

3 1 5 3

PENTATEUCH AND ITS ASSAILANTS

A REFUTATION

OF THE

OBJECTIONS OF MODERN SCEPTICISM

TO THE

PENTATEUCH.

BY

WILLIAM T. HAMILTON, D.D.

PASTOR OF THE GOVERNMENT STREET CHURCH, MOBILE ALA

EDINBURGH:

T. & T CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO , SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO. ,

SHEIFY & CO , WARD & CO. , JACKSON & WALFORD, &C

DUBLIN. JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLII

R.M.C. LIBRARY	
Acc. No.	3153
Class No.	2231
Date	
Standard	
	✓
	✓
Enc. Conts	✓
Checked	am

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
32 THISTLE STREET.

Ben-Hay

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE,	ix
INTRODUCTION—Presenting a brief View of the German Neological Mode of Interpretation,	xv

LECTURE I.

THE CHARACTER OF MOSES AS A SCHOLAR AND A STATESMAN.

The probable date of his birth under the Eighteenth Dynasty.—Education.—Rabbinical Traditions respecting his Infancy.—His military career in Ethiopia. His purity of character.—Firmness. — Military achievements.—Conjecture as to Monumental Records of it. - His skill as a Leader.—His accuracy as a Historian. — Characteristics of his Style as a Writer.—Sagacity as a Statesman. —Wisdom as a Legislator.—Peculiarities of the Mosaic Institutions.—Civil Polity.—Law of Murder, and Cities of Refuge.—Moral Code.—Mosaic Institutions and Laws not borrowed from Egypt.—Testimonies on that point.—General Summary;

LECTURE II.

NECESSITY OF REVELATION.

The Necessity of a Revelation to Man: argued from the Religious Instinct innate in Man.—The importance of Human Destiny.—Man's limited powers. The enfeebling influence of Moral Obliquity.—The character of the Religious Systems embraced among the most enlightened nations of antiquity.—Hindoo Sacred Books.—China: the Chou-King, and Confucius.—Ancient Persians.—Religious System of the Ancient Egyptians.—Idea of one God not exhibited in Egyptian Monuments.—Ethical Teachings of the ancient Philosophers.—General sentiment of antiquity betraying an expectation of a Revelation, 31

LECTURE III.

THE BIBLE IS A REVELATION FROM GOD.

Definition.—The Books of which the Bible is composed are of extreme antiquity. PAGE
 —Mis-statements of Strauss corrected.—Care of the Jews in transcribing.—
 The Bible itself claims to be divine.—In it nothing inconsistent with this high
 claim.—Contrast puerilities of religious systems of India and Egypt.—Bible
 worthy, in every point, of its high claim.—Miracles, what: Instances: a
 suitable attestation of a Revelation.—Miracles not impossible, or the admis-
 sion of them absurd.—Peculiar character of the Jews inexplicable but on ad-
 mission of Mosaic Miracles.—Those of Gospel admitted by early assailants of
 Christianity.—Influence of the Bible on Man proves it divine.—Nations with-
 out the Bible; Romans, Chaldeans, Persians, Assyrians.—China, ancient
 Civilization.—Curious evidences of it.—Eclipses.—Seven Years' Famine.—
 Mariner's Compass.—Printing.—Ancient Egypt.—Ridiculous Superstitions.—
 New evidence for the Bible constantly turning up as time moves on and
 science and learning advance, 54

LECTURE IV.

THE PENTATEUCH THE WORK OF MOSES, GENUINE AND
AUTHENTIC.

Five Books bearing the name of Moses.—Indispensable as an Introduction to the
 other Sacred Books.—Always regarded by the Jews as the work of their great
 Lawgiver.—So regarded by the learned in Europe and in the United States.
 —Some who once denied, after thorough examination, admitted the Mosaic ori-
 gin of these Books.—The Books themselves state repeatedly that Moses wrote
 them, and wrote by God's command.—In the later Jewish Scriptures these
 books are often mentioned as the Law; the Law given by Moses.—Written
 Books, not an Oral Law meant.—Hilkiah did not palm on Josiah forged docu-
 ments as a work of Moses.—Hilkiah found the autograph copy of Moses.—
 The Pentateuch was the Statute-Book of the Jewish nation.—Evidence of ex-
 istence of Pentateuch, and regarded as the work of Moses in ages subse-
 quent to the Captivity.—Mentioned in Historical Books; in Prophets; in
 Psalms.—Samaritan Copy.—Testimony of Josephus.—Translation of the Se-
 venty.—Imposition impossible.—Character and style of these books agree
 precisely with what we know of Moses, and with no other man.—Mosaic origin
 distinctly acknowledged by Christ and the Apostles.—No ancient author sup-
 ported by an equal amount of evidence, 79

LECTURE V.

GENESIS THE WORK OF MOSES, AND INSPIRED.

A necessary opening to the other Five Books.—The first eleven chapters inse-

ORI

PAGE

parably connected with all the rest.—Its importance as the basis of all History.—Recapitulation of argument in Lecture IV.—Internal evidence in this and the other Books of the Pentateuch that they emanated from the same author.—Christ and the writers of the New Testament recognised Genesis as the work of Moses.—Many Passages in the other Jewish writers clearly imply the same.—Whether entirely original or compiled from other sources not material. Moses gave it to the Jews.—Notions of Vitringa, Astruc, &c., as to many fragmentary documents.—The Theory of a Jehovah Document and an Elohim Document.—No contradictory Repetitions.—Moses proceeds logically, giving generals first, particulars afterwards.—Genesis always esteemed by Jews as the work of Moses.—Found in every ancient copy, and every version of the Jewish Scriptures.—Testimony of distinguished ancient heathen writers to the leading facts in the Mosaic history, and to the wide-spread reputation of Moses as a Statesman, a Lawgiver, and a Writer, 114

LECTURE VI.

CREATION IN SIX DAYS.

Is this true?—In what sense is it true?—All truths are consistent one with another.—God's Works and his Word must harmonize.—Care demanded in explaining the Sacred Record.—Mere theories, plausible, but not proved, weigh not against the averments of Scripture.—The Nebular Hypothesis, and doctrine of Development from Lower to Higher Forms of Animal Life, both rejected among scientific men.—Importance of full confidence in Bible statements.—Theory of Diversity of Origin for the Human Races, a bare unsupported hypothesis.—Difficulty of a minutely particular interpretation of the first chapter in Genesis.—Indefinite gap between *the Beginning*, Gen. i. 1, and the Six Days' Creation.—Opinions of eminent men.—Theory of Days of Indefinite Duration, Geological Cycles, considered.—Four Objections to that theory.—Attempted explanation of Creation in Six Days.—Meaning of terms Create, Make, Fashion, &c.—Pearson.—Mosaic Account shewn to be most reasonable, by a comparison with Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius, and Wilkinson, respecting the Egyptians.—Hindoo Cosmogony.—De Lembre, Bentley, Sir W. Jones, and others.—The Chaldeans.—Absurd fables of the old Chinese authors.—Man of recent origin on earth, as Moses testifies, demonstrated by Science.—Sacredness of the weekly Sabbath, 139

LECTURE VII.

POPULOUSNESS OF THE EARTH IN THE DAYS OF CAIN, AND THE LONGEVITY OF THE ANCIENT PATRIARCHS.

Story of Cain.—Bloody Sacrifices.—Prescribed mode of worship and priesthood.

	PAGE
Father of family the Priest.—Meaning of “Stood before the Lord;” “Went out from the presence of the Lord.”—Mark set on Cain.—Where Cain obtained a wife.—Rapid increase of the families of man.—Incestuous marriages.—Such marriages at first inevitable on every theory of races.—Antediluvian longevity corroborated by ancient tradition in other nations, and the recorded reigns of their early sovereigns.—Reasons for preferring the Septuagint chronology to the Hebrew.—Egyptian Monumental Records present nothing fully authenticated that can shake the credit of Moses,	169

LECTURE VIII.

ANTEDILUVIAN GIANTS.

These ancient Bible histories not borrowed from heathen Mythology.—Import of the phrase, “Sons of God,” and “Daughters of Men.”—Superstitious notions of early Christian writers on this subject.—Curious account from Maimonides, of the Origin of Idolatry.—Evil of lustful marriages.— <i>Giants</i> , Import of the term.—Not necessarily of huge stature.—Probable origin.—No evidence that ancients generally were of larger stature than moderns.—Supposed bones of antediluvian giants disinterred were not human.—Instances of unusual stature, ancient and modern.—Men of gigantic stature mentioned in different parts of the Bible as extraordinary cases.—Such still occur.—Patagonians, &c.	189
---	-----

LECTURE IX.

THE DELUGE UNIVERSAL. PART I.

Bible not a text-book of science, yet contains much deeply interesting to the scientific.—Faith of Noah.—Active Obedience.—Moses teaches the Flood <i>universal</i> .—His language implies it.—The narrative is history, not allegory.—Evidence from New Testament.—Theory of Local Inundation.—Universal tradition in all nations.—Ceremonies commemorative of a Deluge universal.—Chaldeans, Gentoos, Indians of Mexico and South America.—Origin of Mounds and Pyramids.—Chinese.—Argument therefrom.—Lyell’s theory unreasonable.—Supposed traces of diluvian action on the earth.—Views of ancient Philosophers (Strabo, &c.) on the Fossils then known.—Evidence of crossing Currents.—Alternating Layers of Fresh Water and Marine Deposits of different ages.—No indubitable traces of the action of Noah’s Flood yet found.—Change in the views of Christian Geologists.—Buckland, Sedgwick, &c.—Direction of Currents.—Boulders.—Alterations of level in land and sea.—Temple of Jupiter Serapis near Naples.—Views of Dr Fleming,	202
--	-----

LECTURE X.

THE DELUGE UNIVERSAL. PART II.

Recapitulation.—Mosaic doctrine.—Deluge universal.—Objections against its universality. — On scientific grounds.—Quantity of water needed.—Subterranean oceans.—Increased weight of earth.—Disturb whole Solar System.—Deluge a miracle.—Sinking of old continents, upheaval of old ocean's beds.—Lands now rising.—Others sinking.—Laws of Nature not uniform in all ages; in the sense of Lyell.—The uniformity includes exceptions.—Garden of Eden.—Site not ascertained on any theory.—Human remains antediluvian not found.—Because all now beneath the deep sea.—Rapid vegetation after flood.—Olive Leaf.—Noah's Vineyard.—Explanation of this.—Alleged incapacity of the ark to contain all the animals.—Difficulty of animals from remotest regions all living in one climate so long.—Dispersion of the animals to their respective climates.—Destruction of all fresh water animals in such a deluge.—Objection to the universality of the Deluge.—From the great age of certain trees.—From appearances presented in certain volcanic regions in France, Sicily, and Asia Minor.—Solution of these difficulties.—Impossible descent of animals, &c. from Mount Ararat.—Monuments of the East, chiefly of Egypt, said to be many centuries older than the Epoch of Noah's Deluge.—Brief solution of this difficulty.—Discoveries of Mr R. S. Poole in Egyptian Archeology and Chronology.—Possible future upheaval of antediluvian cities, and of Ninrod's battle-grounds, 222

LECTURE XI.

DEATH AMONG THE WORKS OF GOD—ITS ORIGIN AND EXTENT.

To Man, the fruit of sin, wide-spread consequences.—Benevolently ordered to the individual, to society.—Extent of Death.—Universal in animal creation.—Is Death among lower animals the fruit of man's sin?—Difficulties attending the affirmative.—Facts adduced proving that Death did invade the animal occupants of this globe before Adam sinned; before Man was formed.—Fossil remains in geological strata.—Gigantic fossil Saurian, with remains in its stomach of animals on which it had fed.—Animal remains abundant in nearly all rocks, limestone, chalk, polishing-stone.—Infusoria incredibly abundant.—Vast mountains mere masses of remains of dead animalculæ.—Pyramids.—Coral.—Deltas of rivers.—Death inevitable to material organization.—Law of Men.—Tree of Life, 253

LECTURE XII.

MAN ONE FAMILY.

All the Races of Men the descendants of one primitive stock.—Diversity of origin claimed for the different races, especially the Negro.—Theory of Professor Agassiz.—His reasoning.—His explanation of the term *unity*.—Of the phrase, *all made of one blood*.—Objections to his theory.—Contrary to Scripture.—Against the testimony of philological facts.—Philology Agassiz rejects as irrelevant.—General arguments on both sides.—Argument for distinct origin of the Negro, particularly.—Polygamy among the dark races.—Professor Agassiz's argument.—Objections to his theory and his reasoning.—His reasoning based on assumption.—The mode of his argument is inconsistent with his avowed principles.—His theory imperfect and inconsistent with itself, as the one type, the aboriginal Indian, spread over the vast extent of America, shews.—Adaptation of different races to their localities designed of God.—The *origin* of man and animals beyond the reach of mere Science.—Testimony of Johan. Müller.—Man differs from animals much in origin also.—If the Creator reveal not *origin* it must be *ever hid*.—Teaching of the Bible.—Old Testament and New.—For the present diversity in descendants from one common stock the Bible accounts.—Law to produce this change impressed on human constitution at Babel; at Confusion of Tongues.—This argued.—Challenge of Agassiz met.—Analogy shews change once made is permanent.—This change before historical times.—This View accounts for all facts, explains all difficulties, consistent with all Bible doctrines.—Incidental evidence hence arising for truth of Mosaic books.—Antiquity of Negro race from Egyptian Monuments, but the old Egyptians not Negroes.—Characteristics of human races do not prove them distinct species.—Mixed races and their fertility shew this.—Man an anomaly in the animal world.—Cannot reason from an anomalous case to other ordinary cases.—Analogous changes in lower animals yield no valid argument.—Nor alleged inferiority of intellect in the dark races.—Case of Egyptians examined.—Instances of Negro intelligence met with by the author.—Adaptedness of religion to all races.—Evidence of this essential unity.—Christian Missions.—The traditions prevailing among men of all races and all countries respecting a Deluge, and their descent from the one family alone surviving that event, bespeak a common origin.—This point argued.—Evidence of early civilization in all countries argues a common origin.—A comparison of language gives evidence equal to demonstration, of a common origin.—Recapitulation of the whole argument,

PAGE

author. Yet it is so simple, and, as he conceives, so natural an inference in the circumstances, that very possibly it may have occurred to other minds, unprompted, as it did to his own.

The dispersion of mankind after the Deluge, the origin of nations, the history of writing, and the great and perplexed question of Biblical chronology, are reserved for discussion in a future work, should life and ability be spared.

Objections are sometimes urged against Christian pastors engaging in works like the present, apart from their appropriate duties as ministers of reconciliation. On that subject, the author of this work begs leave to present the following sensible remarks, extracted from a letter addressed to him by an intelligent, a learned, and a judicious friend, who is himself also a Christian pastor, and one eminently successful and universally esteemed, the Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D. of New Orleans.

“ I am aware that there are objections to pastors, and even to learned professors engaging in services *ab extra*, or supplementary to their ordinary duties. Certainly a pastor’s responsibilities to his people are awful. Well may he cry out, as he considers this, ‘ *Lord, who is sufficient for these things?*’ A right-minded pastor will feel that his people are emphatically committed to his care, that he is set over them by the Holy Ghost, to watch for their souls as one that must give an account to God; but is his soul to be fettered down to his own parish? Is he not to pray and labour for the Church universal, and for the conversion of the world? What would have been the state and character of our Christian literature, if all the men of God before us, had thought and laboured only and exclusively for their own immediate congregations—if they had contented themselves with doing nothing but preaching repentance and faith? How much would the Church of Christ have lost by such a narrow-minded suicidal policy? Who will defend the outposts of the Gospel, if pastors do not? On this very point I have met with a paragraph in the work on ‘ *The Letter and Spirit*,’ by Dr Vaughan (editor of the *British Quarterly Review*), which is worthy of being carefully considered.

“ ‘ Concerning this doctrine (*i.e.* that pastors should do nothing but what relates to the immediate wants of their congregations, he says), we know not another doctrine more likely to be acceptable to the prince of darkness ; for we know not another which in proportion to its prevalence, would operate more thoroughly to his purpose. Now, as through all past time, not only the preaching of the Gospel, but the defence of Christianity through the world, if sustained at all, must be sustained chiefly by men who are by profession its ministers. Such is the manifest design of Providence, and the meddling and short-sighted men who oppose themselves to it, know not what they do. If the priesthood of the sanctuary is to be a match for the priesthood of letters, the path of its labours must become wider and more diversified every day. Men who see this, must give little heed to those who see it not.’ (Letter and Spirit, p. 78, London, 1849.)

“ Again,” continues Dr Scott, “ the same arguments which call for higher, and wider, and more diversified, and more earnest work in the pulpit, call equally loud for the use of the press in behalf of the same object. The religious literature that is needed must be of a high character ; and while it may not professedly labour for the conversion of souls, will nevertheless lead to that most important result.

“ Whatever removes prejudices, cancels objections to the Bible, opens up the understanding to discern true judgment, and exhibits Christianity in alliance with common sense, and with the general intelligence and culture of the age,—in a word, whatever contributes to give the religion of the Bible a *social status*, contributes under God to give it a converting power.

“ In the irrigation of Egypt,¹ there is much apart from, and prior to the long wished-for and harvest-producing flood. There are all the appliances and machinery of human effort waiting for the providence-sent overflowing.

“ So in the history of society and in the experience of indiyi-

¹ Dr Scott has recently made a tour in Egypt and the East.

duals, there is much that is not only preliminary to conversion, but apart from, and yet in order to conversion. The truth must come into actual contact with the men before it can make them free. They must hear of Christ, and have knowledge of Him before they can believe in him. *Whatever, then, contributes to place the Bible before men of intelligence, freed from their prejudices against it, and gives it in their view authority as the word of God, contributes to their conversion, if they become obedient to its teachings."*

In these excellent views, the author of this work heartily concurs.

MOBILE, March 15, 1852.

*David Bruce Mackay -
16th Regt, Calverts.*

INTRODUCTION.

“THE Bible,” said that great oriental scholar, Sir William Jones, “contains more sublimity, more exquisite beauty, more pure morality, more important history, and finer strains of poetry and eloquence, than can be collected from all other books—in whatever age or language they may be written.”

“The Bible,” said that masterly genius of modern eloquence, Patrick Henry, “is a book worth more than all other books that were ever printed.”

Of this wonderful book, that clear and logical reasoner, John Locke, has said, “It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter.”

And yet against the authority of this best of all books, attacks have been made, again and again, with determined and often with bitter hostility. To these several attacks, numerous, and often masterly replies have been published.

But within the last thirty or forty years fresh attacks have been made on various grounds; chiefly scientific.

Astronomy, geology, physiology, and ethnology, have all been arrayed against the teachings of the Bible, and especially against the Pentateuch, the first five books of the Jewish Scripture, and which are generally ascribed to Moses as their author. The historical records of several ancient oriental nations, and especially the records still found among the monuments of Egypt, whose numerous hieroglyphic inscriptions we can now decipher, have been ostentatiously paraded in opposition to the books of Moses; and

men of note in the learned world have not been wanting who maintained that these records, together with certain astronomical tables found in the East, prove conclusively that the chronology of the Pentateuch is completely worthless, its historic statements are entitled to no credit, and that the book of Genesis, especially, is nothing more than a collection of old traditionary tales, and mythical representations, of no historical value whatever.

These are very strong averments; they have been very boldly and very confidently put forth, and they are calculated to shake the faith of the unsuspecting in the truth of holy writ. The confidence with which the assault is made, the appearance of learned research presented in the writings of those who thus attack, and the very nature of the materials constituting the weapons of assault—very learned oriental documents claiming a monstrous antiquity, and the interpreted hieroglyphics of the old Pharaonic dynasties, still legible in the halls of their palaces, the courts of their temples, and the chambers of their tombs, still found over the whole extent of the Nile valley, and other ancient works and inscriptions met with occasionally in Arabia and other eastern lands; and when declared under the sanction of names justly honoured in the learned world for patient industry, and extensive erudition, to be demonstrative of the inaccuracy of the Mosaic record as we have it, all this cannot but make a deep impression on many a mind.

The poison has sunk into many a breast which the antidote will never reach. The object proposed to himself by the writer of the following essays, is to examine this poison, and neutralize its power. The result of his labours in this wide department of inquiry is here given to the public, and is commended especially to the intelligent *seeker after truth*, with the request that these pages be attentively perused, and the facts and reasonings, and authorities herein adduced, be *impartially weighed*. Truth is the sole object aimed at by the writer, and if by the reader the *truth* be sought, the result is not doubtful.

The Bible has successfully sustained too many assaults, from almost every quarter, and from opponents furnished with every

degree of talent, and every variety of learning, for its friends to feel any solicitude as to the final issue now.

Troops of assailants in the last century, including every grade of intellectual qualification, from Paine, Volney, Voltaire, to Hobbs, Bolingbroke, Hume, and Gibbon, and a host of continental writers, tried the temper of their weapons against the citadel of revealed truth, and a host of defenders, as Campbell, Erskine, West, Butler, Paley, &c. arose to shew how strong are the bulwarks, how impregnable the defences of that glorious citadel.

