 6. Cf. Xen., *Anab.*, i, 4, § 9.

⁴ Bochart, *Hieroz.*, i, i, 4; Zendavesta, ii, 217, iii, 62; Gesenius, s. v. *Adam*, in Ersch. and Gruber, *Encycl.*

⁵ Plato, *Polit.*, § 272; Philo., *De Confus. Ling.*, iii, 316, ed. Pfeiffer; Wislicenus, *l. c.*, § 54, seqq.

⁶ *Zendavesta*, i, 23, iii, 84-85.

from a bisection¹ of man, or (as the Thibetans say) from his thumb, or, according to others, his great toe; the temptation of man by woman² to the first act of sin; the notion of trees endowed with miraculous properties, such as those of the Persian³ tree of immortality, and Igdrasil, the Scandinavian tree of life; and the wide spread symbolism of cherubic⁴ forms, found no less among the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians, than among the Hebrews. Nor must the influence of sheer accident be overlooked in accounting for *occasional* minute resemblances in tradition or allegory. Neither ethnology nor the sister science of language have allowed sufficiently for this element; but it would be indeed surprising if the human mind, being subjected everywhere to the same laws, working on the same materials, liable to the same influences, and aiming at the same results, should not often have thought the same thought twice and independently, or endeavoured to convey the same *primà facie* conclusions by the same allegorical machinery.

II. Under the second head of *similar mythical representations of common catastrophes*, may be classed a large number of those so called "traditions of the deluge" to which so much attention has been drawn, as, for instance, the Chaldaean,⁵ the Persian,⁶ the ancient Greek,⁷ the Chinese,⁸ and those found or said to be found in Chili⁹ or New Zealand.¹⁰ If any one will take the trouble to refer to the sources whence these legends are derived, he will find that every one of them which I have mentioned, was by some writers represented as a *partial flood*. They would, therefore, in their original and genuine form have had no connection with the Semitic belief in an *universal* deluge; for while it is quite conceivable that any nation which had suffered from a local deluge would in their traditions represent it as having been universal; it is *inconceivable* that any nation which had once believed in, or

¹ Plato, *Sympos.*, p. 189. A rib is the Egyptian hieroglyph for woman.

² Plato, *Symp.*, x, 205, ed. Bipont. For abundant instances, see Buttmann, *Mythol.* passim; *Berlin Monatschrift*, Dec. 1802; Baur, *Hebr. Mythol.*; Noeh, *Brammineu und Rabbinen*, etc.

³ *Zendavesta*, iii, 105, and in the Buddhist Tantras; Perty, *Anthrop. Vortr.*, § 46; D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.*, s. v. Adam, etc.

⁴ Kitto, *Bibl. Cycl.*, ed. Alexander, s. v.

⁵ Philo., *De Præm. et Pæn.*, ii, 41; Jos., *Antt.*, i, 3-6; Euseb., *Præp. Evang.*, ix, 12; Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, p. 26, seq.; Shuckford, *Connect.*, i, 15; Bryant, *Anc. Mythol.*, ii, 195; Niebuhr, *Lect. on Anc. Hist.*, i, 18.

⁶ Hyde, *De Vet. Rel. Pers.*, x; Faber, *Hor. Mosaic.*, i, 939, and notes.

⁷ Pausan., ix, 5, 1; Apollod., i, 72; Ov., *Met.*, i, 260; Aristot., *Meteorol.*, i, 14; Grot., *Greece*, i, 135; Lyell, *Princ. of Geol.*, 341.

⁸ Couplet, *Confuc.*, p. 38, 76; Martin, *Hist. Sin.*, i, 22; Lyell, p. 8; Huc's *China*, i, 340.

⁹ Ovalle, *Hist. of Chili*, iii, 1, in Pinkerton, xiv, 166; Lyell, pp. 9, 483.

¹⁰ Taylor, *Te-ika-Mau*, 17, 18; Ellis, i, 387.

suffered from an *universal* deluge should have dwarfed it into a *partial* one. Facts, seen through the mists of mythical antiquity, are *magnified, not diminished*. Legend has often exaggerated small things into great; I am not aware that it has ever attenuated great things into small. Several writers, in spite of prejudice, are candid enough to confess that these traditions are independent of each other. Thus, among others, Sir W. Jones¹ admits that the Chinese deluge—caused, as Sir C. Lyell thinks it may have been, by some great derangement of the Yellow River—has no connection with Noah. Herrera, speaking of the Peruvian legend, allows that it described a partial deluge, and that it was not unanimous; and Molina observes of the Chilian legend already referred to, that “it was probably very different from that of Noah.”