The grounds of assault are now changed, and critical ingenuity questions the genuineness of the sacred books, and scientific discovery is arrayed in opposition to the Bible-recorded facts, and archæological research is assumed to furnish proof conclusive, that the early history of the Bible is radically defective. The coarse abuse of Paine is rejected, the sneering insinuations of Gibbon are silenced, the subtle sophistry of Hume is abandoned; but we are told of the facts of geology, of the wonderful revealments in the heavenly expanse, of the demonstrated verities of physiological science, and of anatomical investigation,—we are told of the authenticated records of India and of China, running back many ages beyond any probable date of Noah's flood,—and we are told of the certain results of the discoveries of Lepsius in Egypt, as all uniting their evidence to confute Moses, and to throw utter discredit on the historic portion of the Pentateuch.

But to use the language of the profound Butler (see his *Analogy*, part 2, ch. 8), “the truth of our religion, like the truth of all common matters, is to be judged of by all the evidence taken together. And unless the whole series of things which may be alleged in the argument, and every particular thing in it, can reasonably be supposed to have been by accident, then is the truth of it proved. It is obvious how much advantage the nature of this evidence gives to those who attack Christianity, especially in conversation. For it is easy to shew, in a short and lively manner, that such and such things in the Bible are liable to objection;

but it is impossible to shew, in like manner, the united force of the whole argument in one view."

"Most absurdly premature it is, then" (says a judicious writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for Oct. 1849, p. 182), "to raise a pæan over the fall of Christianity, or of any one of its essential doctrines, upon every new attack upon it, when it has already withstood so many, from the time of Julian to Bolingbroke, and from Bolingbroke to Strauss."

"The only question fairly at issue must ever be—whether the general evidence for the Bible will overbear the difficulties which we cannot separate from its truths—if it will not, we must reject it wholly; if it will, we must receive it wholly: there is plainly no middle ground between absolute infidelity and absolute belief." (Id. p. 182.)

True, there are still difficulties, and some of them of grave import, attending the reception of the entire volume of revelation; but the question always recurs—Do these difficulties overbalance the mass of evidence in its favour? An intelligent and candid inquirer must answer unhesitatingly—Assuredly they do not, *the evidence in favour of the divine origin of the Bible preponderates decidedly and vastly*. "Nor must we overlook the fact, that these difficulties are susceptible of *indefinite alleviation as time rolls on*." The believer in the plenary inspiration of all the canonical books of the Old Testament and of the New (Genesis included) may wait with calmness the progress of events, "assured that, as in so many past instances of *premature triumph* on the part of the deriders of such inspiration, the very ground which these deniers now occupy will one day be his own, and the very discoveries, apparently hostile, of science, of philosophy, and of archæology, will be ultimately found elements of the strength of his cause." (Id. p. 184-187). Revelation, therefore, has nothing to fear but much to hope from the labours of the learned, and the discoveries of science.

Advances in science may enable us the better to understand and the more correctly to interpret the sacred volume, but shake our confidence in it *never*.

Present me to-morrow with some discovery of undeniable facts that seem to be really and directly hostile to some statements found in the Bible, and I will still say—" *The facts I admit, and the statements of the Bible I still believe. There is, I confess, an apparent contrariety. In the present state of our knowledge I see not how to reconcile the two. But wait. Time and advancing knowledge will yet bring to light other truths which shall yet shew the perfect consistency of what, at present, seem to be irreconcilably contradictory positions.* Either the alleged facts are misapprehended and misapplied,¹ as in the layers of alternating beds of lava with superincumbent soil, noticed by Brydone in Sicily, or we misinterpret the statements of the Scripture; and substitute our inferences for its actual teachings, as did the ecclesiastics of former days, who condemned as heretical the doctrine of

¹ A singular illustration of this was furnished by the pæans of triumph with which all Europe resounded about thirty years since over the mysterious paintings found on the ceiling of a temple at Denderah, in Upper Egypt. These paintings were apparently astronomical, and are still known as the Zodiacs of Denderah. (See in *Egypte*, by Champollion Figeac, plate 11, and p. 107-110; also *Monumens de l'Égypte et de Nubie*, Champollion, vol. iv. of plates and plate 304, *bis et ter.* See also Bioti, *Recherches*, &c.)

These paintings, it was at first taken for granted, represented the state of the heavens at the time the temple was built. The most extravagant ideas of the antiquity of these pictorial monuments were advanced; some pronounced them 3000, some 4000, and others even 7000 years old.

Somewhat similar representations were found delineated in two temples at Esneh. At length patient research brought to light the fact, that the smaller temple at Esneh, pronounced by some to be two or three thousand years anterior to Christ, was built, and the paintings had been executed by two Egyptians, in the tenth year of the Roman Emperor Antonius, *i. e.* A.D. 147, while a Greek inscription over the portico of the temple at Denderah declared it to have been dedicated to the safety of the Emperor *l'iberius*. "Ainsi donc," adds Champollion Figeac (*Egypte*, p. 110), "l'antiquité du pronaos d'Esneh est incontestablement fixée: sa construction ne remonte pas au-delà de l'empereur Claude: ses sculptures descendent jusqu'à Caracalla, et du nombre de celles-ci est le fameux zodiaque dont on a tant parlé."

In like manner certain inscriptions discovered on a mummy at Thebes, much like the zodiac at Denderah, were found to be *astrological tables*, respecting the destiny of the person whose body the mummy was, and *not astronomical tables at all*. The parentage and name of the person were mentioned, his birth, Jan. 12, A.D. 95; his death, June 2, 106. And yet for this mummy, and the inscription thereon found, an antiquity of five or six thousand years had been claimed. Thus ended the dazzling visions of high antiquity to Egypt, and the consequent refutation of the Mosaic chronology, based on the discoveries made at Denderah, Esneh, and Thebes.

Galileo that the sun is stationary in the centre of our system, with the earth and the planets revolving round him, instead of the sun moving round the earth, which those ecclesiastics *did verily suppose* the Bible taught."

No one now dreams of objecting these facts presented in the first principles of astronomic science against the truth of the Bible on account of its phraseology, which is the current phraseology of society on these subjects, and adapted to popular comprehension. If, then, we are told that scientific discovery compels us to modify the doctrines of the Bible, we answer—This assertion contains a misrepresentation. Extending knowledge may enable us the better to *understand* the statements found in the Bible, and thus to modify our *interpretation* of its doctrines, and render us more accurate and more strictly scriptural, but the *doctrines of the Bible* still stand there unaltered as at first.

There is, therefore, no manner of weight attending the charge as thus put forth by a living writer. (See *Two Lectures, &c.* by Dr J. C. N. p. 7.) "*There is unceasing change in religious doctrines; what are regarded in one age as essential parts of our Bible, are in another repudiated as spurious, and one reading after another recedes as science advances.*"

In a modified sense this must always be true. Increasing knowledge will enable a man to obtain a better understanding of almost any document. Critical acumen, and the collation of ancient manuscripts, old versions, and different copies, may lead to the improvement of the text by the emendation of here and there a trivial error. The various emendations so much talked of rarely, we may say *never*, touch any vital doctrine or statement. While every advance we make in acquaintance with the history, the antiquities, the writings, the works of art, and with the manners and customs of ancient nations, furnishes us the means for eliciting a fuller and clearer meaning from the language of the Bible as of any other ancient document.

In actual life this is often exemplified. You receive a communication from a distant correspondent. From the first its statements are sufficiently intelligible for all the purposes of

practical utility. But if afterwards you visit the place where the document was written, and make yourself acquainted with the various facts as to localities, persons, and prevailing customs, which were, indeed, not expressly mentioned in the document, nor even directly alluded to; but which, entirely familiar to the writer, influenced his mind, and modified his phraseology,—then the statements contained in that document you can better understand; a meaning before latent, in many a phrase therein, becomes now obvious. Yet the document itself remains as it was before, unaltered and the same; the only difference is, you are now qualified the more accurately to explain it. In our courts of law, for the right interpretation given to testamentary documents, the importance of a thorough knowledge of the opinions, circumstances, and habits of the testator, is fully appreciated; and every scholar is aware of the absolute necessity for a knowledge of ancient customs and ancient localities, to a due understanding of the ancient classical writings.

The fact, then, that an ancient document conveys different ideas to the man whose knowledge is enlarged, various and accurate, from those which one less accomplished glean from it, is evidence rather of its genuineness than otherwise.

So we may aver, that what little light modern science throws upon this subject, rather tends to confirm than to detract from the authority of the sacred narrative.

However superior to us the ancient Egyptians may have been in architecture, in some branches of mechanics and of the fine arts, yet we have no reason to imagine that they, or that Moses himself, could have had the remotest idea of the great truths of geology, or of those embraced in other branches of modern science.

The fact, then, that in recording with unprecedented brevity the circumstances attending the creation of man, and the preparation of this earth to become the place of man's abode, Moses has so expressed himself, that, as science extends her researches and multiplies her discoveries, his ancient record, so far from offering absurdities and contradictions, becomes only the plainer, the more intelligible, and the more evidently probable, can be ae-

counted for on no other ground than that Moses was inspired by the all-wise Maker of the world to write his history in the words of *immutable truth*. Modern science shews, conclusively, that the opening part, at least, of the Book of Genesis, must have been the dictate of *unerring wisdom*.

Plainly, now, if the Bible be given by inspiration from God, we must receive its teachings just as they are given to us. This the rationalistic critics of Germany do not. "So long as the canonicity of any of the records of Scripture, or any portion of them, or so long as the true interpretation of them is in dispute, we may fairly doubt; but, that point once decided by honest criticism, to say we receive such and such portions on account of the weight of the general evidence, and yet reject other portions, *though sustained by the same evidence*, because we think there is something unreasonable, or revolting in their substance, is plainly to accept evidence only *where it pleases us*, and to reject it where it pleases us not."—*Edin. Rev.* Oct. 1849, p. 182.

It is then my sincere and deliberate conviction, that the authority of any one book in the Bible being once admitted, after a careful examination of its claims to inspiration, then, forthwith, and unconditionally, we are bound to surrender our judgment to its teachings.

This is demanded alike by common honesty, sound sense, and true philosophy. In reference to the Bible claiming, as it does, to be a revelation from God, there is, and there can be no middle ground, between absolute infidelity and absolute belief.

And yet the learned rationalistic expositors of the Bible that have appeared in Germany, aim to hold this middle ground. Though called theologians, they treat the Bible just as they would any of the profane classics, deny all miracles, and explain away all the supernatural events therein recorded, by the agency of natural causes. As their writings are often referred to, and their opinions quoted as authoritative, and absolutely decisive, by many of the modern assailants of the Bible, it may be not inappropriate to give here a brief sketch of the opinions and the works of the chief among these German rationalistic expositors of

the Bible. Thus, it has been recently proclaimed to the American public, that "it is in Germany that philosophy, archæology, and all those studies which form the groundwork of biblical criticism, have been most advanced; and this is the fatherland of Luther, Gesenius, Ewald, Eichhorn, Hautman, Gabler, the Rosenmüllers, De Wette, Strauss, and other commentators, who have no equals in England or America. It is men of this stamp, and such men as Channing, Norton, Parker, Palfrey, &c., of New England, *who alone possess the knowledge requisite for deciding such questions*, that dare to teach that the Bible manuscripts have not come down to us untarnished by human hands; and that *the Pentateuch is an anonymous production, of unknown origin, compiled many centuries after the time of Moses, and consequently of no authority in settling questions of science.*" (See *Two Lectures, &c.* p. 18.)

Who, then are these men, Eichhorn, De Wette, Strauss, &c. &c. thus recommended as the only competent judges, the only trustworthy expositors of holy writ?

They are, for the most part, German writers, whose works profess to be introductory to, or expository of the sacred Scriptures, or some portions of them.

Johannes G. Eichhorn was born about the middle of the last century, and, by his numerous writings, he obtained great celebrity as an Oriental scholar, a historian, and a biblical critic. He was professor in the university of Jena, and afterwards in that of Gottingen. His "Introduction to the Old and the New Testament" is replete with the fruits of learned research, and is still valuable. It has gone through several editions. But, learned though he was, and acute in his criticisms, Eichhorn was a decided rationalist. Yet still Eichhorn emphatically maintained the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, Genesis included.

Dr Strauss, the latest of these writers, and still living, blames Eichhorn, in that he but half adopted the rationalistic view; since he found no difficulty in admitting suppositions which, in Dr Strauss's esteem, are most unnatural, as, *e. g.* that "the Pentateuch was written during the passage through the wilder-

ness," *i. e.* it was written by Moses. And certainly, if written by Moses, it must have been written during the passage through the wilderness, since it records the events which occurred before, and during that passage; and since, also, when Israel crossed the Jordan, and entered Canaan, Moses was dead. See Strauss's Introduction to his "*Life of Jesus*," vol. i. p. 20.

Strauss is certainly a competent judge of the sentiments of his distinguished countrymen, and predecessors in biblical criticism. He thus writes of Eichhorn, of Dr Paulus, De Wette, &c. See the "*Introduction*," p. 15, &c. &c.

"Eichhorn, in his critical examination of the Fragments,¹ agrees with the Fragmentists in refusing to recognise an immediate divine agency, at all events in the narratives of early date. The mythological researches of a Heyne had so far enlarged the circle of vision as to lead Eichhorn to perceive that '*divine interpositions must be alike admitted, or alike denied, in the primitive histories of all people.*' It was the practice of all nations,—of the Grecians as well as the Orientals,—to refer every unexpected or inexplicable occurrence immediately to the Deity. The sages of antiquity lived in continual communion with superior intelligences.

"Whilst these representations (such as Eichhorn's statement of the matter) are always, in reference to the Hebrew records, understood verbally and literally, it has hitherto been customary to explain similar representations in the pagan histories, by presupposing either deception and gross falsehood, or the misinterpretation and corruption of tradition. But Eichhorn thinks *justice evidently requires that Hebrew and pagan history should be treated in the same way*, so that intercourse with celestial beings, during a state of infancy, must either be accorded to *all nations*, pagan and Hebrew, or equally denied to all."

¹ These are a collection of Essays published in Germany by Sessung in 1774, presenting the grossest Deistical arguments against revealed religion, against the books of the Old and the New Testament, denouncing the men honoured in Scripture as base and unworthy, denouncing the doctrines and the laws laid down in Scripture as barbarous and unworthy of God, and denouncing the miracles as absurd and incredible.

Now surely this is sufficiently explicit. The learned Eichhorn, a renowned biblical critic, too, hesitates not to put the supernatural part of the Mosaic history on precisely the same footing as the pagan mythological fables. On p. 17, Dr Strauss thus proceeds : " Eichhorn is of opinion that no objection can be urged against the attempt to resolve all the Mosaic narratives into natural occurrences : " he " agreed with the Naturalists in divesting the biblical narratives of *all their immediately divine contents*, but he rejects the conclusion that Moses was an impostor, pronouncing it over-hasty and unjust."

In conformity with these principles, Eichhorn sought to explain *naturally* the histories of Noah, Abraham, Moses, &c. Viewed in the light of that age, the appointment of Moses to be the leader of the Israelites was nothing more than the long-cherished project of the patriot to emancipate his people ; which, when presented before his mind with more than usual vividness *in his dreams*, was *by him believed to be a divine inspiration*.

The flames and smoke which ascended from Mount Sinai at the giving of the law, were merely a fire which Moses kindled in order to make a deeper impression upon the imagination of the people, together with an accidental thunder-storm, which arose at that particular moment. The shining of his countenance was the natural effect of his being overheated ; but it was supposed to be a divine manifestation, not only by the people, but by Moses himself, he being ignorant of the true cause.

In his application of this mode of interpretation to the New Testament, Eichhorn was more reserved. Indeed, it was only to a few of the narratives in the Acts of the Apostles, such as the miracle of the day of Pentecost, the conversion of the Apostle Paul, and the many apparitions of angels, that he allowed himself to apply it. Here, too, he refers the *supernatural* to the figurative language of the Bible, in which, for example, " a happy accident is called a protecting angel, a joyous thought, the salutation of an angel, and a peaceful state of mind, a comforting angel."

Such is the spirit pervading the hermeneutics of Eichhorn.

“But,” continues Dr Strauss, “it was Dr Paulus who, by his commentary on the Gospels in 1800, first acquired the full reputation of a Christian Evemerus.¹ In the introduction to this work, Paulus states it to be the primary requisite to a biblical critic to be able to distinguish between what is *fact* and what is opinion. That which has been actually experienced internally or externally, by the participants in an event, he calls *fact*. The interpretation of an event, the supposed causes to which it is referred by the participants, or by the narrators, he calls *opinion*. But, according to Dr Paulus, these two elements became so easily blended and confounded in the minds both of the original sharers in an event, and of the subsequent relators and historians, that fact and opinion lose their distinctions; so that the one and the other are believed and recorded with equal confidence in their historical truth. This intermixture is particularly apparent in the books of the New Testament. In his commentary, and also in his later work, ‘The Life of Jesus,’ Dr Paulus firmly maintains the historical truth of the Gospel narratives, and he aims to weave them into one consecutive chronologically arranged detail of facts; but *he explains away everything of immediate divine agency, and he denies all supernatural intervention*. Jesus, to him, is not the ‘Son of God,’ in the sense of the Church, but a wise and virtuous human being; and the effects he produced *are not miracles*, but acts, sometimes of benevolence and friendship, sometimes of medical skill, and sometimes also the results of accident and good fortune.” (Id. pp. 18, 19.)

Eichhorn agrees with Paulus and others in considering *the miraculous* in the sacred history as a *drapery*, which needs only to be drawn aside in order to disclose the pure historic form.

De Wette also, who was the most distinguished of all the so-

¹ So designated from a learned writer, Evemerus, who proposed a two-fold method of explaining the ancient pagan mythology, representing the deities of the popular worship as good and benevolent men, the lawgivers, and just rulers of early times, whom popular gratitude had deified: or, on the other hand, as artful impostors and cruel tyrants, who had successfully imposed on popular credulity, to subject the masses to their control.

called liberal theologians of Germany, rejects everything supernatural in the sacred books. He declares that *common sense decides a miracle to be impossible.*

The rationalistic or natural mode of interpretation employed by Eichhorn and Paulus, necessarily supposes a basis of historic truth in the narrative, and that the records containing the narrative must have originated at or near the time when the events occur, and have originated from the testimony of eye and ear witnesses. Hence Eichhorn admits the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

If these records be of later origin, and based on less original reports, what security is there that what is taken for matter of fact, does not belong to mere opinion or tradition ?

The transition from the rationalistic to the mythical interpretation, is natural and easy. Semler had spoken of "*Jewish mythology*, and had called the histories of Samson and of Esther *mythi.*"

Gabler, Schelling, and others, would interpret sacred history, no less than profane, on the mythical principle, according to the axioms laid down by Hoeyne. *A mythis, omnis primorum hominum cum historia, tum philosophia, procedit.* In 1820, Bauer published what he called a "*Hebrew Mythology of the Old and New Testament.*" The earliest records of all nations are *mythical*, and why should those of the Hebrews be the sole exception ?

By this writer (Bauer), a narrative is deemed mythical, 1st, When it proceeds from an age in which were no written records, but events were transmitted by *tradition.*

2d, When it presents, as historical, accounts of events which were beyond the reach of experience ; as, *e. g.* occurrences connected with the spiritual world : or,

3d, When it deals in the marvellous, and is couched in symbolical language. Many such narratives occur in the Bible.

Wegscheider (another distinguished liberal critic), declared it impossible to rescue the Bible from the reproaches and scoffs of its enemies, except by the acknowledgment of *mythi* in the

sacred writings, and the separation of their inherent meaning from their unhistoric form.

Vater, another celebrated biblical expositor, boldly declared that the peculiar character of the narratives in the Pentateuch cannot be truly comprehended, unless we concede that they are *not* the production of an *eye-witness*, but are a series of transmitted traditions.

But De Wette went still further than Vater, and advocated the mythical interpretation of a large proportion of the *Old Testament* histories. *De Wette lays down a principle which effectually refutes the rationalistic mode of interpretation.* It is this. "The only means of acquaintance with a history, is the narrative which we possess concerning it; and *beyond that narrative, the historian or the interpreter cannot go.* In these Bible records, the narrative reports to us only a supernatural course of events, which we must either receive or reject. If we reject the narrative, we know nothing at all about the event; and we are not justified in allowing ourselves to *invent* a natural course of events of which the narrative is totally silent."

In this position De Wette was undoubtedly right, and the rigid application of this principle wholly annihilates most of the so-called psychological interpretations of events related in the Gospel histories, as even Eichhorn saw and admitted. For example, the Naturalist denies God's covenant with Abraham as a historic fact, but still, he maintains, the narrative had a historical basis: as, *e. g.* "Though no objective divine communication took place, still the occurrence had a subjective reality in Abraham's mind, in a dream, or in a waking vision. In other words, a natural thought was awakened in Abraham's bosom, which, in the spirit of the age, he referred to God."