That such traditions are *universal*,—that they are found in every part of the world—has been constantly asserted, and indeed it is by this asserted *universality* of the traditions, that the unity of race has been supposed to be confirmed. The assertion, however, is wholly erroneous; and it is an observable confirmation of what has been already urged, that, whereas we *do* find such legends in all regions liable to great aqueous catastrophes, we have on the other hand, *no such legends* in Africa or Australia, regions³ which are exempt from any such liability;—a fact which at once proves the *non-universality* of these traditions, and explains at the same time their wide extension. It may be observed too, that many of these stories ought to be called philosophemes rather than traditions, belonging as they do to a *series* of cataclysms⁴ and conflagrations, supposed to be necessary for the purification of a sin-stained world, and therefore falling under the head already examined.

III. Many traditions, though they are partly explicable under other heads, may be classed as vague and often absurd stories forced into unreal resemblance with the biblical narrative.

When we are confidently told (as is often the case) “that the Universal Deluge and the Unity of Mankind are doctrines strikingly confirmed by a legend found among the so and so, etc.,” it will constantly be found that when the legend is examined in its totality, all resemblance, except the general physical fact, will melt utterly away.

I have already observed that no such legend has been found in Africa, and I said this with a perfect knowledge that the Egyptian story of Osiris has repeatedly been paraded⁵ as a reminiscence of

¹ Works, i, 106.

² *Princ. of Geol.*, p. 8.

³ Lyell, p. 9, 483.

⁴ Plato, *De Legg.*, iii, 677; Lucret., i, 339; Whewell, *Hist. of Induct. Sciences*, iii, 500.

⁵ Tzetzes (quoted by Bryant, etc.) identifies Noah with Osiris. The only points of resemblance are, that Noah was a husbandman, and was set afloat on the 17th of Athyr (October).

the Flood, as, for instance, by Faber in his Bampton Lectures and *Horæ Mosaicæ*, and by numerous other writers; yet the outline of the story as derived from Plutarch's¹ tract "De Iside et Osiride," is simply this: Osiris was a good king who promoted agriculture and the progress of his people. During his absence Typhon rebelled against him with seventy-two conspirators. They made a chest or coffin, very splendidly embellished, the exact size of Osiris' body, and on his return Typhon promised to give this chest to any one whom it would fit. All the guests tried, and when Osiris got in, Typhon instantly closed it, covered it with lead and flung it into the Nile, whence it was carried into the sea by the Tanaictic mouth. This coffin, forsooth, is compared with Noah's ark, and the myth which refers to "the withdrawal of the Nile into its banks when the Etesian winds have ceased," is a tradition of the Flood, although nothing is more clear than that the Egyptians claimed special² exemption from such catastrophes, quoting in proof their rainless atmosphere! We may well, therefore, adopt the language of Sir C. Lyell, that "the fact³ that we have no trace in the mythology of Egypt or its monumental annals of a Flood, or the tradition of one, taken in connection with the exemption of Egypt for 3,000 years from great aqueous catastrophes, is suggestive, when compared with the universal prevalence of such traditions in *places liable to partial deluge.*"

We might quote other cases, such, for instance, as the story of Lake Dilolo, hesitatingly adduced by Dr. Livingstone⁴ as probably "a faint tradition of the Flood," and as the only one of the kind to be found in Africa—a negro story, in which it requires an imagination vigorous indeed to see any resemblance to that tremendous catastrophe. I prefer, however, to give in its totality the story of the Ojebway Indians, which is often quoted as a triumphant parallel. It is taken from the *Hist. of the Ojebway Indians*,⁵ by Kahkewaquonaby, a half-caste missionary, and it will be seen how ridiculously few and how easily explicable the points of osculation really are. It is as follows:

"There is a great toad which has the management of the water and is an enemy to the animal with a great horn. This animal gored the toad and thereby caused a deluge. A man named Nanahbozhoo, with some animals and fowls, escaped from this deluge on a raft. Nanahbozhoo then made a new world, sending the coon and the otter to dive for earth. As the creatures died

¹ A part of it is translated in Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.*, v, 329.

² Plat., *Tim.*, § 5; Diod. Sic., i, 10. ³ *Princ. of Geol.*, p. 637 (6th ed.).

⁴ *Miss. Travels*, p. 327.

⁵ Similar legends (?) are found among the Crees (Franklin, *Journey to Polar Sea*, p. 73), Dogribs (Id., p. 294), Californian Indians (Beechey's *Voy. to the Pacific*, ii, 78), etc.

in the attempt, Nanahbozhoo blew on them to resuscitate them. He then sent the musk rat, which came up dead, but with some mud on its paws, shewing that it had dived deep enough. He revived it, and out of the earth made a new world by rolling it in his paws, and sending a wolf to run up and down upon it until it was large enough. He then commanded it to stop growing, and went and sat down at the North Pole."