To this point of view, taken by the rationalist, De Wette very shrewdly and happily replies, by asking "How he knows that such thoughts arose in Abraham's mind? The narrative refers them to God; and if we reject the narrative, we know nothing at all about these thoughts of Abraham, and consequently cannot know that they had arisen in him naturally." According to

general experience such hopes as are described in this covenant, viz. that he should become the father of a mighty nation, which should possess the land of Canaan, could *not* have sprung up naturally in Abraham's mind. But, adds De Wette, it is quite *natural* that the Israelites, when they had become a numerous people in possession of that land, "*should invent the covenant, in order to render their ancestor illustrious.*" Thus, adds Dr Strauss, "the natural explanation, by its own unnaturalness, ever brings us back to the mythical."

We plain American Christians may add, that the natural interpretation by its unnaturalness, and the mythical by its absurdity, in some instances, and by its daring impiety in others, both combine to drive us back to the *supernatural*—to the plain old-fashioned interpretation, by reference to miraculous intervention. On that ground, and on that only, all becomes plain, consistent, and intelligible. By this mythical interpretation of Bible narratives you may, indeed, get rid of all chronological difficulties, and of troublesome discrepancies; but you are compelled to deny the genuineness of the books, and you destroy their authenticity. Thus De Wette, denying the possibility of miracles and of prophecy, maintains the modern origin of the Pentateuch, and especially of the Book of Genesis, from the miraculous nature of the events therein recorded. He thus reasons: Since they record supernatural events, these narratives must be myths. But to be myths, these narratives must have originated in reports that arose long subsequent to the times to which they refer. His words are: "Such accounts can only owe their origin to *popular report*, which must have been of very long standing, to have become exaggerated to the degree in which it is given in this book."

Dr Strauss himself, who is by some extolled as a pre-eminently able and sound biblical expositor, carries out this principle of mythical interpretation, with unsparing hand, and applies it equally to the New Testament and to the Old.

In the Introduction to his celebrated "*Life of Jesus*," Strauss says (vol. i. p. 64), "The fact is, the pure historic idea was never developed among the Hebrews, during the whole of their political

existence." He adds, "Indeed, no just notion of the true nature of history is possible, without a perception of the inviolability of the chain of finite causes, and of the impossibility of miracles."—Again, p. 74, vol. i. he says, "The result, however surprising, of a general examination of the biblical history is, that the Hebrew and Christian religions, like all others, have their myths."

Still further to illustrate the views of this writer, notice the criterion he lays down, pp. 87, 88, by which to distinguish what he calls the *negative phrase* of myth in the Gospel history, *i. e.* fable, or legend, which is not historically true. Thus, "when the narrative is irreconcilable with the known and universal laws which govern the course of events. When, therefore, we meet with an account of certain phenomena or events, of which it is either expressly stated or implied that they were produced immediately by God himself (such as divine apparitions, voices from heaven, and the like), or by human beings possessed of supernatural powers (miracles, prophecies, &c.), such an account is *so far* to be considered *not historical*."

So then, if Dr Strauss is to be our guide in the interpretation of the Bible, the covenant with Abraham—the Exodus of Israel from Egypt—and the history of Israel's wandering in the desert;—the Gospel account of the annunciation, by an angel, to the blessed Virgin—that of the miraculous conception of Christ;—the whole series of miracles ascribed to Christ, and even his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension afterwards, in bodily form, up to heaven, are all to be regarded as myths, as mere fables and fictions, that have no foundation in truth. These narratives are all, in Dr Strauss's view, utterly destitute of historic truth.

"And inasmuch," continues he, "as in general the intermingling of the spiritual world with the human, is found only in unauthentic records, and is irreconcilable with all just conceptions; so narratives of angels and of devils, of their appearing in human shape, and interfering with human concerns, *cannot possibly be received as historical*."

Of course this critical axiom condemns as utterly fabulous the history of the deliverance of the three Israelites from Nebuchad-

nezzar's fiery furnace, the deliverance of Daniel in the lion's den. It repudiates also the vision of Zacharias in the temple, and his dumbness till after the birth of the Baptist. It repudiates the history of the temptation of Christ, his agony in the garden of Gethsemane, and the appearance of angels at his tomb on the morning of the resurrection, and at his subsequent ascension—so wide-sweeping is the operation of this one rule. Accordingly when, in the body of his work, Strauss sets himself to expound the history of Christ's nativity, he denies the appearance of an angel to Mary, he denies the miraculous conception of Christ, and he represents Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, born as any other son, born lawfully of his parents. Dr Strauss boldly denies that the Gospel histories are the production of eye-witnesses, or of contemporary writers at all.

On p. 56 of vol. i. he says :—" This alleged ocular testimony, or proximity in point of time, of the sacred historians, to the events recorded, is *mere assumption*; an assumption originating in the titles which biblical books bear in our canon." Again, p. 68, he says : " The external testimony respecting the composition of our Gospels, so far from forcing upon us the conclusion that they proceeded from eye-witnesses or well-informed contemporaries, leaves the decision to be determined wholly by internal grounds of evidence, *i. e.* by the nature of the Gospel narratives themselves." Accordingly, he thus concludes his examination of the annunciation and birth of John the Baptist, as given by Luke : " We stand here upon purely mythical poetical ground ; the only historical reality which we can hold fast, as positive matter of fact, being this— the impression made by John the Baptist, in virtue of his ministry and his relation to Jesus, was so powerful as to lead to the *subsequent glorification of his birth*, in connection with the birth of the Messiah in the Christian legend." (Vol. i. p. 121.)

In vol. i. p. 193, Strauss remarks :—" We have no ground for denying that the *mother of Jesus bore her husband several other children besides Jesus, younger, and perhaps also older than Jesus* ; because the representation in the New Testament that *Jesus was the first-born son, may belong no less to the myths*

than the representations given by the early Fathers, that Jesus was an only son."

Eichhorn had previously avowed the opinion that our four Gospels, in their present form, were not in use, and were not known till the end of the second century. Previous to that time, it is supposed that other gospels were in circulation, allied to those we possess, but not the same. This is substantially the opinion maintained on this subject by Strauss. (See pp. 62, 63.)

For the miraculous events recorded in the Gospel biographies of Jesus, Strauss thus attempts to account:—"The expectation of a Messiah had grown up among the Israelitish people long before the time of Jesus, and just then it had ripened to full maturity." (Vol. i. p. 80.) Again, p. 81, we read:—"Believing that Moses and all the prophets had prophesied of the Messiah (see John v. 46; Luke iv. 21; xxiv. 27), it was natural for the Jews, with their allegorizing tendency, to consider their actions and destiny (*i. e.* those of the prophets) as types of the Messiah, so as to take their sayings for predictions. In general, the whole Messianic age was expected to be full of signs and wonders. The eyes of the blind should be opened, the ears of the deaf should be unclosed, the lame should leap, and the tongue of the dumb praise God (Isa. xxxv. 5; xlii. 7; comp. xxxii. 3, 4.) These merely figurative expressions soon came to be understood literally (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 21, &c.); and thus the idea of the Messiah was continually filling up with details even before the appearance of Jesus. Thus many of the legends respecting him had not to be newly invented; they already existed in the popular hope of the Messiah, having been mostly derived, with various modifications, from the Old Testament; and they had merely to be transferred to Jesus, and accommodated to his character and doctrines. In no case could it be easier for the person who first added any new feature to the description of Jesus, to believe himself its genuineness, since his argument would be, *Jesus was the Messiah, therefore such and such things happened to him.*" "Besides," adds Strauss, "we must take into account the overwhelming impression which was made upon those around him by the per-

sonal character and discourse of Jesus as long as he lived among them, which did not suffer them deliberately to scrutinize and compare him with their previous standard. The belief in him as the Messiah extended to wider circles *only by slow degrees*, and even during his lifetime the people may have reported many wonderful stories about him (Matt. xiv. 2.) After his death, the belief in his resurrection, HOWEVER THAT BELIEF MAY HAVE ARISEN, afforded a more than sufficient proof of his Messiahship, so that all the other miracles in his history need not be considered as the foundation of the faith in *this*, but may rather be adduced as the *consequence* of it." (Vol. i. pp. 82, 83.)

Of all miracles, this universal infatuation of the contemporaries of Jesus, and of the men of several succeeding ages who heard of him, thus supposed by Strauss, and by him offered as the *natural* explanation of the wonders recorded in the New Testament, is the most miraculous. His contemporaries were so overwhelmed by the effect of the sayings and doings of Jesus, who was only a very good and wise man, that they could not judge soberly of him, nor of his acts. His kind deeds were magnified into wonderful miracles on every hand. Succeeding generations laboured under the same delusion, which deepened and spread; and men kept inventing new miracles and ascribed them to Jesus, and really believed they were true, though nothing of the kind had actually happened. They believed and taught that his conception was miraculous, and preceded by angelic appearances and prodigies, though he had been born just like any other child; nay, they persuaded themselves to believe finally, that after his death, Jesus had arisen and had appeared alive repeatedly to many who knew him well, though nothing of the kind had occurred to Jesus when dead more than to any other dead man. And this is rational criticism on the Gospel history! To this palpable absurdity are men driven who deny the miracles recorded in holy writ. Their theory of solution is far more incredible than are all the miracles of the New Testament. Put out of view the absurdities into which it drives him, and we must admit that this system of Dr Strauss is a very

convenient, one truly. It rests wholly on his assumed position—his great axiom—the chain of natural events is immutable. *The sequence of nature's laws is invariable.*

A miracle is impossible, prophecy is impossible, therefore all accounts detailing miracles are not true, they are but fables. Such fables are the growth of long time in rude ages, therefore the Pentateuch must have been a collection of traditions put together many ages after the occurrence of the wonderful events which they so exaggerate; consequently the Pentateuch cannot be the work of Moses. Moreover, the Gospel histories also being full of marvels, could not have been the production of eye-witnesses, as is vulgarly believed. The Jewish expectation of a Messiah prepared the way for something extraordinary and wonderful. Jesus of Galilee was no ordinary man. His life and teachings made a deep impression upon the public mind. The idea that he was the long looked-for Messiah was suggested; the notion took, and spread rapidly and widely.

All the long-cherished national ideas about the Messiah were soon associated with the name of Jesus. Popular rumours spread the idea and extended the belief. Various accounts of the rumoured wonders were written by different unknown individuals, and were widely circulated. These narratives were very soon ascribed to the immediate followers of Jesus, his apostles, as they were designated, as the authors of them; and at length the four Gospels, as we now have them, were the result. And this miserable system is put forth to the world as criticism, learned criticism! It is put forth by men celebrated for profound erudition and critical acumen; men, too, who are called theologians and Christian divines! But in reality, this system utterly repudiates the authority of the documents it professedly expounds.

This entire system of exposition is but a learned infidelity; it rests upon a mere dogmatic assumption, viz. nothing is credible or possible which does not come within the range of our personal experience or personal observation. The argument amounts to just this: "Because we have never seen the regular chain of secondary causes and their effects disturbed by single arbitrary

acts of interposition by the one absolute Cause, therefore such disturbance never did take place, never could take place; it is impossible, and no evidence can prove that it has occurred.

If the fundamental principle on which Strauss and his co-labourers proceed in their criticisms be correct, then the African chieftain who scornfully rejected as absurd and incredible the accounts furnished him by his foreign visitors of countries where water becomes at times hard and solid as the rocks, was in the right; then, too, the wonderful convulsions of the surface of this planet of ours, as taught by geologists, are incredible, and their occurrence must be deemed impossible. These learned men, in presenting themselves as interpreters of the sacred books, do straightway assume the character of judges; and instead of confining themselves to the proper business of exposition, *i. e.* explaining what those books really do teach, they dogmatically declare, that so and so these books cannot teach, because so to teach were absurd; and therefore these books do not teach so.

Whatever else it may be, this is not a sobor criticism. The business of a critic is to expound the true import of a document just as it stands, not to prescribe what its meaning ought to be, or what doctrines it ought to contain. And especially in interpreting a book claiming to be divinely inspired, there is no middle ground between absolute infidelity and absolute belief.

The design of the following pages is to vindicate the authority of the sacred books, and more especially of the books of Moses, against the sophistry of the rationalists, the cavils of infidelity, against the objections urged on various scientific grounds, and against the difficulties presented in the alleged results of modern research and recent discovery among the archives of the East and the monumental records of Egypt. May the God of truth accept this humble tribute to the value of His holy book, and make it useful to many a young inquirer!

*David Baran, M.A. -
College Row, Calcutta.*

LECTURE I.

THE CHARACTER OF MOSES AS A SCHOLAR AND A STATESMAN.

THE result of the latest researches among the monuments of Egypt, compared with the data furnished in the most carefully revised chronological tables, would lead us to conclude that Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver and leader, was born in the sixteenth, or early in the fifteenth century before the Christian era; and during the early period of the eighteenth dynasty of Egypt.—
• Dr Nolan places the Exodus in the time of Thothmes IV. B.C. 1492.

Wilkinson places the birth of Moses B.C. 1571, under Amosis Chebron, the first King of the eighteenth dynasty.

The Exodus he places under Thummosis, or Tothmosis, or Thothmes III., the sixth King of the eighteenth dynasty, B.C. 1491.

Osburn seems to place the birth of Moses in B.C. 1847, under Amosis, the first King of the eighteenth dynasty.

But Champollion Figeac places the Exodus at B.C. 1528. (See Egypte, p. 340.)

• Moses was, unquestionably, long anterior to all the records of authentic history, saving only the books furnished by his own pen. The reputed annals of China, of India, and of Chaldæa, are, demonstrably, of much later origin. Some few hieroglyphic inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt, may possibly antedate him; though even this is not beyond the reach of doubt. Certain it is that society was yet in its infancy—saving only in Egypt,—and possibly in the far East; Homer, the father of Grecian song, was long, long posterior; and even the Trojan wars, of which Homer sung, occurred only in the time of Solomon, many centuries after Moses. The Grecian, the Persian, and even the Chaldæan empires, whose history is, to us, that of the remotest antiquity, sprang into

being many ages after Moses lay sleeping in the dust. The countries where those nations afterwards flourished, and where the kingdoms of modern times afterwards arose, were either a wilderness, yet unreclaimed from their original solitude, or, at best, the seat of hordes of wandering barbarians.

Egypt was, indeed, already occupied by a people numerous and powerful,—a people subjected to a government well organized and vigorously administered; a people, too, far advanced in knowledge of the arts and sciences, as the still extant monuments of their greatness demonstrate. But the Egyptians stood alone. The territories adjacent seem to have been occupied—as Palestine unquestionably was—by numerous petty tribes, mutually jealous of, and hostile towards, one another; and engaging in frequent bloody wars. In such a state of society, civilization cannot advance; men remain, for long, rude, unpolished and ignorant; and it is passing strange, that in such a state of things, such a man as Moses should have arisen, and such writings as those constituting the Pentateuch, should have been produced.

Therefore, whether we consider the age in which he lived,—the condition of society around him,—the disposition of the people with whom he had to do,—the difficulties with which he had to contend, or the triumphs he achieved in arms, in arts and in literature; in ethics, in legislation, and in government; Moses must be pronounced the most extraordinary man that ever lived.

Of the race of Abraham, in the line of Levi the son of Jacob, Moses first saw the light in Egypt, where his countrymen had resided for several generations, and were now suffering cruel oppression from the powerful Egyptian monarch. The date of the birth of Moses cannot be fixed with absolute precision; but, according to the ordinary computation, it was about A.M. 2433, or B.C. 1600; Usher makes the Exodus B.C. 1495. It was certainly during the period when the cruel policy of the Egyptian court required the destruction of all male Hebrew infants. From this fate Moses was rescued by very extraordinary means.

Maternal tenderness had secreted the child for three months, when further concealment becoming impracticable, he was placed by his mother in a kind of cradle, or basket of bulrushes, carefully prepared so as to render it impervious to water; and in this frail vessel he was left near the water's edge, on the bank of the Nile,

where he was found by Thermothis (according to Dr Nolan *Amense*), the daughter of Pharaoh. Moved by pity, and struck by his rare infant beauty, the princess rescued the foundling, adopted him for her own son, and, by a strange but happy coincidence, he was by her confided to the care of his own mother as nurse. From the manner of his preservation, he was called *Mou-sha* (Heb. *Moshee*—Moses, *i.e. drawn from water*); *Usher's Exodus*, B.C. 1491. For it is found that the Egyptian names given in the books of Moses are genuine Egyptian, as is proved from the monuments.¹

How long Moses remained in the family of his own parents we know not; but it was certainly long enough for him to become thoroughly imbued with the true national feeling of a Hebrew. At a suitable age, he was claimed by the princess, and educated with all the care due to one openly acknowledged as the adopted son of the heir to the most powerful throne in the world.

Josephus tells us, that when only four years old, Moses was presented by the princess to the reigning Pharaoh, her father, as her son and heir; and that, to gratify his daughter, the monarch took the child in his arms, and placed the royal crown on his head; but that he cast it indignantly to the ground, and trampled upon it. Whereupon several of Pharaoh's most revered counsellors advised the immediate destruction of the child, as of one certain, should he live, to bring dire calamities on the kingdom, the emblem of whose sovereignty he thus early treated with indignity. This cruel policy Providence suffered not to be carried into effect.

His position in the court of Pharaoh must have insured to him the best possible education; and as the royal family of Egypt were connected with the priesthood (the monarch himself being often of the sacerdotal order), Moses must have had access to all the varied stores of knowledge, in history, natural science, philosophy, legislation and government,—to all the monuments of their antiquity, and the secrets of their religion, for which that ancient people were distinguished. And thus it is recorded,—“*Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.*”

¹ The Hebrew rabbins relate wonderful stories of the infancy of Moses. Among others, they aver that the princess was a leper; that the mere touch of the ark containing the infant cured her, and hence her determination to adopt the child it contained.

An apt scholar he was unquestionably, for the writings he has left behind him, and the records of his vast achievements, shew that he far transcended his instructors in true wisdom, and in sober practical learning.

In the court of Pharaoh Moses held his distinguished position till he had reached full maturity. About the age of forty, Joseph assures us, he headed the Egyptian armies in an expedition into Ethiopia, where he subdued the city Saba; he also won the affections of Tharbis, the princess of the people he had vanquished, and married her. If this tradition be true, we know not that he had any issue by this marriage.

It must have been after his return from this successful military expedition that the circumstance occurred, which, by reviving an instinctive and indomitable love for his own peculiar and oppressed race, gave a new and unexpected turn to the current of his life, and altered the entire complexion of his destiny.

Distinguished in rank, high in favour at court, and honoured for his brilliant success in arms, Moses could not forget that he was of the stock of Abraham, and that the oppressed Hebrews whom he beheld toiling in cruel bondage were his brethren.

The merest accident, seemingly, roused these latent feelings into sudden and decisive action. Going out one day, for the express purpose of observing the condition of his countrymen, his indignation was aroused by the spectacle of an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew. Glancing hastily around to assure himself that he was not observed, he vindicated his Hebrew brother, by killing the Egyptian on the spot. The body he hid in the sand. Attempting, on another occasion, soon after, to reconcile two Hebrews whom he found quarrelling, his interference was resisted by the aggressor, accompanied by a bitter taunt against him as the killer of the Egyptian so recently. Justly concluding that the deed was known, that an investigation must take place, and punishment follow, unmitigated by royal favour—which must now be lost to him—Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, who, as he had surmised, sought to slay him. The old Jewish rabbins have here a singular story. They tell us that Moses was actually apprehended for this act, and condemned to death; but that God caused his neck suddenly to assume a preternatural hardness, so that the sword of the executioner not only left Moses uninjured, but, by its rebound,

killed the executioner himself. At such fables we can only smile. Certain it is that Moses left the country, and retired to Midian, where he who had dwelt in courts, and had led powerful armies to conquest, engaged himself to Jethro, a priest of the country, in the humble capacity of herdsman, or keeper of his flocks. In this obscure retreat he remained many years, having married Zipporah, daughter of Jethro, by whom he had two sons. This entire and long-continued seclusion furnished Moses with abundant leisure for reflection on the condition and prospects of his countrymen, and for maturing plans for their relief.

Here also, as we may well suppose, he reviewed the studies of his early youth, and explored those fields of knowledge, to reap which those studies had qualified him. Here, doubtless, he rendered himself familiar with the traditions and the imperfect records then in existence of the history of mankind since the flood, and possibly in antediluvian times; and here, in all probability, he wrote the book of Genesis, and revised (perhaps translated) the book of Job, for the use of his countrymen. Certain it is that here he claims to have received his commission from the Almighty Jehovah, to act as his representative in the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage, and in their safe conduct to the promised land. The project of such an enterprise seems to have been brooding in his mind for many years.