Similar alleged traditions are found among the Crees, the Dogribs, and the Californian Indians: and such is the kind of evidence brought to corroborate the Unity of Mankind! But so far as any circumstances in these bizarre narratives do recall the Mosaic narrative, we unhesitatingly refer many, if not all, of these to

Class IV. Mere wilful plagiarisms from the Bible, forming no part of the original legend, but unconsciously adopted from, or consciously attached to it.

We are fortunately able in various instances to trace the genesis of these final touches and ornamental additions. For instance, we know that the ancient Greeks had two legendary deluges—that of Ogyges and that of Deucalion; but, whereas, in the *early* poets we find in these legends of natural disturbances, no detail which resembles the Mosaic narrative, in *later* writers, on the other hand, we have full-blown particulars of the animals which Deucalion¹ took with him; the dove² which he sent out, the mountain³ on which his ark rested, and the sacrifice⁴ he offered on first landing. Coincidences, it will be observed, sufficiently remarkable;—but from whom are they derived? Not from Homer and Hesiod, or any of the old writers, but mainly from Plutarch and Lucian, writers certainly acquainted with the Jewish beliefs and one of whom has openly travestied the sacred books! Lucian, indeed, says, "Such things the Greeks relate respecting Deucalion," and Mr. H. Horne⁵ quotes this as a sufficient proof that he is not copying Scripture! The minds that can accept such proofs will doubtless attach importance to the Apamean medal which, if genuine, was struck in the time of Septimius Severus.

In the same way it may be asked, Who are our authorities for the oft-quoted coincidences of the *Chaldean* traditions with the Mosaic story? They are, Berosus, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Alexander Polyhistor, quoted or alluded to by Philo,⁶ Josephus,⁷ Eusebius,⁸ Cyril,⁹ and Syncellus.¹⁰ How can we be certain, with

¹ Lucian, *Timon*, 59; *De Deâ. Syriâ*, § 12.

² Plut., *De Sollert. Animal.* § 13, p. 968.

³ Suidas, s. v. Parnassus.

⁵ *Introd.*, p. 149, seqq.

⁷ *Ant.*, i, 3, 6; *Contr. Apio.* i, 19.

⁹ *Contr. Julian.* i, 8.

⁴ Pausanias, i, 18-8.

⁶ *De Præm. et Pæn.*, ii, 41.

⁸ *Præp. Evang.*, ix, 12.

¹⁰ *Chron.*, p. 30.

the modern instances before our eyes in which even honest writers have cited their parallels in a singularly arbitrary manner—how can we be certain that writers so wholly unscrupulous as Josephus, Cyril, or Eusebius, have not coloured the details in passing through their hands? And, again, even if we make the large assumption that this is not the case, who shall assure us that these writers with Hieronymus, the Phœnician Mnæseas, and others to whom Josephus appeals, had not directly copied their details from what they heard from the Jews? Some of the very writers who preserve these narratives as authentic confirmations, are anxious enough at other times to represent the heathen as borrowing all their wisdom and knowledge from the Hebrews. If, however, we are to believe, on such authority, that Gideon (or Jerubbaal) is identical with that Hierombalos² who is supposed to have supplied information to Sanchoniatho the Berytian, or that Thales, and Plato, and Aristotle derived their philosophy from fragments of Jewish truth learnt in Egypt or Phœnicia; or, again, that Zoroaster was once a servant of the Prophet Ezekiel; and if it be, at any rate, certain that the Arians and Semites were very early in contact with each other,—how can we avoid supposing that these lost Pagan authors may have made judicious and ornamental use of Semitic legends?

If, then, we have rendered probable the *suspicious* origin of these so-called traditions in *ancient* times, we can confirm our conjecture by proving that a *fifth* class of traditions, even in modern times, are absolute and wilful inventions. We might at once imagine this to be the case from the fact that, as a rule, such traditions are quoted *not by the earliest visitants* of various countries, but only by the *later* ones, who, in short, find the teaching of their own Christian predecessors embodied in a legendary form. A Dutch traveller, for instance, tells us that he found a tradition of the Deluge in the Sandwich Islands; but, assuming it to exist, who shall assure us that it was not derived from the Spaniards, who discovered those islands in the sixteenth century?