The dying martyr Stephen represents Moses as entertaining this idea even at the time he killed the Egyptian, previously to his flight into Midian, "*for he supposed his brethren would have understood how God, by his hand, would deliver them.*" (Acts vii. 25.) Not improbably the supineness, the tame serf-like spirit evinced by his countrymen on that occasion, had chilled the fervour of patriotic feeling in the breast of their illustrious defender, and long suppressed the spirit of heroic daring that was glowing within him. Repressed it was, and held in check for years, but eradicated it could not be; and amid the shady retreats around Horeb, where he tended his flocks, the wrongs of his countrymen, and the means and mode of redress, were oft and deeply pondered. The season for action at length arrived. The strange phenomenon of a bush on Mount Horeb, burning apparently with brilliant blaze and intense heat, yet still unconsumed, caught his attention, and arrested his steps. A voice addressing him from the midst of the

burning bush, satisfied him that he stood in the presence of Jehovah, Abraham's God. Then and there it was that Moses received his heavenly commission, as the deliverer, the legislator, the prophet, and the leader of Israel: he was clothed with full authority, and invested with all necessary powers to achieve the magnificent enterprise. He promptly obeyed. He made immediate arrangements to pass, with his young family, into Egypt, there to enter upon the discharge of his new functions. On his journey from Midian to Egypt occurred a singular incident. By some unexplained means, probably a malignant disease, Moses was placed in eminent peril of his life. Rightly interpreting this as a proof of heaven's displeasure, for the neglect of the sacred Jewish covenant in his own family, he caused both his sons to be circumcised. The peril passed away, and he resumed his journey, with this impressive lesson, "*That no public commission, no official engagements, can lawfully be allowed to interfere with private, personal, or social duties.*" Ere he reached Egypt, Moses was joined by his brother Aaron, whom, by divine direction, he associated with him as his coadjutor and spokesman. They summoned the leading men of Israel, detailed to them their plans, and opened their commission. The hope of national deliverance was awakened, and the people agreed to submit to Moses, as the leader and the prophet, duly commissioned of Jehovah. Speedily thereafter Moses appeared at court, and obtained an audience of the reigning Pharaoh, and boldly demanded the release of the whole Hebrew people, for the avowed purpose of their passing beyond the Egyptian frontier, there to serve the God of their ancestors with rites, which, to the ox-worshipping Egyptians, would have seemed an impious abomination. This demand, earnestly made, and urged in repeated audiences before the monarch, was long and resolutely refused; until a series of prodigies, unprecedented and unparalleled in the world's history, wrung from the proud Pharaoh a reluctant consent.

The further details of the matchless career of Moses I shall not minutely pursue. They constitute the historical portion of the books of Moses, chiefly the Exodus, and are familiar to all.

Under the guidance of this illustrious leader, the whole body of the Hebrews, with their wives and their little ones, their flocks and their herds, and greatly enriched by liberal largess from their

late oppressors, left the Egyptian frontier behind them. At the shores of the Red Sea they were overtaken by the disciplined hosts of the repentant Pharaoh's armies in hot pursuit. Through the Red Sea, miraculously divided before them, Israel's bands safely passed, while the pursuing Egyptians were therein drowned beneath its returning waters. During their long sojourn of many years in the desert regions of Arabia, the Hebrews were led, directed, provided for, and protected from every foe, by the matchless skill, the sleepless vigilance, and the untiring energy of this renowned commander. He fed them with food that fell daily like the dew : he supplied them with water that gushed at his bidding from the sterile rock ; and at Sinai's rugged mountain, near which they lay encamped about a year, he delivered to them, as the immediate enactment of the mighty Jehovah, whose servant he avowed himself, that inimitable document, that matchless code of morals, *the Decalogue*, the two tables containing the Ten Commandments.

At length, when he had brought the Hebrews, after a sojourn of nearly forty years in the Arabian desert, to the borders of the promised land, this distinguished man pronounced his farewell discourse in the hearing of all the people. He delivered, in their presence, a copy of the annals he had written, and which also embodied the entire system of laws he had enacted, into the hands of the chief ecclesiastical officers, to be by them sacredly preserved in the ark, the palladium of their religion and of their national hopes. He resigned the government into the hands of Joshua, whom he had carefully trained to act as his successor ; and then this venerable prince, this matchless lawgiver, retired to die in privacy, in the presence only of the God he had so long served. At the age of 120 years, while yet "*his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated,*" Moses died, deeply lamented ; and to this day, by his whole nation, he is revered as the greatest as well as the first of their prophets, and the most distinguished man of all their race.

The character of Moses presents a brilliant assemblage of excellences, rarely found combined in any one individual.

As a man, his conduct was most exemplary. He discharged all the duties of private life with uniform propriety. As a son, a brother, a husband, and a father, his life was a pattern of propriety, and his reputation without a stain. The kind fraternal

intercourse he ever maintained with Aaron his brother, and with Miriam his sister, was every way becoming; while the respect with which he treated Jethro, the father of Zipporah his wife, and the readiness with which he adopted the discreet suggestions Jethro made respecting the appointment of subordinate judges (see Exod. xviii. 17-27), evince the beauty of reverence for virtuous age, the courtesy of the kind kinsman, and the policy of the sagacious statesman. The conduct of Moses furnishes a beautiful exemplification of that regard for the claims of age, of kindred, and of one's country, so emphatically enjoined in his writings.

He was evidently a good man and sincere. Moses was no impostor. He devoutly believed in the divine origin of the commission under which he acted, and in the truth and importance of the doctrines he inculcated. This his whole life shews. In prosecution of his extraordinary mission, he hazarded his lofty position in the Egyptian court. He vindicated his oppressed countrymen at the risk of his own life, and after he had entered on the public duties of his great enterprise, he braved every danger. He fearlessly presented himself before the powerful Pharaoh, the deadly enemy of his race; and in the presence of the scoffing court, he vindicated his own commission, the majesty of the God in whose name he acted, and the rights of the oppressed Israelites, for whom he pleaded. Neither murmurings among his own people, nor threats nor insults from the Egyptian court, could deter him, or cause him to waver for an instant. He carried his point. He led the Hebrews forth from under the yoke of Pharaoh, and saw them encamped in safety near the foot of Mount Sinai, after a series of prodigies unheard of in the history of the world till then. Of these prodigies a minute account is given in his writings. In memory of them, rites peculiar and most expressive were by him incorporated into the religious system of the Hebrews; and he appeals to their knowledge of these very events, as containing the reason for the appointment, and sufficient motives for the conscientious observance of these very rites. Imposition here would have been impracticable. Had these assertions of miracles and prodigies performed by Moses on their behalf and before their own eyes, been false, the Jews would have known it; and they never could have been induced to favour and to perpetuate the shameless lie, by observing these rites, and enjoining on their children the

sacred observance of them in all time to come. But observe them they did, with great reverence; and they have perpetuated this observance among their descendants, in every age, to the present day. The Jews, who had every advantage for ascertaining the truth in this case, firmly believed in the sincerity of Moses, and in the truth of his narration of prodigies by him performed. And to this day their descendants believe the same, and revere the memory of Moses as of a man pre-eminently *wise, sincere, and good*.

Moses was also a man of great firmness and self-control. In many ways this was shewn. It is apparent in the steadfastness with which he adhered to his one great purpose of emancipating Israel, and habituating them to the novel institutions he felt himself commissioned to establish. The frowns of power, and the clamours of the mob, were alike incapable of shaking his settled purpose, or of turning him from it for a moment.

When the people gathered together in tumultuous assemblies, loudly clamouring against his rule as unauthorized and irksome, he calmly faced the angry multitude, and reproved them for their folly, and their impious rebellion against the God he served. When he saw the multitude sunk in licentious indulgence, and thus inviting speedy destruction, Moses hesitated not to apply the severest remedies. He rallied his faithful adherents around him, and, sword in hand, he reduced the multitude to reason and submission, even though it cost the lives of thousands. It was the only price at which a return to virtue and good order could be purchased.

When, on another occasion, his integrity was called in question, and the validity of his commission, and of the priesthood he had instituted was denied, alone and unsupported he meets the tumultuous rebels, and fronting them all, he calmly appeals to heaven for the vindication of his integrity and the punishment of his assailants. Fire suddenly breaking forth and consuming the sacrilegious invaders of the priesthood, an earthquake that swallowed up Korah, and the next day's pestilence that swept through the murmuring camp, fully justified his noble self-possession, and reliance on God. It is impossible to contemplate Moses in the midst of scenes like these (and they were, alas! but too frequent), without being struck with the dignity of his character as pre-eminently *firm, calm, and self-possessed*.

As a patriot, Moses was yet more distinguished. No man that ever lived accomplished more for his countrymen, and secured less to himself. Contemplate but what Moses achieved, and at what cost to himself, and his character will stand forth beaming with the glory of the purest patriotism. Himself trained in a court, surrounded with its pleasures, and loaded with its honours, he beheld the spectacle of a people enslaved, degraded, and cruelly oppressed. Those wretched victims of a relentless policy, he could not forget were his countrymen and his brethren. Most men, in the position of Moses, would have shunned them, ashamed of his origin, and desirous to eradicate the remembrance of it from his own mind, and from the minds of the courtiers around him. But so far from this, the noble-minded Moses felt and yielded to the claims of consanguinity. He clung to his people the more tenaciously for the misery in which he saw them sunk. He identified himself with them by one daring act, as if to shew his determination to rescue them, or to perish in the attempt. The ignorance of his countrymen, their degradation of character (an inevitable fruit of long years of servitude), and their strong yearnings after the idolatrous usages and licentious pleasures prevailing around them, presented formidable difficulties. Nothing deterred at the prospect, Moses met these difficulties patiently and resolutely, and, by a discreet perseverance, he overcame them all.

The sacred functions of the priestly office he assigned to Aaron, his brother, to be perpetuated in his family; for Phineas, the son of Aaron, had shewn himself every way equal to this high dignity. His own sons Moses left in the inferior rank of Levites, subordinate to the priesthood. During his own natural life, it is true, Moses was the leader and the judge of Israel. But, after giving them a pure religion, national independence, and a government strongly imbued with a genuine democratic spirit (since the most important offices were elective), he appointed Joshua, a man unconnected with his own family, to succeed him as leader of Israel, and to settle the tribes in the promised land of Canaan. The whole life of Moses is replete with genuine patriotism—noble, pure—as that of the immortal Washington. Moses was to the oppressed Israelites what Alfred was to England; what William Tell was to the Swiss.

As a scholar and accomplished writer also, Moses still stands

pre-eminent. He was educated under all the advantages to be found at the seat of power and the fountain-head of learning in the ancient world: and it is asserted that he was "*learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.*" No ordinary commendation this, for Egypt was the cradle of ancient learning. Nor can a careful reader of the books of Moses fail to perceive from the familiar acquaintance he displays with the position, the customs, the history, and the mutual relations of the several nations around Palestine, with the origin of those nations, of the arts generally practised among them, the productions of their countries, the nature, extent, and materials of their commerce, and with the various traditions prevailing among them respecting occurrences connected with the remotest antiquity, that Moses possessed a mind active, well trained, accustomed to research, and richly stored with the fruits of research among all the various departments of human inquiry.

Even in a scientific point of view the writings of Moses are to this day invaluable. The explorations and measurements made in Egypt by the French expedition in 1820, furnish data to shew that some great convulsion must have altered the whole aspect of that country at a period not more remote than about 4000 years before Christ, which is much about the period Moses assigns to Noah's deluge; so that science herself furnishes evidence of the accuracy of the Jewish lawgiver, and of the worthlessness of the claims now so boldly advanced for an enormous antiquity to Egypt and her monuments. These monuments could not have been erected before the soil on which they stand, and from which their builders must have obtained their sustenance, was formed.¹

Moreover, in the first chapter of Genesis, Moses gives a concise history of the origin of this earth, and of its living occupants. Now a diligent comparison of the several steps in the creative process, as detailed by Moses, with the most approved theories of cosmogony now in vogue among the learned, and especially with the order which geological researches shew that the great Architect of the universe did actually observe in the production of the several occupants of our globe, from the first breaking up of chaos, has satisfied many among the learned, that however it may have been obtained by the writer, the scientific knowledge embodied in the books of Moses is so varied, so profound, and so accurate, that

¹ See M. Henri's "Egypte Pharaonique," vol. i, 40, 41.

the noblest results of modern scientific research, are only an approximation to a recovery, in our times, of scientific knowledge perfectly familiar to Moses.

The erudite and candid author of *L'Egypte Pharaonique*, remarks on this subject :—

“The cosmogony of Moses, simple, clear, and natural, is evidently the result of learned research. The author of this system, respecting the origin of the earth and the heavens, *must necessarily have devoted himself to profound meditations on the history of the globe: and it is certain that geology must, in his day, have reached an extraordinary point of perfection*, for the historian to follow, as Moses has done, step by step, all the mysteries of that creation.” Again, he writes :—

“No mortal man assisted at the work of creation: no human eye could have penetrated the mystery, and reported to us that which took place at the grand epoch of the origin of this world. And yet Moses recounts all that the hand of God wrought to form this universe: and what Moses relates, exhibits an exactitude and an accuracy so complete, that the progress which the sciences have made in our days, lends the support of their resistless testimony to each one of his narrations. So valuable are the writings of Moses as embodying the first principles of science.

“To quote the language of a distinguished French writer, who rejects the idea of inspiration :—‘The history of the creation, as given by Moses, which is the system of Egypt in the first, or learned age of its existence, can only be regarded as the result of the long-continued study of a great number of countries of different geologic formations, compared one with another, and the application of principles deduced from laborious geognostic explorations.’ It evinces, consequently, a very advanced state of the sciences, chemical, and consequently of mathematics also.” (*Henri, Egypte Pharaonique*, vol. i. pp. 155, 156.)

Another writer in the same language, remarks :—“*So many things would prove Moses to be a wise geologist of our age, if he did not learn the facts which he relates, from some other source than the study of the formation of the globe, that it is only a mind in which great frivolity of character is joined to deplorable ignorance, that can perceive any flagrant contradiction between Holy Scripture and the profane sciences.*” (*Am. Saintes' History of*

Rationalism in Germany. Eng. Transl. Lond. 1849, p. 263.) In another passage in the same work, M. Saintes remarks :—"The sciences, in our days, display in their teachings, notwithstanding the assertions to the contrary, more and more harmony with biblical facts." He here refers to the first part of Genesis, (id. p. 67.)

A mind of the highest order, then, Moses unquestionably had ; a mind well disciplined, richly cultivated, and thoroughly conversant with the profoundest philosophical views of the age : while he soared far above those views, immeasurably outstripping his contemporaries.

The simple majesty in which he presents the idea of God, the one Being uncreated and the all-powerful Creator of all things, the directness with which he states his lofty doctrines, and the perfect clearness and precision with which he lays down the several duties of morality, and that too, in an age of idolatry, superstition, and licentiousness sanctioned under the venerable name of religion, discover in the Jewish leader a mind of transcendent powers, of surpassing vigour and clearness, far-reaching in its views, and deep, penetrating, and accurate in its conclusions.

In the vast expanse of ethics and philosophy, Moses was the morning star that ushers in the day. He was the Columbus who explored unknown deeps, the revealer of the certain and the solid. What though you tell me that Moses was thus elevated in intellectual dignity and power, by the direct inspiration of God ! Admitted, freely admitted : but what then ? All minds are the product of God, all their powers and capacities, their talents, their capabilities, yea *genius itself*, are from God. Our talents for acquiring knowledge, our opportunities and facilities for gaining it, and our tact and ability for rightly using it when gained, are all the gift of God, as truly as was the supernatural knowledge of Moses. But knowledge, however gained, expands and strengthens the mind that has it. Moses had a mind pre-eminently vigorous and active, richly stored, too, with knowledge which he well knew how to use to the best advantage. That knowledge, that tact and ability were his, and not the less so because he was inspired. They appertained to his mind, they determined his character, and made him what he was, the master spirit of the age, the glory of his nation, an ornament to humanity, and a blessing to man.

As to *his writings*, Moses is distinguished for the simplicity of his diction, the clearness with which he conveys his ideas, and the purity of the style in which those ideas are clothed. Occasionally he rises to the loftiest heights of eloquence; as in the triumphant anthem sung on the destruction of the Egyptian hosts in the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 1-20), in the prophecies he attributes to Balaam, and in the beautiful description he gives of the care of Jehovah over his people, like a majestic eagle hovering over, guarding and directing her young (Deut. xxxii. 1-14).

In the *pathetic* too, the history he gives of Joseph is, to this day, unrivalled for a touching simplicity true to nature.

To the pen of Moses we may certainly ascribe the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures, *i. e.* *Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy*. Besides these books, known as the Pentateuch, the Jews generally reckon as the product of Moses eleven psalms, *i. e.* from the xc. to c.: of this, however, we have no absolute certainty.

By not a few distinguished men it has also been believed, that Moses is the author of the book of Job. The celebrated Origen, who flourished in the third century of the Christian era, maintained that Moses translated the book of Job out of Syriac, or Arabic, into Hebrew. This opinion is still held by many: nor is it altogether improbable; although there is certainly a great difference, remarked by learned men, between the style in which the book of Job, and those of the Pentateuch are written.

The author of writings such as these, which have outlived so many ages and centuries, which have come down to us through thousands of years, and which still command the veneration of the most enlightened portion of mankind, as treasuries of knowledge, and oracles of wisdom, is surely entitled to the very foremost place on the records of fame as a *scholar*, a thinker, and a writer. *He is all original, from first to last.* Before all others in time, he still stands, unsurpassed in accurate science, unequalled in simplicity, clearness, sublimity, and touching pathos. As such he is still universally admired and used.

But, *in the tumultuous scenes of public life*, as well as in private, in the camp and the field, as well as in the closet, *the conduct and the achievements of Moses, command our respect.* He was a brave warrior and a successful general no less than a

profound scholar. Like Cæsar, he could conduct an army to victory in the face of an immensely superior enemy, and then exchange the sword for the pen, and furnish interest and instruction both, in the modest narrative he wrote of deeds achieved by his own skill and prowess. Tradition represents Moses as waging successful war in Ethiopia, in command of the Egyptian armies, and acquiring distinction, power and renown, before he abandoned the court of which he was an adopted son. Of these earlier exploits, however, we have received no authentic records. But, from the hour when he stepped forth as the advocate and the leader of the Hebrews, his military talents were called into requisition, and their exertion was signally successful.

The *bare fact* that he could arouse to a sense of their wrongs a vast, but miserable horde of task-driven serfs, that he could inspire them with a desire for freedom, and keep that desire alive; *that he could* unite this undisciplined rabble in one body and keep them so; *that he could* lead them forth in safety, encumbered as they were with their women, their children, their cattle, and all their possessions, and that too in the face of a powerful monarch, their oppressor, backed as that monarch was by a numerous, disciplined, and well-appointed army, bent on arresting their departure, and riveting upon them again the yoke of bondage; *the fact* that Moses could so arrange this vast multitude embarrassed by so many encumbrances, as that, in the midst of a sterile and inhospitable desert they should move in safety, and be furnished with ample sustenance; and that this successful leadership, notwithstanding all these complicated difficulties, should be continued through the long period of forty years, until he saw them on the borders of a fertile and populous country, eager to take possession, and now fully qualified to do so, by the discipline to which they had been so long subjected, all this must ever suffice to place Moses in the first rank of military leaders. However this skill might have been obtained by him, certain it is that Moses had it: and Moses exercised it, not for the purpose of self-aggrandizement, but exclusively for the good of his nation. He used this skill for the elevation of a tumultuous rabble of slaves to the character and standing of a brave people, determined on national existence, independence and honour, and competent to win it for themselves.

We know, indeed, that throughout the whole of his splendid and trying career, God himself sustained and directed Moses; and we know, too, that God directed and sustained Cyrus, and Alexander. On the pages of history these men stand prominent, as great military leaders. Viewing all the circumstances of the case, Moses is yet more deserving of honour, as the most daring, skilful, and successful general of the age in which he lived.

It would be strange if, amid the multiplicity of monuments commemorative of the exploits of Pharaohs and of Satraps, vastly his inferiors in daring and in success, that no monument proclaiming the prowess of Moses should have survived. Already the rocks of Sinai have found a voice, attesting, somewhat hesitatingly as yet, it may be, yet still attesting the prodigies wrought for Israel in the deserts of Arabia. And if the tradition of the earlier exploits of Moses in his Ethiopian campaigns should be authentic, it were no wonder if yet, when the mists of obscurity that still enshroud these Nile-valley monuments, shall have been more fully dispersed, it shall be found that among those remote and most ancient monuments in Nubia and Ethiopia, appear the record of military conquests achieved by Moses for the Egyptian crown,—achievements, the glory of which could not be tarnished, nor the proud recollection of them be willingly obliterated among the Egyptians, even though the champion who had gleaned those honours for Egypt, had subsequently abandoned the court and the country, and had, by a series of exploits not less splendid, founded a rival kingdom in Asia. Among the monuments of the several Rameses,¹ it is at least possible that the Ethiopian conquests of Moses may yet be found commemorated. Ra, is a prefix to many Egyptian names, of import equivalent to that of our phrase, the royal; and of these several Rameses, may not some one yet prove the designation of the Hebrew-born, adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter,—the conqueror of Saba and Ethiopia,—the accepted

¹ Ramses is explained as meaning begotten of Rà, or of Phù, the "offspring of the Sun," or of heaven. But since in Egyptian, the vowels are often, indeed generally omitted, just as in Hebrew, without the points, Ramses, i. e. Ra-meses, presents the very name Moses, with the prefix Ra, indicating royalty.

As to the distinguished position held by Moses, see the testimony of ancient writers, as adduced by Mons. Champollion Figeac, in his *Egypte, (l'Univers Pittoresque)*, pp. 1, 122.

spouse of Ethiopia's queen, Tharbis; and designated both from his adoption at the court of Pharaoh, and from his royal nuptials in Ethiopia,—*Ra-Meses*,—the royal Moses? ¹

Not to dwell on this conjecture, certain it is, that we can add,—*as a statesman, Moses ranks among the greatest.* He found his people oppressed, enslaved, and consequently degraded. For helpless subjection to the power of others, speedily deteriorates the whole man, and self-reliance dies. A generation brought up in slavery, are unfitted for freedom; to them, independence would be fraught with curses as much as with blessings. Their children may be trained to a nobler destiny, but the race that has itself grown up in slavery, can be elevated, if at all, only by slow degrees. The experience of centuries, and that in all countries, has taught mankind this lesson.

But Moses saw this, as by intuition; and he laid his plans, and made his arrangements on the dictate of a masterly policy, which was indeed essential to the success of his noble scheme.

The original race of slaves that left Egypt, adults, under Moses, ever shewed themselves restless, turbulent,—impatient of the wholesome restraints of law and regular government, and incapable of appreciating the advantages of such government. This race passed away in the wilderness; and their sons, trained under the institutions that were to distinguish them above all other nations, yielded a cheerful obedience to the laws, and fully carried out the plans of their great prophet.

To accomplish such a task, to control the discordant elements

¹ It may be interesting to consult, on this point, "Monumens de l'Égypte et de Nubie, by Champollion le Jeune, vol. i. of the Plates, and Plates XI, XIII, and XV., in which the Pharaoh (Ramses V.) is styled again and again, *Meses*, beloved of Amoun." See also Osburn's *Ancient Egypt*, p. 14. See also Rosellini, B. 6, Pl. CI., Plate 82, 4; 164. 3; and Depense XXX., where the cartouche of Sesostris, or Ramses III. is given, whose name and title Osburn renders thus: "Pharaoh vigilant in justice. *Σωτηρ*, Sesostris, the approved of the Sun [the beloved of Amoun, Ramses], III." There is in these cartouches no Ra, it is merely *Meses*, beloved of Amoun. See also the last line of royal names in the *Table of Abydos*; see Champollion Figeac, plate 47. A copy of this table is also given in Dr Hawkes's *Egypt and its Monuments*, p. 25.

These magnificent delineations of Ramses are mostly at Ipsamboul, in temples near the region of Moses' conquests, and which were constructed at a period near his time. (See Champollion Figeac, p. 340, 341).

with which Moses had to work, and by his tact and management to raise a band of emancipated serfs and their children in intelligence, civilization, and self-respect, until they could be safely settled in a country of their own, and be formed into a community, the first in the world, to be the depositary of a free government, under a written constitution, which distinctly prescribed the duties, and secured the privileges of all, religious and political, public and private, those of magistrates and of citizens; and to effect all this in one generation, was a work accomplished *but once* in the history of the world, a statesman-like work, to which the genius of Moses alone, of all men that ever lived, has been found equal.

The institutions established by Moses were pre-eminently judicious, and admirably adapted to the character of the people; their peculiar position as the sole depositary of a pure religion; a people to be kept separate and distinct from all the rest of the world. These institutions were designed to endure; and they have endured. For several thousands of years they have been maintained by the Jews, and that, too, even since the dispersion of that people into all parts of the globe; and they still retain a vigour that promises perpetuity.

“These institutions,” as one has well said (see Robinson’s Calmet), “have withstood the fury of persecution, and the still more dangerous snares of seduction. They are, to this day, essentially the same in China, in India, in Persia, and in Europe. They may have been neglected, they may have been interpolated, they may have been abused; but they are the same, and they are still observed. Nor is the claim of consanguinity and brotherhood unfelt throughout the whole race. Despised and scattered abroad among all nations, they are distinct from all, and bound to each other by ties which the lapse of ages has not destroyed, and has hardly weakened.” Nor is it certain, that even should the whole Hebrew race embrace Christianity, every rite that distinguishes them as Jews, must absolutely cease and determine.

Their three great annual festivals, when every adult male must attend in one place where stood the altar of God; their great Sabbath year; their numerous priesthood for the conduct of the splendid temple worship; their various admirable courts of justice, and their magistrates nearly all elective, as well as their laws of inheritance, and year of Jubilee, were peculiar institutions,

well adapted to secure their purity, as a nation settled permanently in one country. All these might fall into disuse on their dispersion into distant lands; but yet, as Jews, however dispersed, they are marked as a distinct race, and as one, by circumcision, by the annual passover, by their weekly 7th-day sabbath, and by their synagogue service for the reading of the sacred books of their fathers.

Now, a mind that could form the conception of a government embodying such institutions so peculiar and unique, yet so influential in their character, and so durable in their nature; a mind that could and did devise the details of this system, and the means for carrying it out into full and practical operation, with materials such as were presented in the Hebrews just emerging from Egyptian bondage; a system that should raise them from barbarism to civilization and refinement, that should suit their condition when settled in a land that Moses never visited; a system that should be still appropriate in the height of their growing prosperity, to be witnessed only in the far-off future; and a system that revolutions, dispersion, and wretchedness, cannot overthrow, yea, that time itself neither wears out nor renders obsolete;—a mind which conceived and executed this system in all its vastness, and with all its minute details, must have been pre-eminent for an exuberance of all those great qualities, which, when found even in a moderate degree, stamp their possessor as an able statesman, and a man of genius.

But it is when considered as a Lawgiver that the true greatness of Moses is best seen. Law is the slow growth of ages. It is the index of public intelligence, the standard of civilization. All history shews that the advance from barbarism to that condition in which government is administered in strict accordance to written law, is very slow; it requires a long course of years. Laws are usually enacted cautiously, one after another, as the exigencies that call for them arise, and the alteration, amendment, or repeal of old laws is constantly taking place. *Law is the concentrated experience of ages, rendered durable by record.*

Moses alone was blessed with a mind so capacious, views so enlarged, and political sagacity so keen and so profound, that he produced at once a system of laws, both civil and ecclesiastical,

which settled the entire government of a new people, ~~and~~ which was about speedily to become great and powerful, and settled on a durable foundation. But little prepared could the Jews have been to appreciate the institutions of Moses. They had indeed long dwelt in Egypt, and in daily contact with the most enlightened people then on earth; but they had held among that people an inferior position. A race of hard-worked, despised, and sorely oppressed serfs, they had but just burst their bonds. Whatever the civilization around them in Egypt, the Jews had had but little opportunity to derive benefit from it. On the great subject of religious opinions and moral conduct, all nations and all tribes of that period were in deplorable error. Polytheism and gross idolatry everywhere prevailed, and even the Egyptians were notoriously addicted to gross superstitions, paying religious homage to beasts, and birds, and reptiles. Of the *state of morals among the Egyptians* we have no very definite accounts; but among the Canaanites and all other adjoining countries, it was wretched in the extreme. This universal degradation the Hebrews could not have entirely escaped. Everything in the people for whom he planned, and in the condition of society around him, was, therefore, adverse to the magnificent designs of Moses; and yet he matured, and he accomplished these designs.

The basis of his whole system was, *reverence for the one only God, the supreme Ruler*. God was the head of the Jewish government. The worship of God was also homage to the sovereign; and idolatrous practices were not impiety merely, they were treason against the state. Hence the severity of the laws Moses enacted against heathenish practices: a severity necessary to the continued existence of Israel as a nation, at the time and under the circumstances. A severity, however, which gives no sanction to bigotry or to religious intolerance now.

Under the Mosaic code, the priesthood was assigned to the family of Aaron alone; while the whole tribe of Levi was devoted to the subordinate duties of waiting on the priesthood in their sacred services, caring for the sacred vessels, the music, and all the requisites for public worship. In this tribe also, sacred literature was more especially cultivated, the law was diligently cared for, copies of it were multiplied and preserved, its statutes were interpreted and taught to the people. The duties of all the

several ecclesiastical officers were minutely prescribed, and the maintenance of these officers was carefully provided for by law.

For the due administration of public affairs, ample provision was made. Each one of the twelve tribes was, in some respects, an independent community, administering its own internal affairs by a government composed of officers of its own selection: while a general council of the nation, composed of delegates from each of the tribes, guarded the interests of the entire confederacy.

Through this national council, the extraordinary leaders, such as Moses, the judges, and, in later times, even the kings, communicated with the tribes, and made their enactments known to the people. The Jewish commonwealth, as constituted by Moses, was a confederacy of republics, strongly resembling the complex government of these United States.

Each tribe had its own head, or *prince*, who was elected to this high office from among the descendants, in the direct line, of the founder of the tribe. By the prudent counsel of Jethro, Moses appointed additional magistrates, viz. judges, some over ten, some over fifty, some over a hundred, and others over a thousand men: and all these leaders of thousands, or elders, were associated together, under the prince of the tribe, as the general council of the tribe. When all such elders dwelling in any city or neighbourhood were convened, they formed the legislative assembly of that city or neighbourhood (Deut. xix. 12; xxv. 8, 9. Judg. viii. 14; ix. 3-46; xi. 5. 1 Sam. viii. 4; xvi. 4). When the chief elders from *all* the tribes were convened in one body (or by their duly appointed delegates: see Exod. xix. 7; xxiv. 3-8; xxiv. 31, 32. Levit. iv. 13; xviii. 3-5; ix. 5), they formed the *legislative assembly* of the entire nation (Judg. i. 1-11; xi. 5; xx. 12-24. Josh. xxiii. 1, 2; xxiv. 1). The priests, who were the learned class in the community, were also hereditary officers in the state, being clothed with *civil* no less than religious functions. They had a seat in this grand assembly (Exod. xxxii. 29. Numb. xxxvi. 13; viii. 5-26). The priests were the authorized interpreters of the law, both civil and ecclesiastical. This great national assembly, or Comitia, was summoned by special messengers, and convened before the tabernacle in early times. They exercised the chief rights of sovereignty. They declared war,

concluded peace, ratified treaties, appointed civil rulers, generals, and, in later times, even the kings. The oath of office was administered by the judge (*e. g.* Joshua or Samuel), and in later times by the king. The king himself was sworn into office by the Comitia, acting in the name of the people (Exod. xix. 7; xxiv. 2-8. Josh. ix. 18-21. Judg. xx. 1; xi. 14; xx. 13-20. 1 Sam. x. 24; xi. 14, &c.)

In a time of peculiar difficulty from sedition, Moses selected seventy distinguished men from among the different tribes, to act as his councillors in affairs of state. These were called the *Sanhedrim*. (Numb. xi.) These, however, were not judges. They were appointed for a specific purpose, and their office ended with the life of Moses. From the death of Moses till the Captivity, we find no mention of a sanhedrim. After the Captivity, indeed, in the time of the Maccabees, the Jews appointed a sanhedrim of seventy-two elders, over whom presided the high priest. But this sanhedrim, which in later ages acted as the supreme council of the nation, is by no means to be confounded with the sanhedrim of Moses.

The trials conducted before the several law courts were usually held at the gate of the city, an unencumbered space of public resort. To insure openness and due deliberation, no capital case could lawfully be tried at night. Hence courts were usually held in the morning. Nor was it lawful to examine a cause, pass sentence, and put that sentence in execution the same day. In the trial of Jesus Christ all these merciful legal precautions were disregarded.

These several institutions were admirably adapted to the character and the circumstances of the Jews, and were well calculated to accustom them to the government of established law, the only guarantee for order and freedom.

There is, however, one institution established by Moses, which discovers a wonderful tact, in turning apparently formidable obstacles in the way of the rule of law into a means for establishing it the more effectually. I refer to the Cities of Refuge.

From time immemorial it had been deemed the duty of the man next of kin to a person slain by violence, to avenge his death on the slayer. He was called the *blood-avenger*. If he failed to punish the killer of his kinsman, he was accounted *infamous*. In

a rude state of society this custom must be highly useful; but it is obviously liable to great abuses. Homicide is not always murder.

The province of established tribunals of justice it is to ascertain not only the fact of the slaying, and the person of the slayer, but also the intention, criminal or otherwise. If the slaying was accidental, or necessary to self-defence, then it was not criminal; but of this the blood-avenger could not judge impartially. His kinsman being slain, his part it was to avenge him, and infamy covered him if he slew not the slayer. The fact of the slaying was all he looked at; of its justifiableness he was not, and he could not be, a competent judge. The person of the slayer once known, he *must slay him, or live in infamy*. To remedy the fearful abuses to which this custom must always be liable, Moses resorted to a singular expedient.

He appointed six cities of refuge, three on each side of the Jordan; to these cities straight roads were to be opened from every part of the country. A man who had slain any person must flee to the nearest of these cities of refuge, which were all placed under the control of the Priests and Levites. If found by the blood-avenger outside of the city, he could be lawfully slain; but so long as he remained within the city of refuge, he was safe from the immediate stroke of the blood-avenger. In that city he must abide until duly tried before a legal tribunal, and his guilt or innocence determined. If proved guilty of wilful murder, he was forthwith surrendered to the blood-avenger, to be by him slain. In such case, the death of the convicted murderer was inevitable. No sanctuary could shelter the convicted murderer, and no commutation was admitted.

If, on trial, acquitted of *intentional* murder, he was still required to dwell in the city of refuge during his whole life, unless the high priest should die; on the occurrence of this event, the homicide might fearlessly return to his own home, the blood-avenger having no longer any legal right to molest him.

Thus, by this singular institution, Moses extended no shield to the guilty—he did not aim to crush at once the spirit of private vengeance; but he sagaciously availed himself of that spirit, and of the custom to which it had given birth, to induce the criminal murderer, and the unfortunate homicide, alike, to throw themselves

on the protection of law for security from immediate pursuit and destruction, and for a fair and open trial afterwards. The very custom, and the deep feelings which would seem to threaten insuperable opposition to the empire of law, and the action of regular tribunals, were thus skilfully turned into important auxiliaries, to insure the influence of law, and establish the authority of its tribunals. The Mosaic law respecting the cities of refuge was a masterly stroke of legislative policy.

But it is *the Moral Law*, briefly expressed in the Ten Commandments,—*the Decalogue*, as recorded in Exodus, ch. xx. *that yields to Moses the palm of matchless legislative wisdom.*

The teachings of sages and philosophers, on the subject of human duty, have usually, in every age and country, been prolix and obscure, and so shrouded in mystery as to be nearly unintelligible to the great mass of mankind. But in the moral law first promulgated by Moses, we have just the reverse of all this. In this inimitable document, we find the entire range of human duties comprised in a compass so brief, that a child may commit the whole to memory in a few hours; and yet so comprehensive is this law, that it covers the entire field of duty. No one duty to God or man is here omitted. No one is there, of the many forms of vice, or gradations in crime, which is not herein unequivocally condemned.

Brief though this wonderful document is, it is yet perfectly intelligible to all. Each duty is herein so clearly defined, and so fully set forth, that the little child, the superstitious idolater, and the rude barbarian, as well as the philosopher and the man of science, may hence learn to whom he owes his being,—the service appropriate to that great Maker, and all the duties towards his fellow-men, which spring from his relation to them and to God, our common Creator. This peerless document, while it develops principles which may amaze and charm the strongest intellect, and the most cultivated mind, does also lay down its positions so distinctly, and detail duty so clearly and definitely, that its meaning is perfectly obvious to the humblest capacity and the most ordinary attention. Moreover, this law accords in all respects to the convictions of right inherent in every human breast.

It is a law adapted not to any one age of the world exclusively, nor to any one race of men, nor to any one class in society. It

is pre-eminently *the law for man*, for the whole human family, in all ages, in all countries, and in every condition of life.

No revolutions in the political world, no rise or fall of powerful dynasties, no change in the aspect of society, can ever either add to the force or impair the authority of this noble law. It is based on principles, and it deals with relations that appertain to human nature, and are unchangeable. To the white man, and the black; to the monarch on his throne, and to the beggar in his hovel; to the exalted leader of a nation of freemen, and to the slave at his meanest drudgery; to the statesman loaded with the cares of government, and to the obscurest of the multitude whose political destiny he controls; to the profound philosopher, to the applauded author of brilliant discoveries in science, and to the most illiterate peasant that plods thoughtlessly at his daily toil, this law is invariably and alike applicable. No lapse of ages can render it obsolete; no advances in science can impair its lustre or weaken its force; no change of circumstances can make it inapplicable or inappropriate. So long as man is man, dependent as a creature of God, and a member of the social body, this law must retain its force, and be always appropriate. So based in truth are the principles on which it rests, that it never can lose its authority over a single human being.

Some writers there are who would have us believe that Moses did not originate, but that he borrowed from the Egyptians, his code of morals, his pure Theism, and his most important regulations; and this, forsooth, because we are told "*Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.*"

This position is demonstrably false.

That Moses was a perfect master of all the wisdom of Egypt is true; and so the Bible asserts. But it does not thence follow that he possessed no other knowledge besides that derived from Egypt. It is no unheard-of thing for a scholar to master all the knowledge that his teacher can impart, and afterwards to accumulate, upon this, much larger and more valuable knowledge, by his own independent researches. This, we know, Moses did; and for this his long retirement in Midian furnished time and ample opportunity.

Moreover, the boasted wisdom of the Egyptians has been much exaggerated; for, whether we judge by the report of that wisdom

furnished in the classical writers of ancient Greece, or from the testimony yielded by the records of the Egyptian sages themselves, as now opened to the world in the interpreted hieroglyphics of their gorgeous temples, palaces, and tombs, and in their ritual of the dead, we find nothing to sustain this assertion. Some important moral duties are therein recognised: a future life *seems* to be there shadowed forth.¹ But the soul of the Mosaic system, *i. e.* the existence of one sole supreme God, a pure spirit, and the common brotherhood of all mankind, as the creatures of one God, the children of one heavenly Father, *that is not* found there. Over all the acres of surface covered by the hieroglyphic writing and the brilliant picturing of the ancient Egyptians, which still exist in wonderful preservation among her monuments, you look in vain for a recognition of the *one only God*. No sign, no symbol, no token of this one fundamental truth, is there found. (See Sir G. Wilkinson's *Mann. and Cust.*, 2d series, vol. i. p. 178.) On this subject the testimony of the celebrated Dr Pritchard is clear and explicit. In his learned work, the *Analysis of Egyptian Mythology*, p. 406, he says: "With respect to *theology*, no two systems can be more directly opposed to each other than the Mosaic doctrine was to that of the Egyptians."

Again, p. 408, Dr P. remarks: "In the most striking features in the whole system of *civil regulations*, the plan adopted by the Hebrew lawgiver stands in direct opposition to the polity of the Egyptians."

Dr Redford, in his useful book, entitled "*Holy Scripture Verified*," remarks, p. 60 (Lond. ed. 1837): "No sort of analogy can be traced between the theory (of cosmogony) which Moses has left us, and any of the speculations which the Egyptians indulged."²

¹ I say *seems* to be there shadowed forth. See Wilkinson's 2d series, Plates 87 and 88, and the description, vol. ii. pp. 442-448. See also the magnificent and very curious Plate of the Judgment of the Soul, as given by Rosellini, Dispensa XXXVIII. m. d. c. Plate LXVI.; and see Champollion, *Monumens de l'Egypte et de Nubie*, vol. III. of the Plates, and Plate 272. This representation is found at Thebes, Biban, El Molouk.

² The doctrine of the Egyptians as to the continued existence of the soul after death, was not that of immortality, properly speaking, but of metempsychosis; *i. e.* a fresh birth into another body, and then another, &c. After it has gone through all the terrestrial, marine, and winged animals, it again enters a human body. (Herodotus, ii. 123; see also Wilkinson, Rosellini, and Champollion, quoted above. This circuit was

We may add further, that an imitation of the rites or the doctrines of the Egyptians, introduced by Moses into the institutions he gave to the Jews, would have been next to impossible, because it would have tended to destroy their confidence in him as an inspired prophet. On the conviction felt by them that he was a prophet inspired by Jehovah, rested the sole authority of Moses over the Jews. He denounced the customs of the Egyptians. An inspired prophet could not consistently borrow religious observances from a people whom he denounced as impious idolaters.

Sir William Jones also, the great Oriental scholar, has remarked, "There is no shadow of foundation for the opinion that Moses borrowed the first part of *Genesis* from the literature of Egypt." (Id. p. 60.) He adds, "Still less can the adamantine pillars of our Christian faith be moved by the result of any debates as to the comparative antiquity of the Hindoos and Egyptians, or of any inquiry into the Indian theology." (Id.)