Let us, however, quote two memorable instances to show that we have something more than suspicion to go upon. At one time the theologians of Europe were edified by an Indian tradition of the Deluge resembling the Mosaic account in the minutest particulars, and professing to be derived from the Puranas. This narrative was furnished to Sir W. Jones by Colonel Walford, who had received it from a Brahmin as a genuine passage of ancient sacred Hindoo literature. When, however, the Puranas were

¹ See Winer, *Bibl. Realwört.*, s. v. Gideon; Joseph., *C. Apion.*, ii, 36; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i, xxiv, v, xiv; Euseb., *Præp. Evang.*, x, 4, ix, 5, etc.

searched, it was found that the pretended legend did not occur there, and it is now abandoned as a deliberate fiction.

The other instance is still more instructive. A distinguished modern missionary, Mr. Moffatt, the worthy father-in-law of Dr. Livingstone, was told in Africa a legend which coincided with the Bible in the most trifling details. He candidly confessed the extreme delight which the discovery gave him; but the legend aroused his caution by the suspicious accuracy of its resemblance. He had the rare honesty to institute very careful inquiries, which succeeded in establishing, wholly improbable as such a supposition at first appeared, that the man had derived his so-called legend from intercourse with a missionary in another and distant part of Africa. But for Mr. Moffatt's extreme care and candour, this supposed South African legend would undoubtedly have been added to the long list of those already adduced, and would have figured, beyond the possibility of contradiction, as a triumphant and indisputable argument in proof of the universality of the Deluge and the Unity of Mankind!

Mr. Moffatt sensibly observes, that his own fate in being thus deceived by a *sham legend*, may not have been singular, and in confessing the great pleasure excited by his supposed discovery, he has pointed out a very probable and fruitful cause of distortion in other narratives. Missionaries and travellers, preoccupied with foregone conclusions, and expecting or wishing to find that of which they are in search, seize much too eagerly on some accidental story, ask leading questions which the savage is generally only too pleased to answer in the way which he sees they desire: and, finally, without any conscious misrepresentation, tell the story with certain *nuances* and terms of expression, which are, in fact, purely subjective.

Nor is this all. The growth of tradition among savage tribes is amazingly rapid, and the savage is so unconscious of the conception of truth, and so ignorant of the simplest processes of his own mind, and so anxious to cap every story which he hears by one which he considers much better, that the narrative or sermon of a missionary may often inspire him on the spot to re-echo the same narrative as an original national possession. Kahkewah-quonaby,—the half-caste Ojebway missionary already quoted—says that “many of their *traditions* are founded on dreams.” Now not only are savages, like very young children, greatly addicted to perfectly unconscious lies, caused by projecting into the external world the vivid impressions made on their own imaginative minds,—but further, if a Biblical story were thus reproduced from the replications of a dream, the savage would be still more certain to regard and represent it as some old and well-known legend of his people. And this childish imitation, this unconscious

echo of a childish and half-idiotic brain, has often, we believe, been mistaken for a serious and connected tradition. In point of fact it *would become* a national tradition in an incredibly short time, since among nations without any literature, the *origin* of everything is immediately forgotten. We therefore quite agree with Mr. Gliddon that “these infantile stories did not often ascend to an epoch more ancient than the missionaries from whom we receive them. In this manner the missionaries only retook, under another form, that which they themselves had sown, and they registered as ancient traditions that which was the fantastic envelope given to their own teaching. This is what has incontestably occurred,—notably on the discovery of America, and more recently in the islands of the Indian Archipelago, and of Polynesia.”

On all the grounds, then, which I have adduced, we may, I think, safely conclude that a most undue prominence has been given to the arguments derived from the supposed unity of national traditions. No tradition can be admitted as evidence until we have proved, first, that it is *genuine* ; secondly, that it is *ancient* ; thirdly, that it is not an original and independent representation of physical facts, common in most regions of the globe ; and, fourthly, that any isolated point of resemblance to the Semitic narratives could not be attributed to the same kind of accident as that which sometimes causes an identity of words for the same object in languages which have not the slightest affinity with each other. When these tests have been applied, it will be found that most of our so-called traditions have evaporated altogether : and even when this is not the case, it is not difficult to prove that the similarity of traditions cannot authorise the inferences so frequently founded upon it.

XVIII.—*On Mr. Bateman's Researches in Ancient British Tumuli.* By JOHN LUBBOCK, Esq., Pres. Ethnol. Soc., V.P. Linn. Soc., F.R.S., etc.

(Read March 22nd, 1864.)

I MUST commence this short paper, by apologising to the Society for the form in which it is presented. It is a very convenient and almost universal rule, with the leading London societies, not to receive reviews, or abstracts, of already published works. Nevertheless, the present communication bears some resemblance, and for it I may perhaps quote as a precedent those which are found