The ancient Egyptians were an ingenious people, refined and luxurious in their manners undoubtedly. But, of originating the ideas with which, as its living spirit, its pervading essence, the Mosaic moral code is replete, Egypt, with all its splendour and with all its wisdom, was (for all that has yet been brought to light) as utterly incapable, as would be the savage warriors, the aborigines of our own American forests; as are the Caffres and the Hottentots of South Africa.

That the sublime doctrines, the comprehensive views, the pure morality and the wonderfully accurate science¹ with which the

supposed to occupy 3000 years; like the doctrine of the Indian philosophy. (Faber, *Pagan Idolatry*, vol. i. pp. 14, 111, and 113.) That it might be ready to receive the returning soul, at the end of this 3000 years, the body was embalmed with so great care.

What resemblance has this to any teaching of Moses? Moses has been charged with borrowing from the Egyptians the idea of the Urin and Thummim. (See *Diod. Sic. l. 65, 5, B i. ch. 48.*) Gesenius refers to this. Grotius turned the tables, by charging this imitation upon the late Egyptians. He maintains that they borrowed this from the Jews:—"Imitati sunt hoc (i. e. the breast-plate of the Jewish High Priest) sed ut pueri virorum res, imitantur Egyptii."¹ (*De Veritate*, i. 16.)

¹ The learned Adrien Balbi has said:—"No monument, either historical or astronomical, has yet been able to prove the books of Moses false; but, on the contrary, with these books agree, in the most remarkable manner, the results obtained by the most learned philologues and the profoundest géométricians." (*Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*, Mappemonde. Eth. 1.)

¹ See an able examination of this charge in Tompkins' *Hulsean Prize Essay* for 1849, pp. 80-92.

books of Moses are replete, could have been obtained by him from the ingenious authors of the mythological delineations, still found adorning the magnificent temples, the splendid palaces, and the elaborately wrought tombs now standing in the valley of the Nile, is merely and simply an *utter impossibility*.¹

How wonderful, then, must have been the mind of him who first arranged and embodied the ideas that make up this *great law*. This law has withstood the revolutions of time, the shock of determined opposition, and the scrutiny of jealousy. The cavils of objectors, and the reflections and researches of the learned, have failed to discover in the moral precepts of this law any one defect, or to make upon it any improvement.

It has been the admiration of the ablest legislators in all subsequent ages, and it has been used as the model after which the most approved and successful laws have been framed. It embodies the substance of all sound legislation, and it presents the essential germ of all true religion. As it was the earliest, so it has been found to be the wisest, the noblest, the completest of all laws. Issuing as it did in a remote, a superstitious, and a barbarous age, it presents an embodiment of wisdom never since surpassed, never since equalled in any age.

Great discoveries are usually made gradually. A glimpse of some great truth is first obtained: it is conjectured rather than known; and time, and thought, and labour, must perfect the discovery. But in this instance the discovery was made at once: the great truths of morality and religion burst forth upon mankind in all their glory, like the sun rising brightly on the morning sky. The system was given to the world by Moses at once clear, well-defined, perfect, evincing itself to be immutable truth, by its universal applicability, at all times and to all men, of all races, everywhere. It was no rude conjecture; it was a complete discovery. *It was a heavenly birth*. It was the true prototype of that beauti-

¹ Mr Tompkins, in his Hulsean Prize Essay, 1840, says, (p. 79), "The sublime truths of Revelation have as logical a connection with the abominations of Egypt, as they have with the nebulous theory of Hægel."

And even Bunsen, in speaking of the sacred books of the Egyptians, says, (p. 49, vol. i.) "These contain no history of the Egyptian people as do the books of the Old Testament. The idea of the people, and still more of the *people's God*, the Creator of heaven and earth, is wanting."

ful old fable of classical Greece. Pallas, embodiment of wisdom, springing forth quick, matured, and armed cap-a-pie, from the brow of Jupiter, or from the supreme intellect. Plain it is then, that *the Decalogue is a monument of wisdom, unparalleled in the annals of mankind.* Hence it may be safely affirmed :—

Such was the genius of Moses, that he, more than any other man, has influenced the destiny of mankind.

Every now and then men have appeared in human society, endowed with minds so vigorous, active, and commanding, as that they have moulded the opinions and controlled the intellectual movements of their own age and of succeeding generations. These were the master-spirits of their age. Such were Homer and Aristotle, Socrates and Plato, Demosthenes and Cæsar, each in his peculiar sphere of influence. Such, too, were Charlemagne, and but lately, Napoleon, Bacon, Newton, and Luther, each in his own department of action ; but Moses has shewn himself the great master-spirit, not of one age, but of all ages, and of all nations too.

His institutions moulded the character and shaped the destiny of the entire Jewish nation, certainly. The pure religion he taught, and the admirable moral precepts he laid down, were, indeed, shut up for ages among that one people. But they have gradually spread abroad among mankind, and have proved most influential in furthering the progress of civilisation and human happiness. Christianity, the religion of the most intelligent and enterprising nations on the earth, is founded on the religion of Moses. From him, also, Mohammed borrowed his distinguishing religious tenets, and all of his ethics that are valuable ; and Mohammedanism is the religion of a large portion of Asia, and of many tribes and nations of Africa, while the laws enacted by Moses, and especially the law of the Ten Commandments, constitute the acknowledged basis of all wise and effective legislation in every civilized country under heaven.

Nor must we overlook the spirit of liberty pervading the government Moses established, with its officers and its magistrates all selected by the suffrages of the people, over whom, when chosen, they ruled. On this point Dr Pritchard (*Anal. Mythol. Egypt.* p. 408) has remarked :—“ The founders of the Egyptian civil regulations made it their chief endeavour to depress the

masses in society, and to elevate the *few* in wealth and power. On the contrary, the system of society established by Moses was one of perfect equality; not the casual result of circumstances, but this was the object which Moses purposely contrived a great part of his civil institutions to uphold." The Hebrews were all required to regard each other as brethren.

By these institutions a spirit of freedom was awakened in the heart of the Jewish nation, which never perished, and which rarely slept. It led to deeds of heroic daring, and of surpassing endurance, in resistance against the oppressions of tyranny, when the rights of conscience were invaded. The reiterated and daring struggles of the Jews for religious freedom have, in almost all ages, presented to mankind an impressive spectacle. Christianity perpetuated this spirit, and raised it yet higher. Popular elections and popular representative assemblies were introduced from the synagogue into the church. 2153

When it was attempted, oppression was resisted unto the death. And who can tell how far the freedom now enjoyed among many nations, and extending more widely every year, may be the offspring of that spirit of liberty that has ever animated the church, and the Jewish nation before it?

The task of fully tracing out the influence exerted on the world, and the benefits conferred on man by the Jewish nation, in true religion, pure morals, sound legislation, and in extending the spirit of religious independence and of political freedom, has yet to be performed. Trace their entire history, and the Jewish nation will be found to exhibit claims to the admiration and to the *gratitude* of mankind, as the earliest and the most unyielding advocates of the rights of conscience, and the boldest champions of freedom the world has ever beheld.

Its obligation to the Jews has never yet been acknowledged by the world, nor even appreciated. And I, for one, count it an honour to the American republic, and to the age in which we live, that an act of tardy justice has at length been done to this long-oppressed but noble race, in that the Secretary of State (Mr Webster) has recently set a proud example to the nations of the earth, in refusing to ratify a treaty with a foreign power, on the sole ground that that treaty made invidious distinctions adverse

to the race of Abraham. All honour to the name of Daniel Webster therefor!

Nor can we forget that all the good conferred on the world by and through the Jews, is a direct result of the institutions established, and the truths promulgated by the Jewish lawgiver *Moses*. View this man in what light you may, and he presents the most splendid character on record.

As an individual, he was virtuous and pure; a genuine patriot, zealous and untiring, firm and self-possessed; a profoundly learned man, and an accomplished writer; a successful general, and a pre-eminently able statesman; a wise lawgiver, and a man of commanding genius beyond all that ever lived. *Moses* has done more than any one man, and more than any combination of men ever did, to influence the condition, and to improve the character, not of his own peculiar nation only, but of all nations.

Thus distinguished, *Moses* stands forth to view as a man of pre-eminent worth, of incomparable mind, of matchless attainments, of wisdom unexampled. How suitable it was, then, that such a man should have been *honoured* to act as the mouthpiece of heaven, to proclaim to men their duties, and prepare them to receive the higher gift of salvation, afterwards made known in the gospel of Christ. And in fact, to adopt the language of another (Dr Redford, *Holy Scrip. Verified*, p. 16), "The brief statements given in the first few paragraphs of the books of *Moses*, imply a knowledge which could *not* have been acquired by any of those means which men possess. They display an insight into the laws and acts of nature, which it is impossible to ascribe to the individual writer, or to the people among whom he received his education. So far as great truths and universal principles of nature can be discovered by human effort, we know perfectly well that great labour, cautious investigation, patient research, and *much time* are demanded. They require a large induction of particulars, and a great accumulation of facts, before they can be securely and confidently asserted. It is a rare (one might say a totally unheard-of) case for such principles or truths to be brought to maturity by a single mind." In fact, it never has been done. "The first, in general, merely suggests them. Others, and usually in a long succession, verify and prove them, in all their bearings."

“ When, therefore, we perceive how slowly great principles and general laws are discovered, even by the most comprehensive and accomplished minds, in the present day, it must appear *altogether incredible* that Moses should have ascertained all the great natural truths which he records, by his own researches, or that he should have derived them from the wisdom of the Egyptians.” (p. 17.)

The information imparted to us by Moses upon these recondite subjects, is of so peculiar a character—it is so accurate, so comprehensive, and it so entirely anticipates all that has been brought to light by science, even down to this very hour, that *it is impossible to attribute it to the ordinary sources of human knowledge*. Moses was, beyond denial, a man of transcendent genius. But *no mere genius* could possibly have accumulated the knowledge his writings embody. There is, to this day, no theory extant as to the origin of the world, that is even plausible, which does not assume as its basis the very principles first laid down by Moses alone. Add to this his theology, so simple, so sublime, so rational; add, also, his inimitable code of morals, and *the evidence is complete*. There is no possible way of accounting for this vast, this amazing, this superhuman wisdom of Moses, but by acceding to his own statement—a statement sustained by other direct, varied, and conclusive proofs—*Moses was a prophet*—he wrote just as he was inspired of God to write.

How fully entitled, then, to our cordial reception and our implicit confidence, are the precepts of a religious teacher so pre-eminently endowed and gifted of heaven as was Moses! And how puny are the powers, and how contemptible in comparison are the teachings of the pigmy opponents, who, in our day, would seek to subvert the authority of Moses! By every competent and impartial investigator, Moses must be acknowledged, and that quite independently of his divine commission, to be the **Father of History**, and the **Founder of Literature**: and how our reverence for his character, and our esteem for his writings should rise, when we are assured also that Moses was, under God's own guidance, promulgator of the only true religion—the originator of all sound jurisprudence—the *great Teacher of pure morals*—yea, that Moses was also the planner and the author of the first truly popular government among the nations of the earth.

If George Washington is justly honoured by a great nation as the Father of his emancipated country, much more should Moses be honoured by *all*, not only as the first and the most distinguished of all the prophets of God, but also as the *Instructor* and the *Benefactor* of the *whole Family of Mankind*.

LECTURE II.

NECESSITY FOR REVELATION.

ACTS xvii. 23.—“ To the unknown God ” *ἄγνωστο θεῷ.*

To the unknown God. What a designation! And this was the inscription adorning the face of an altar seen by the Apostle Paul, in the very heart of Athens, the centre and focus of the refinement, wealth, literature, and piety of all Greece!

There it stood, open to the notice of all: and that such altar, bearing such inscription, did anciently stand in the heart of Athens, is attested by several writers of classical antiquity. It was the memorial, we are told, of a fearful pestilence, stayed by the intervention of some unascertained power, after all the deities of the Grecian Pantheon had been supplicated in vain.

There it stood—a memento of deliverance, but a token, also of ignorance—of ignorance on matters the most deeply interesting: ignorance, too, prevailing amongst a people the most polished, the most learned, the most philosophic of all antiquity. That majestic altar at Athens, that mysterious inscription, “ *to the unknown God* ” was a palpable indication of *the necessity for a divine revelation to man*. So, at least, the great Apostle to the Gentiles evidently regarded it; for he seized the occasion furnished by his arraignment before the august court of the Areopagus, to present to his philosophic audience a brief outline of the doctrines of revelation, respecting one God, the Creator of all, the common brotherhood of all the races of mankind, and the duty of all to render a pure and spiritual homage to their common Creator. “ *Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.* ”

If the subtle Stoics, the polished Epicureans, and the philosophers of the Areopagus at Athens, needed, in matters of religion, to be instructed by a divinely inspired teacher, much more must

the great bulk of mankind need it. Hence the theme of this lecture. "*For the safe-guidance of man, a revelation from God is needed.*" By *revelation*, I would be understood to mean, *knowledge beyond the reach of unaided reason; knowledge supernaturally conveyed, by direct inspiration from God:* such as the great body of Christians understand the Apostle to mean, when he tells us, "*all Scripture is given by inspiration of God:*" and again, "*holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*"

There is, indeed, a modern spurious philosophy, a canting imitation of German mysticism, which is magniloquent and obscure, dealing largely in high-sounding words utterly misapplied.

The advocates of this pseudo-philosophy descant much on spirit and essence, development and progress. With them science is a revelation; reason is an inspiration; analogy is a symbolization, the seed is a *prophecy* of the future plant. With them, every truth is sacred, and all knowledge is divine. Writers, and declaimers of this stamp, strike the unreflecting as original and profound, simply because they deal in unintelligible mysticisms, perverting terms, and confounding all language.

In one sense it *may* be said, that *all truth is sacred*: but certainly *reason is not inspiration*; any more than gazing on the heavens with the naked eye, is the same as surveying the vast expanse through a skilfully constructed telescope.

Natural science is the proper field of action for human reason, in which to try her own inherent power.

Revelation is another, and altogether a different field, into which the human mind is led only by *inspiration*, *i. e.* by a supernatural influence direct from God; wholly distinct from mere reason, and above it.

To use these terms indiscriminately, or to substitute the one for the other, is to confound things entirely different and distinct. It is, in fact, to render language useless, or rather, to make it the instrument for blinding and misleading.

Revelation, then, supernaturally imparted by inspiration from God, is necessary to man. It is so, because,

1st, *The religious instinct is innate in man.* It is a feeling ingrained, apparently, in the very nature of man, that he is a being, not only frail and dependent on a higher power, but also respon-

sible to that power. Among men of every nation and tribe under heaven, in every country, and in every climate, is found the evidence of this religious instinct.

It is so now, and it has been so in all ages. Every tribe of men, no matter how rude, has been found to have its own deities, its ceremonies of worship, its dogmas of belief; its hopes and its fears, founded upon those dogmas. The Jew and the Gentile, the Asiatic, the European, and the American savage, the Islamite, the Brahmins of Hindostan, the Buddhist of Ceylon, the followers of Confucius in the celestial empire, and the dark-skinned trembler before the gree-gree in the burning wilds of Africa, all corroborate this statement. There is not one single well-authenticated case in exception.

Some few savage tribes have been spoken of by travellers as so debased, that they gave no indication of any ideas of a superior power, or of personal responsibility. But a better acquaintance with such savages, and with their language, has usually shewn they were not entirely destitute of religious sensibility; although their notions on these points may have been very obscure.

It may, then, be safely asserted that a recognition of a higher power, and a sense of responsibility to that power, are characteristic of man, wherever found. The religious instinct seems to appertain to humanity as such.

Now, for the gratification of all other instinctive propensities, suitable means are bountifully provided by the Creator. He has given us the air to breathe, food to eat, water to drink, the day for labour, and the night for repose,—the social feelings and the domestic relations,—together with all the varied objects around us, to excite and to gratify man's thirst for knowledge. Surely, then, *this instinctive longing for an acquaintance with our duties*, our future prospects, and the means of solid happiness, was not given to us in vain.

As truly as the structure of the eye shews the need of light in which to use it, and warrants the belief that light will be given for that purpose; so *this moral structure of man*,—this internal organization, shews the need of *supernatural* light, for its appropriate actions, and warrants the hope that such spiritual light will not be withheld.

Again, 2d. *The importance of the interests involved, shews the*

need of revelation. For the sustenance, the safety, and the comfort of man, in this world, ample means are provided. With a mind capable of observing, comparing, reasoning, and planning, and with a body admirably adapted to serve as the instrument for effecting his purposes, and carrying out his plans, man walks the *lord of this earth*. The soil he treads, yields, in return for his labour, a copious harvest of varied products for his sustenance; while the fowls of the air, and the inhabitants of the deep, no less than the beasts of the field, minister to his luxury. Home, with its comforts and its heart-felt delights,—society, with its conveniences and all its refining influences, contribute largely to the happiness of man, and shew the providential arrangements of the mighty Creator for his well-being.

Well may life be valued, and the light of the sun prized. But life is short, and if, as there is cogent reason for believing, we *are immortal*, then, for us, *the one grand inquiry is*, and ever must be, how can we render that future life a happy one?

In comparison with this, all that relates merely to the interests of this our brief sojourn on earth, sinks into insignificance.

If you were about to remove to a far distant country, a foreign land, there to settle for life, you would spare no pains to obtain correct information as to the country, its productions, its climate, —the character of its inhabitants, the peculiarities of their society, their laws, their customs,—and all that could enable you to decide as to the requisites for there making yourself respectable, comfortable, and at home; you would not trust to your own surmises, nor to the mere assertions of rash pretenders; you would require *authentic information* from competent sources.

So, also, our immortal nature proclaims the necessity for information, such as no child of earth, however gifted, can impart, respecting the unseen world that awaits us, and the means by which we may be fitted to enter that world, with a fair prospect of ~~safety~~ safety, of honour, of happiness when there. *This needed instruction, a revelation from God can alone impart.*

* Again, 3d. *The limited extent of our powers demands it.* For all that respects this life alone, and its interests, we are abundantly qualified to judge and to act. We have here, to do with objects that are palpable to the senses, with agents, whose nature is known to us, and on whose movements we can calculate

The results of scientific research, in so many departments of nature, the regularity of the seasons, and the stability of what are called the laws of nature, all combine to enable us to lay our plans, and prosecute them with vigour, almost certain, that, by a prudent foresight against possible contingencies, success will crown our efforts to secure comfort, respectability, and usefulness in life. Every man knows that by industry, skill and uprightness in his business, combined with discretion in his conduct and prudence in the management of his property or his gains, all that a reasonable ambition can desire in his peculiar station may be his. The agriculturist, the mechanic, the merchant, and the scholar, all busy themselves in matters with which they are conversant, and to understand and to manage which, their own inherent powers are sufficient. But, in regard to the higher interests of the life to come, we have no such natural means of judging. Our condition and our destiny after death, we possess no faculty, no power, no means whatever of ascertaining. *That* can be determined only by the unseen Author of our being. The great fact of the *existence* of that august Being, *we can establish* with sufficient clearness and certainty, by the operation of our *reason*. Some of his attributes, also, we can make out,—such as his *greatness*, his *omniscience*, and his *almighty power*. For his *justice*, also, we discern proof, ample and conclusive. But what may be the precise nature of the relation we sustain to him, what may be the service he requires from us, what the duties he requires to be by us exercised, one towards another. and what may be the *bearing of our conduct in this life, upon our destiny hereafter*, we cannot, by unaided reason, determine. All this lies utterly beyond the reach of our noblest powers.

Equally inscrutable to us is the question, *Can this sense of guilt, loading our hearts, be relieved? Is God merciful? Can he pardon the guilty? and, if so, how? by what means? In what way, and on what conditions, is that pardon to be had? No mere human intellect is sufficiently acute, active. or powerful to grasp effectually these points, and to answer satisfactorily these deeply interesting inquiries. That answer can be yielded only by inspiration from God.*

It is not enough here to fall back upon the goodness of God, and say, “I am not afraid to trust my Maker. He who has pro-

vided for us here a world so bright, and so rich in materials for enjoyment, can make all needed arrangements to render us happy hereafter. If I do my duty here, I have no fears for hereafter, so long as God is good, and is almighty." Agreed, I say; but this brings us no nearer to the point than before.

God can render us happy hereafter, no less than here; but the question is, *will* he? and in what way? on what terms? What, if it should turn out to be true, that *the formation in us, and by us, of a certain moral condition, or character, is absolutely indispensable to our future happiness, just as the bud must precede the blossom, as sowing the seed must precede gathering in the harvest, or as the cause must precede the effect?* If such is, in truth, the law of spiritual being, and spiritual progress, God will not, and he cannot, violate this law for the sole purpose of accommodating us. The interests we have at stake are too vast to be hazarded on a rash assumption. We here want *certainty*, not conjecture. That *certainty, revelation, and revelation alone can yield.*

If we *do our duty* here, we may dismiss all fear for hereafter, you say. So say I, too. But still the question recurs, *what is our duty?* It is, at least, possible, that *duty* here may include something more than probity in our dealings, man with man, and self-control in our pleasures. But if so, then, one who has been strictly honest, amiable, honoured and useful among his fellow-men, may yet have failed in some of his essential duties, and thus he may fail to meet with perfect happiness hereafter. He may even find bitter disappointment, and heavy sorrow awaiting him. Who shall say? Obviously, a revelation from God, and that alone, can settle these fundamental points.

But, further, 4th. Not only are *our powers* limited, but they *are enfeebled by our moral obliquity, and the judgment is perverted by inclination.*

Account for it or not, as we may, it is a fact plain and undeniable, that the moral condition of a man affects his intellectual powers, and his judgment, at least, in regard to all questions of right and duty.

The conviction that such is the fact, is indicated in many ways, on every hand. It is shewn in the demand for a blameless life in the teachers of religion. It is shewn on trials in your courts of justice, by the rejection as incompetent jurors and improper judges,

of all persons whose interests or affections are supposed to be involved in the issue of such trial. It is shown in the abatement with which the testimony of interested witnesses, however generally upright, is always received; and in the undeniable power of prejudice to bias the judgment.

If you would bring to settlement a disputed claim, if you would terminate a misunderstanding or a quarrel, you seek as arbitrator a man of admitted probity, and one who has no interest whatever involved in the affair. From *impartial probity* alone do you anticipate a clear discernment of the true merits of the case, and a just decision.

But in the case of our duties and our responsibilities to our Maker, we are deeply interested; an unprejudiced judgment is almost impossible to us. Who is not aware how frequently his judgment and his inclinations clash? That which is easy to us, or profitable, or pleasant, we readily persuade ourselves must be innocent. That to which inclination strongly prompts, we are with difficulty brought to recognise as evil. Nay, even where the judgment is correct and clear, an inclination to the contrary will too generally control the conduct; and this ill conduct will, ere long, operate on the whole man, clouding his judgment, and impairing his perceptions, as well as debasing the character.

This reflex influence of wrong-doing is forcibly expressed in that oft-quoted passage:—

“Vice is a monster of so hideous mien,
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen,
Yet, seen too oft—familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace!”

This power of evil habits to pervert the judgment, is noted in the Bible, where it is said that the wicked “*call good, evil; and evil, good.*”

And this conflict between conviction of right, and inclination to wrong, is expressed in that well-known line of the Roman poet, “*Video meliora, proboque, sed deteriora sequor.*”

“I see the good, and I approve,
But yet—the worse pursue!”

The same is intimated in a very striking passage in Paul's let-

ter to the Romans (Rom. vii. 19), "*The good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do.*"

These inward conflicts in men's bosoms, and this frequent contrariety between conduct and conviction, led certain distinguished philosophers of old to maintain, that every man has within him two opposing demons, or spirits, urging him in different directions: the one good, the other evil. If, now, in the wisest and the purest of the heathen sages, this innate tendency to evil was found, not only perverting the conduct, but biassing and blinding the judgment, as to what is right, and what wrong; if even in one possessed of a clear and infallible rule of duty before him, this adverse influence was still felt, what must be the uncertainty of judgment on all these high points, in those left without any higher guidance than their own reason, ever faltering and staggering beneath the influence of selfish passions, and corrupt tendencies?

This powerful and ever active sympathy between a defective wavering judgment, and busy evil tendencies, proclaims, as with trumpet-tongue, in every nation, and every tribe, *the necessity for a revelation from heaven, to make known to us the path of right, of safety, and of peace.* Like the altar "*To the unknown God,*" at Athens, it is *a memento of ignorance and of the urgent need of a heavenly teaching.*

Again, 5th. *The systems of religion embraced among the most enlightened nations of antiquity, serve but to shew yet more clearly, the need of a revelation.* If in anything correct notions prevail among men, we might surely expect to meet with them in the religious belief, and in the system of worship maintained; for correctness there, is most desirable, and most important.

But, in every nation, and from the remotest times, the religious systems of men without the Bible, have been defective and absurd. Of the mythology of Greece and Rome, I need not now speak: it was a tissue of grandeur and littleness; of imposing splendour, and the most disgusting licentiousness. The little of good which it did present, was derived originally from Egypt.

As to what the doctrines of Bramah can do for mankind, let India testify, where society is divided into castes, hopelessly separated from each other; where a cruel superstition degrades the mass of the people; where veracity is almost unknown, and where

impurity, open and utterly shameless, taints even their highest ceremonies of religious worship.

In regard to the Vedas, or sacred books of the Hindoos, it is asserted by M. Pauthier (*Livres Sacrées de l'Orient*, p. 313), that "The deities invoked appear, on a hasty examination of the Vedas, to be as varied as are the authors of the prayers addressed to them. But, according to the most ancient annotations made on the Indian Scriptures, these names, so numerous, of persons and of things, are all to be resolved into different titles of *three divinities*, and finally, of one God alone.

The Nig-ham-ti, or Glossary of the Vedas, terminates with three lists of the names of gods; the first containing all those which appear to be synonyms of *fire*; the second, the synonyms of *air*; and the third, those of the *sun*. In the last part of the Ni-rouk-ta, which relates exclusively to the divinities, it is twice asserted there are only three gods; and that these three gods denote only *one deity*, is established by numerous passages in the Veda itself.

Thus it is distinctly stated, "The divinities are three only, whose habitations are the earth, the intermediate region, and the heavens; *i. e.* fire, air, and the sun."

These divinities are all specified by various mysterious names, and the Lord of creation is their divinity collectively.

Again, "There is but one only divinity, the *great Soul (Mahân Atmah)*. It is named *the Sun*; for the *sun is the soul of all other beings*, and this is declared by the wise man (*le sage*). *The sun is the soul of whatever moves, and of whatever moves not.*" The other divinities are portions or fractions of his person. (See Notice sur les Vedas, Pauthier, pp. 313 and 314.)

Of *China* we know too little, and the boasted documents of its extreme antiquity are too feebly corroborated by any evidence save what they bear upon the face of them, for us to institute a full comparison. It is true, indeed, that M. Pauthier, the learned historian of *China*, the translator and commentator on Chinese philosophy, literature, and religion, asserts, in his "Introduction to the Sacred Writings of the East,"—"The Chinese civilization is, without doubt, *the most ancient civilization of the existing world*. It is carried back authentically (*i. e.* by the testimony of

(Chinese historians), as far as two thousand six hundred years before our era; *i. e.* to B. C. 2600."

"The documents collected together in the work called *Chou-King*, *i. e.* *the Book*, by way of eminence (like as our sacred scriptures are called *the Bible*, or *The Book*), are the most ancient documents of the history of the world. The ideas contained in the *Chou-King* respecting the Deity, the beneficent influence which he constantly exerts upon the affairs of the world, are very pure, and worthy, in all respects, of the soundest philosophy" (See *Livres Sacrées de l'Orient*, par M. Pauthier, Introduction, p. x. Paris, 1842.)

Such are the bold assertions of this enthusiastic advocate of the vast antiquity claimed for China. And yet, M. Pauthier himself admits that this work, *Chou-King*, is but a compilation, arranged by Confucius, so late as the middle of the sixth century before Christ; although Mon. Pauthier contends that this great Chinese philosopher had so profound a respect for antiquity, that he altered not at all the accounts he collected from ancient documents, and put in order, in that publication. "Besides" (adds Mon. P.), "to Sinologues (*i. e.* to Chinese scholars, those skilled in the Chinese tongue), the style of these writings, which differs as much from the style of modern Chinese writings, as the style of the twelve tables differs from the style of Cicero, is sufficient proof of their antiquity."

On the shewing of this distinguished Orientalist himself, then, it is plain that the authenticity of these Chinese sacred documents is more than questionable: their high antiquity is conjectural at best.

Pauthier is doubtless an able Sinologue himself, but he cannot be supposed able to appreciate the niceties of the ancient Chinese, and of the more modern, as might a profoundly learned native Chinese scholar. A Chinese, or a Hindoo sage, might master the English language sufficiently to read it fluently and accurately, and even to appreciate its qualities and to speak it too: but such foreign critic would obviously be quite incompetent to decide questions involving such niceties as must be considered in pronouncing on the spuriousness or genuineness of the work put forth by Chatteron. An accomplished native writer might, without great difficulty, impose on a foreign critic, as of extreme antiquity,

a document really modern, but composed for the purpose of its being passed off for one of great antiquity.

Besides all this, the documents themselves, of which translations are now extant, in more than one of the languages of modern Europe (the French translation of a portion of it, by M. Pauthier himself, is now before me), furnish evidence that the system of Confucius, and the doctrines taught in this renowned book, the Chou-King, were *political* rather than religious; they respected man rather as a *community*, consisting of governors and governed, than as an individual. The admissions of Pauthier himself shew this. Thus (and I here quote Mon. Pauthier's own words), "In the Chou-King we shall especially remark the intervention of heaven, or of the Supreme Intelligence (*de la Raison Supreme*), in the relations of princes with the people (*avec les populations*), or of governments with the governed; and this intervention is always in favour of the latter, that is to say, of the people," &c. &c.¹

But, whatever may have been, or may now be, the character of the religious philosophy of the Chinese, as held by their learned dignitaries, certain it is that the institutions of Confucius (admirable though they were for many sound moral precepts) are not inconsistent with idolatry, and with the extensive prevalence of infanticide among the people at large.

It is well known, also, that the Assyrians and Chaldeans were idolaters, and were greatly addicted to astrology—as the Persians still are to this day.

The ancient Persians acknowledged two ruling principles—the one good, *Oromanzas*; the other evil, *Arimanes*. They offered sacrifices to both: to the former, sacrifices of thanksgiving; to the latter, sacrifices deprecatory—in order to avert calamities. Such, and so pitiable were the religious systems of the most re-

¹ The Confucian system of religion, if religion it can be called, for it has little or nothing to do with theology, is merely a scheme of ethics and politics, from which things spiritual and divine are, generally speaking, excluded. In the works of Confucius there are some allusions to Heaven, as the presiding power of nature, and to Fate, as the determiner of all things: but he does not appear to attribute originality to the one, or rationality to the other. "Life and death are decreed by Fate; riches and poverty rest with Heaven."

See "China, Political, Commercial, and Social," by R. M. Martin, Esq. London, 1847, vol. i. p. 57.

markable, and the most highly civilized among the nations of antiquity.

In China and in India, both, we find still existing the remains of their ancient dogmas treasured up in their sacred books.

Ample time has been afforded to develop the full influence of their religious tenets on the manners and the practices of the people at large; for both these ancient nations, and more especially the Chinese, have, through a long succession of ages, preserved themselves isolated from all other nations, and consequently untouched by the customs and the sentiments of foreigners. The result is such, as modern observation has found them. They are a people refined in manners, and luxurious in their habits, idolatrous, and deeply superstitious.

But we are now frequently and very confidently told, that in Egypt, the cradle of wisdom, and the birth-place of the arts, *there was found* a system of religious belief, together with a code of morals, wise, healthful, worthy of man, and the actual prototype of Judaism, and, consequently, of Christianity too. Moses is said to have been "*learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians*;" and the doctrines he taught, and the institutions he established, shew it to be true. For all that is excellent and distinctive in the Jewish law, and the Jewish ceremonial rites, was (as the enthusiastic admirers of Egyptian archæology tell us) plainly borrowed from Egypt.

In this bold statement there is a strange compound of truth and falsehood.

A series of stupendous monuments is really found in Egypt, of extreme antiquity; and they present historical paintings, and hieroglyphic records, running back, in regular sequence, to a period long anterior to the time of Christ; nay, even anterior to Moses; and possibly older also than the age of Joseph; we might almost say, older than the time of Abraham himself. On these monuments the names and the attributes of their gods are recorded—the ceremonies of their worship are described—and the tenets of their creed are set forth. The doctrine of the soul, as separate and distinct from the body—as surviving the life on earth—is plainly recognised. Many admirable precepts of morality are set forth in their ritual of the dead; in the trial to which they represent every man as subjected after death, before

the forty-two judges of the dead, in the region of Amenti. The souls of men they represent as subject to a metempsychosis—a passage from one animal into another—till their stains are gradually purified, when the souls are absorbed in the essence of their greatest of gods, Amoun. (Wilkinson's *Man. and Cus.* 2d series, v. 2, p. 112). Egypt was undoubtedly peopled by one of the earliest colonies from among the children of Noah. These colonists brought with them, it is probable, a knowledge of the one God, and of the moral virtues he requires and approves.

The ancient Egyptian ritual gives proof of the patriarchal *origin* of the Egyptian creed; but their whole religious system gives proof also of the corrupting influence of priestly cunning. The priesthood in Egypt was always a large and a powerful class. They were originally the rulers of the whole land, as the historic tables of the dynasties of their gods seem to intimate. The military order afterwards seized on supreme power,¹ about B.C. 2200, and furnished the kings. But even their kings, the most illustrious and the most powerful, were compelled to be introduced into the ranks, and initiated into the mysteries of the priesthood, before they could enjoy the éclat of a public and solemn coronation, as monarchs of Egypt. (See Wilkinson.)

The great truths of religion, so far as they were really known, were shrouded in mysteries, and were shadowed forth to the people only in symbols. The knowledge of the real meaning of those symbols—of the spirit of their religion, was confined to the initiated.

Among the Egyptians, the priesthood was a secret order, and knowledge the most sacred and important was a kind of freemasonry, communicated only by symbols, and shrouded in the deepest mystery.

Lucian asserts: "The Egyptians were reputed the first who had a conception of the gods, an acquaintance with religious matters, and a knowledge of sacred names."

Sir J. G. Wilkinson asserts that, "superstitiously attached to their sacred institutions, and professing a religion which admitted much outward show, the Egyptians clothed their ceremonies with

¹ This is the view taken by Champollion, and it seems to me but reasonable, although the learned Heeren appears inclined to doubt its accuracy. See his *Egypt*, pp. 497, 498.

all the grandeur of solemn pomp : and the celebration of their religious rites was remarkable for all that human ingenuity could devise, to render them splendid and imposing." (Mauerns, &c. Ancient Egypt, 2d series, vol. i. p. 141.)

It may be averred that even Papal Rome, with all her gorgeous splendour of ceremonial, falls immeasurably short of the majestic pageantry of ancient Egyptian ceremonies. (See plates to Wilkinson's Manners and Customs, &c. 2d series, vol. ii.)¹

The ancient Egyptians are said by the learned to have held the doctrine of one only Supreme Being, the source of all, and independent of all !

It is not improbable that they were acquainted with this grand truth, handed down to them by tradition from the patriarchs who survived the Deluge. That there was some remnant of truth lying at the basis of the religious system of Egypt, as late at least as the time of the patriarch Joseph, is rendered more than probable, by Joseph's marriage with Asenath, daughter of Potiphara, priest of On, or Heliopolis. (Gen. xli. 45.) The idolatrous daughter of a priest of a religion wholly idolatrous, we cannot suppose would have been chosen by the pious Joseph, to become his wife, the mother of his sons, the future heads of tribes in Israel.

But the knowledge of the one God, if still held in Egypt, must have been regarded as one of their most sacred mysteries—it was confined to the priesthood and the initiated, and carefully veiled in mysterious symbols from the vulgar.

Certain it is, at least, that whatever may have been the knowledge on this subject, held by the Egyptian priesthood, the *ancient Egyptians did not, under any form, symbol, or hieroglyphic, represent the idea of THE UNITY OF GOD.* (Wilk. Man. and Customs of Anct. Egyptians, 2d series, vol. ii. pp. 176-178.)

"It appears" (says Wilkinson) "that the divinity himself was not represented in the sculptures of Egypt, and that the figures of their gods were but deified attributes, indicative of intellect, power, goodness, might, and other qualities in the Supreme Deity." Over

¹ See *v. g.* the pictorial representation of the ceremonies performed at the coronation of a king, from the sculptures of Rameses III. at Medinet Haboo, Thebes. (Wilkinson, vol. iii. of 2d series.) See also the great funeral procession of a royal scribe, delineated at Thebes (vol. iii. as above.) See also Champollion, *Monumens de l'Egypte et de Nubie.* (Plates, vol. i. Plate 11, 12, 13. Pl. 27, 28, 29.)

all the acres of hieroglyphic painting and hieroglyphic writing, not one solitary recognition has yet been found of the one Supreme God. No one sign, symbol, or character has been detected representing this grand idea.

Like the ancient Greeks and Romans, the Egyptians divided their gods into different classes or grades. Of their *great gods*, the Greeks reckoned twelve.

The great gods of Egypt were eight in number, one of whom generally formed, in conjunction with two of the others, a *triad*, which was worshipped by a particular city or district with peculiar veneration. In these Egyptian triads, the third member proceeded from the other two, *i. e.* from the first and the second. Memphis, Philae, Thebes, and nearly every large city or nome, had its own peculiar triad.¹ Throughout every part of Egypt, all the great gods were treated with respect. But an immense number of other deities were set up as objects of worship, some in one place, and some in another; and it often occurred that certain rites were performed in one district, which were totally different from those practised in another. Among the objects of adoration in Egypt, was the bull Apis, the cow, the crocodile, the cat, the dog, and even vegetables, such as leeks, &c. Hence the severe satire of the Roman poet Juvenal. (Sat. 15th.)

“ Who knows not, Bythinian Volusius, what monsters
Mad Egypt can worship? This place adores a crocodile,—
That fears an ibis saturated with serpents;
A golden image of a sacred Cereopitheus shines,
Where the magic chords resound from the half-Memnon;
And ancient Thebes lies overthrown with its hundred gates!
There a sea-fish,—here a river-fish, there
Whole towns worship a dog,— nobody Diana.
It is a sin to violate a leek, or an onion, or to break them with a bite.”

In this, satire though it is, there is no exaggeration.²

¹ The great triad worshipped at Thebes was the god Amoun, the goddess Maut, and their son Khonso. Another triad was Osiris, Isis, and their son Horus, always represented as very youthful. This was the triad greatly revered at Philae. (Wilk. 2d series, vol. i. p. 185.) Neph (or Kueph), Satè, and Anouk, constituted the triad chiefly honoured at Elephantine and the Cataracts.

² Two towns (as Plutarch tells us) waged obstinate war one upon the other (see Plut. de Isid. § 72; and Wilk. 1st ser. vol. iii. p. 59), because the people of Cynopolis were in the habit of eating a fish esteemed sacred by the people of Satopolis, in the

Even so late as the time of the Roman dominion in Egypt, so deep-rooted were these superstitions, that a Roman soldier, who had accidentally killed a cat, was put to death; and not even the power of the Romans, the conquerors of the country, availed to save him. So says Diodorus (i. § 3.) See Wilkinson, 1st series, vol. iii. p. 43.

When a dog died, every person in the house to which he belonged went into mourning, fasted the entire day, and every article of food that happened to be in the house, or on the premises at the time, was carefully destroyed. (Wilk. 2d ser. vol. ii. p. 140 : also 1st ser. vol. iii. pp. 42, 43.)

The Egyptians had an immense number of deities; gods were made of *the senses, the virtues, and of every abstract idea* which had reference to the deity or to man. *Intellect, might, wisdom, prudence, fortitude, &c.* were all deified. *The year, the month, the day, the very hour,* were all placed each under its own peculiar divinity. (Wilk. 2d ser. vol. i. p. 172.) *The sun, the moon, air, earth, the Nile, and the generative principle in nature,* were all deified and worshipped. Nay the dead were considered as identified with the gods; and a modified worship was rendered by every man to his deceased ancestors, represented by their mummies.

One instance, at least, has been found, of a Pharaoh standing, while yet living, and with his queen by his side, paying divine honours to the representative of his own body, embalmed as a mummy,—the symbol of his own future deification. (See Mons. Ampère, Rev. des Deux Mondes, Nov. 1846, p. 685.) Such were the religious tenets, and the practices prevailing among the

Egyptians. So, also, at Denderah the crocodile was abhorred, while at Ombos it was worshipped; and hence, at one time, cruel wars were waged between these two cities. In the second volume of his second series, on the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, Sir J. G. Wilkinson tells us that “many serious quarrels ensued between whole towns and provinces, owing to the circumstance of a sacred animal having been killed, either from accident or design, by the inhabitants of a neighbouring district, where its worship was not acknowledged.” This, also, has been noticed by the same keen Roman satirist, Juvenal:

“ Numina vicinorum,
Odit uterque locus: cum solos dicit habendos
Esse deos, quos ipse colit.”— Juv. Sat. xv. 36.

See also Wilkinson, 2d series, vol. ii. p. 159.

ancient Egyptians, the result of their boasted wisdom. Whatever may have been the excellence of the dogmas revealed to the initiated priesthood, under their symbols,—to the mass, to the whole nation, the teaching of Egyptian wisdom was that of polytheism, idolatry, and an utterly ridiculous superstition.

On the most splendid of their temples and their shrines, the gorgeous pictorial delineations, and the mysterious hieroglyphic records, practically read *Ἀγνωσιῶ Θεῶν*, *To the Unknown God*. The very wisdom of the Egyptians, so sadly perverted in all that relates to the object and the forms of worship, is one of the most significant of all proofs, that *to guide man aright, a revelation from heaven is indispensable*.

Again, 6th. *The ethical teaching of the ablest of ancient philosophers was of such a character, as to demonstrate the need of a divine revelation.*

On the fearful corruption of morals, generally prevalent among the nations of antiquity, and among the heathen of our own day, I shall not dwell; although the practical influence of the ethics inculcated by their teachers, is therein faithfully reflected. The ancient Egyptians were singularly blameless in their manners, so far as the evidence presented on their monuments goes to shew, and many admirable precepts of morality were embodied in their ritual of the dead.

A similar concession may be made, in regard to the comparatively pure morals prevailing in China.

The moral precepts which were but imperfectly set forth among the Egyptians, were all embodied by Moses, in his laws, and were therein placed in their true light, exhibited in their proper relations, grounded on just considerations, and sustained by the only appropriate authority.

But, if we except this dim glimmering of patriarchal light still lingering in Egypt, and possibly, also, among the mountain fastnesses of western China, the whole ancient world was shrouded in the thickest gloom of moral darkness.

Plato derived his best ethical notions from Egypt; and from Plato, Cicero, Seneca, and the other distinguished philosophers of Rome, and even of Greece, drew largely for their opinions in morals.

But, although each of these celebrated men laid down many just

principles, and wholesome rules, still, there is hardly any one vice which has not been vindicated and recommended by one or more of the illustrious sages of antiquity.

One recommends lying, in certain cases ; another justifies suicide ; and we know, that in their own conduct, an illustration of their moral code was often presented by contrast, rather than by conformity. Upon the *great mass* of society, their reasoning was *powerless*. To the multitude, their ethical system was unknown ; or if known, it was unintelligible.

The great mass of men, in all ages, are doomed to daily toil, through their whole life. They have neither leisure, nor ability, nor inclination, for abstruse speculation and nice reasoning.

The system of ethical philosophy, as taught by the ancient sages, is, after all, but the reasoning of fallible and imperfect men. It carries no authority. It will not induce a man to forego a coveted pleasure, when brought within his reach.

- In order to control the passions of men, and arouse conscience to vindicate the *right*, in opposition to the *desirable*, there must be presented a rule of duty not only plain, explicit, and intelligible, but also of *unquestionable authority*. Such rule *revelation alone can furnish*. The very nature, therefore, of the wisest teachings of the wisest men of antiquity, in morals, *shews the necessity for a revelation from God himself*.

Lastly, 7th. *The general sentiment of mankind betrays the expectation of a revelation, and does, therefore, bespeak its necessity*. Go where you may, among men, and you find some system of religious belief, and religious practices, which, however rude, are professedly derived from heaven. Egypt, ascribing her sacred rites to Isis, Osiris and Ptah. to Amoun, to Thoth and Khonsu, incarnations of the supreme monad ; China with its heaven-taught Confucius ; India with her Brahmins and her sacred books ; Numah, with his institutions enjoined upon him in his mysterious conferences with the nymph Egeria ; Mohammed, with his visions and his teacher-angel ; and the North American savage prophet with his dreams, and his voices of the Great Spirit, all combine to shew a deep-seated conviction in the human heart, that, in what relates to man's duties and responsibilities to his Maker, a supernatural guidance is desirable, is indeed necessary, and that the attainment of such guidance is not hopeless.

The best and the wisest among the ancient sages felt, and avowed the conviction, that, for men, divine guidance is needed.

Cicero expressed himself in a very striking manner.

Socrates is yet more explicit; he avows his despair of ever attaining to anything like certain knowledge in religion or in morals, until some divine teacher shall come to instruct us. His words are, "We must, of necessity wait, till some one from Him who careth for us, shall come and instruct us, how we ought to behave towards God and towards man." (See Faber's *Difficulties of Infidelity*.)

Plato, who had visited Egypt, and had been initiated into many of its sacred mysteries, still felt himself compelled to declare, "We cannot know, of ourselves, what petition will be pleasing to God, or what worship we should pay to him; but it is necessary that a lawgiver should be sent from heaven to instruct us." Such a divinely commissioned teacher Plato expected, and he adds: "Oh! how greatly do I desire to see that man, and who he is!" Plato even affirms, that *this lawgiver, or teacher, must be more than man, in order that he may teach us what man could not know by his own nature.*

Such were the convictions, so deep, so clear, in the minds of those most competent of all our race, in ancient times, to judge in the case, that supernatural instruction, directly from God, is needed for man, in all that pertains to religion and to moral duties. Thus we find that the polytheistic belief and the multifarious rites of ancient nations—the various pretences to a heaven-descended religion—the claims of impostors—and the aspirations of distinguished sages in time past, all combine to shew the *necessity for a divine revelation.* Every sacrifice offered on the face of the earth—every struggle of the victims slain, proclaimed the *need of revelation.* In this point of view, every gorguous pile erected and used as a temple, in Egypt or in India—every Grecian mystery—every Roman shrine, was an altar mutely pointing "*To the Unknown God,*" demonstrating the need of a revelation.

The mariner, who has navigated in safety the open ocean, and is now approaching an unknown coast, when he sees the rude breakers tossing and roaring between him and the desired port, and beholds before his eyes the fruits of self-confidence in others—

one vessel thumping upon the rocks—another stranded on the beach—another already beaten to pieces among the foaming breakers—readily admits his need of a pilot, and hoists his signal to secure one to guide him in safety through the unknown channel.

So also the necessity for revelation in all that pertains to religion and to moral duty, is betrayed by *“the instinct of religion characteristic of man everywhere; by the importance of the interests involved, because we are immortal; by the imperfection of our powers, and the limitation of our capacities; by the significant fact, also, that the free and appropriate exercise of these our powers is impeded by our evil passions, and the judgment is impaired by our corrupt tendencies;—while all this is yet further corroborated by the defective nature and the absurd character of the religions established among even the noblest nations of antiquity, the Egyptians pre-eminently. The morals taught by the wisest of merely human teachers have been grievously defective; and the morals prevailing in society, where unaided reason was the sole guide, have been yet worse than the precepts—have indeed been fearfully depraved. And lastly, the general sentiment of mankind, as expressed in the innumerable pretensions to an authoritative religion, and the hope, avowed by some of the most distinguished philosophers of antiquity, that some divine teacher would yet be commissioned of heaven to enlighten mankind—*all these considerations concentrate their force on one and the same point, and shew *the necessity for revelation, and the importance of it; and they shew also that the expectation of a revelation from God is rational and is well founded, since, without a revelation, all attempts at worship are directed to “an unknown God.”*

If no revelation has been vouchsafed to us, then we are floating on the vast ocean of existence ignorant of our origin, ignorant of our destiny, without direction, without guide—without hope—like a ship at sea without rudder, without charts, without compass, without any means of ascertaining her position, or of controlling her course, driven hither and thither, the sport of every tempest, helpless as a log, and completely at the mercy of the winds and the waves.

LECTURE III.

THE BIBLE IS A REVELATION FROM GOD.

2 TIM. III. 16.—“ All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.”

HAVING presented some of the considerations which go to prove the necessity for a revelation from God to man, I propose now to show that *the Bible is such a revelation*; that it is a divinely inspired book. I do not maintain merely that the Bible *contains a revelation*; for that might be true if only a small part were inspired (the Gospel of John, for instance), while the rest might be myth, or full of error, or it might be, at best, a beautiful human production. More, far more than this, we hold and shall maintain. We believe that all Scripture, the whole Bible, was, as an inspired apostle expressed it, “ *given by inspiration of God* ;” so that the Bible, from first to last, when rightly understood, is truth, pure truth, without any admixture of error. This is the one only point I propose now to illustrate. What is meant by the Scriptures, or the Bible, it is not necessary here to define. The sacred book is now in every house, and in the hands of every individual. It is well known to all. It includes the Old Testament, *i. e.* those writings ascribed to Moses and the Hebrew prophets, those books which have, in all ages, been counted sacred among the Jews; and also the New Testament, *i. e.* the four gospels, and the epistles or letters, ascribed to the apostles, Paul, James, Jude, Peter, and John, together with the book of Acts, and the Apocalypse or Revelation. All these have been received as divinely inspired, from the earliest ages of the Christian Church.

The Apocrypha we reject, because, though containing writings of unquestionable antiquity, the production of devout, and generally discreet men, yet the true marks of inspiration are wanting in the Apocrypha.

The books of the Old and New Testament are divinely inspired.

1st. *These books are of great, some of them of extreme antiquity.* We can satisfactorily trace them to the several æras when they claim to have been written.

The Bible is, as every one is aware, a collection of several distinct works, little books, or tracts, written on very different subjects, and by many different authors; at different periods, also, extending altogether over a space of about 1600 years, from Moses to John, the last of the apostles.

The writings of the New Testament can be satisfactorily traced, partly by venerable manuscripts, and partly by references to them, and by quotations from them in writers of established reputation, back to a period not very far removed from the time of the first planting of the Christian churches by the Apostles and the immediate disciples of Christ. This has been clearly proved by various industrious writers, and especially by Dr Lardner in his great work, "*The Credibility of the Gospel History*," in which that learned and impartial author has shewn, that the principal facts recorded in the New Testament are confirmed by passages of ancient authors who were contemporary with our Saviour, or his Apostles, or who lived near their time. Indeed, so numerous are the passages from different parts of the New Testament quoted in writers of the earlier ages of Christianity, that, were the New Testament lost, it might be almost fully restored by collecting these several quotations from it.

Again. Many proofs turn up incidentally, of the genuineness and truth of the New Testament writings; proofs found in allusions to men and events, to customs and to laws, peculiar to those times; which may be supposed well known to the writers of the times, but which a forger of spurious documents would be certain to have overlooked. This kind of evidence is presented with great force and beauty by Dr Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*. A striking instance of this kind of evidence has been recently adduced.

It had been objected by the celebrated German rationalist, Dr Strauss, and others, that by the inaccuracies in some of their statements, the New Testament writers had betrayed themselves, and furnished conclusive proofs that the books bearing the names

of these writers, were the product of a period considerably posterior to the apostolic age; because no writer of that time *could* have been ignorant of the real facts.

For instance, Luke calls Gallio "*Proconsul of Achaia.*" (Acts xviii. 12). We should not have expected it, since, though Achaia was originally a senatorial province, Tiberias had changed it into an imperial one, and the title of its governor was, therefore, *Procurator*. But now, a passage in Suetonius inform us, that Claudius had restored the province to the *Senate*: and thus, most unexpectedly it turns out, that Luke has given the correct designation.

Again. Luke calls Sergius Paulus *Governor of Cyprus* (Acts xiii. 4-7): yet we might have expected to find in Cyprus only a prætor, since Cyprus was an imperial province. In this case also (remarks the celebrated Dr Tholuck), the correctness of the historian has been remarkably attested. For *coins*, and later still, a passage in Dion Cassius, have been found, giving proof that Augustus restored this province to the Senate: and thus, as if purposely to vindicate the Evangelist, the old historian adds, "*thus proconsuls began to be sent into that island also.*" (Transl. from Tholuck, pp. 21, 22). In the same manner coins have been found proving that Luke is correct in some other passages of his writings, the accuracy of which had been disputed.

Is it not fair, then, to suppose, that other apparent discrepancies of the same order, may be eventually removed by similar evidence? (Edinb. Review, October 1849, p. 180.)

It has often been alleged by infidels, and the allegation is reiterated by Strauss, that in the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ, given by the Evangelists, irreconcilable contradictions occur, absolutely fatal to the whole story. Gilbert West, in his book on the Resurrection, has long since triumphantly refuted these very objections. Mitchell's "*Guide against Infidelity,*" may be consulted with advantage on this point (pp. 71-152).

As to the Old Testament, our copies correspond with those in possession of the Jews, and by them held in so great reverence, that many centuries since, the learned rabins counted every word and every letter in each of the books of which the Old Testament is composed; and so careful were they in transcribing copies of

their law, *i. e.* of the Old Testament scriptures, that if, in writing it out, the copyist omitted one letter, or introduced a superfluous one; or if the parchment became blotted, it was put aside as useless; the whole copy was regarded as spoiled. With such care employed from time immemorial, a mistake of any consequence was almost impossible.

Besides this, we have furnished us in the writings of Josephus, a learned Jew of the age next succeeding that of Christ, a list of the books held sacred by the Jews. It corresponds with that of the books making up the Old Testament as we have it. Josephus gave also a history of his nation, taken from the Jewish Scriptures of his day. That history corresponds, in all its leading facts, with the contents of the Old Testament now.

Furthermore, a Greek translation of the Old Testament had been extensively used, for two centuries before Josephus, among the Jews scattered in different provinces of the Roman empire in which the Greek language generally prevailed.

Moreover, the prophetic and the historical books do mutually illustrate and corroborate each other, furnishing also points of contact with the history of other nations of antiquity, and exhibiting a series of historical events running back to the times of Joshua, the immediate successor of Moses. The circumstances of the case are such, that deception and mistake are almost impossible.

For the authenticity of no ancient book extant is there evidence so abundant, varied, and satisfactory, as there is for that of the Bible, and especially for that of the five books of Moses.

The Bible, it is certain, contains the most ancient books now existing in the world: and the several documents of which it is composed, were demonstrably written at the times to which they are, respectively, ascribed. There is no room for the suspicion, that forgeries, of more modern date, may have been foisted in among them.

Again, 2d. *The Bible itself claims to be inspired.* Moses, in the laws he enacted, and the institutions he established for Israel, did, most explicitly and repeatedly declare, that he followed the instructions given to him by Jehovah himself (see Ex. iii. 7-10; vi. 1; vii. 1; Levit. vi. 1; viii. 1; xxv. 1. &c. Deut. xxvi.

16-18.) The Decalogue was proclaimed in audible tones from Mount Sinai, in the hearing of all Israel.

The Jewish prophets do, one and all, aver, that they spake and wrote only as the divine Spirit directed. They wrote from his dictation (Isa. i. 1, 10, 18; ii. 1; vi. 1; lxvi. 1; Jer. i. 2; ii. 1; vii. 1; Ezek. i. 1; vi. 1; xii. 1. Dan. ix. 12, 13, &c. &c.) Jesus Christ did unequivocally recognise the Jewish Scriptures, as divinely inspired. (See John v. 39. Luke xvi. 16; xix. 29.)

The Apostles tell us that the psalmist was a prophet (Acts ii. 30); and that the Holy Ghost spake by David (Acts iv. 25; Heb. iv. 7); by Joel (Acts ii. 17; compare also Heb. iii. 7, with Ps. xc. 7; and also Heb. ix. 7, 8, with Exod. xxx. 19, &c.) Yea, the Apostles tell us that *all Scripture* is given by *inspiration of God*: and Peter ranks the writings of Paul with *the other Scriptures* (2 Pet. iii. 15-16); while John pronounces a terrific curse on the man who shall add to, or take from, the words of the book written by inspiration (Rev. xxii. 19.) The books which go to make up our Bible, are venerable from their extreme antiquity; and unless the writers of them were shameless impostors, and wicked liars, these books are pure truth, having been penned, from first to last, under the teaching and the control of God himself.

But, 3d. *In the Bible nothing is found inconsistent with this high claim.* Not a few there are, in our day, who openly maintain that the Bible is but one among the many mythical systems of religion, which have originated in the remote antiquity of different nations; and that the lapse of time it is, which has gradually clothed with a supernatural garb events, simple and natural in their origin. Hence they boldly conclude the several books of the Bible *could not* have been written at the time ascribed to them, *because* a long succession of ages was requisite to introduce into the *tradition*, on which alone (as they contend) all these narratives must have been based, its *supernatural portion*.

It is obvious, however, that this pretended *philosophic* view of the subject rests upon nothing else than a *rash assumption*: an assumption contradicted by all the historical facts in the case; contradicted by the full proof which we have, that all these several

books *were written*, from the Apocalypse by John back to the five books of Moses, in the very ages to which they are severally ascribed.

But now compare the teachings of the Bible with the sacred myths of any other nation. The deities that figured on the Olympus of Greece, and were honoured in the Capitol at Rome, were shameless reprobates, whose intrigues, jealousies, meanness, and outrageous passions, would not be tolerated in *any* respectable society of *our* times.

In India, the religious system was, and it still is, a strange compound of mystical philosophy and gross indecency: while even the gravest and the purest of all ancient pagan mythologies—that prevailing over the whole valley of the Nile, embraced fables of the most puerile character, notwithstanding the matchless wisdom claimed for the hierarchy who taught it. Witness the travels of the goddess Isis, in search of the body of her murdered husband, the god Osiris; and the conflict of Isis and of her son Horus, with the dreaded god Tryphoon (the murderer of Osiris), to recover possession of the body. (See Sir J. G. Wilkinson's *Mann. and Cust. of the ancient Egyptians*, 2d series, vol. i. pp. 329-333.) No such childish fables are given in the Bible. Here there is nothing monstrous or unnatural; nothing, even, weak or frivolous; nothing merely human in the sentiments or the conduct attributed to the Deity.

The entire absence from the Bible of all such silly narratives, such impossible monstrosities, such degrading passions, and of such debasing views and revolting pictures, as abound in the myths of all, even the most intellectual and refined of the nations of antiquity, shows the immeasurable superiority of the Bible above all other of the so-called *sacred writings*, and it bespeaks, for the Bible, *an origin in truth*.

Again, 4th. *Not only is there, in the Bible, nothing inconsistent with a divine origin, but it is, in every point, worthy of its high claim.* This is true, whether you contemplate the *beautiful simplicity of its style*, the *majesty* with which it clothes every representation of the Deity, as a pure spirit, self-existent and indestructible, wise, just, and good; whether you look at the *pure morality* taught in the Bible, the *wonderful doctrines* it unfolds, the *wise maxims* it records, or the *reasonable duties* it enjoins. Every page

of this matchless book beams with wonders—wonders of wisdom and of kindness. It relates the most astonishing events with the calm simplicity of conscious truth. No exaggeration is found in this book; no laboured attempt at display; no effort to surprise. Its writers express themselves with the unmistakeable dignity of conviction. The representation given of God is *grand beyond compare*: and it is, in every point, a representation well comparing with the *Great First Cause*, “*with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.*”

The idea of creative might is presented with matchless simplicity and beauty: “*God said, Let there be light; and there was light.*” He called the whole universe into being with his word: “*He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.*” While the tenderness and compassion of the Deity are expressed with inimitable sweetness: “*Jehovah is merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth;*” yea, “*like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.*” Ps. ciii. 8, 13.

Where, in all the records of Egyptian wisdom, can you find sentiments like these? Where, amid all the reasonings of Grecian sages, or of Roman moralists, will you meet with so copious a treasury of sound, practical instruction as the book of Proverbs contains? And where, among all the learned of antiquity, or the polished and subtle disputants of Islamism, or of Buddhism, will you light upon views of the common brotherhood of all men, together with moral precepts so just, so reasonable, so all-comprehensive, and so kind, withal, as those with which the Bible abounds? “*Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,*” is a precept so unique yet so reasonable, so simple yet so comprehensive, as that it of itself may be said to stamp the book which first presented it with the unmistakeable marks of a divine origin.

View it on whatever side, and in whatsoever light you will, and the Bible stands forth as a document every way worthy of the high origin it claims. *It is from God*: it can have proceeded from none other.

Another kind of evidence is that—

Fifth, furnished by MIRACLES.

A miracle has been defined to be *a temporary suspension of the laws of nature*. For instance, the *dividing of the waters of*

the Red Sea. before the advancing bands of Israel, simply on the extension of his rod over the waters by Moses; *the falling down of the walls of Jericho* at the blowing of the rams' horns, by order of Joshua; *the sudden withering of the fig-tree* cursed by Christ; and the *walking of Christ upon the surface of the sea of Tiberias*, were all *miracles*, because these effects were brought about in such manner, as that the ordinary operation of the laws of nature was interrupted.

The laws of nature are those which God himself has established, and the operation of which continues unchanged, at all ordinary times, and in all places. To alter these laws, or to interrupt their regular operation, is beyond human power. If, on any occasion, these laws be interrupted or suspended, it must be because God, who impressed these laws upon the material universe, has so willed it. If on any occasion these laws have been interrupted at the bidding of mortal man, the fact of such interruption is itself a proof that the power so to do, has, for the occasion, been delegated to that man. In all nations, and in all ages, this has been felt and admitted. Nicodenus but expressed the instinctive feeling of every human mind, when he said to Jesus, "*No man can do these miracles, except God be with him.*"

Suppose you should see me step forth before you all,¹ and take my stand in front of this edifice; and while the heavens are clear and cloudless over our heads, I should command the clouds to assemble, and rain to fall copiously on one single well-defined spot (say over every inch of surface inclosed within the railings surrounding La Fayette Square, immediately fronting this structure, and not one drop to fall outside that inclosure), and that you should then see the thick masses of dark clouds suddenly coming up, and rapidly gathering overhead, and torrents of rain descending forthwith on that precise spot, and that only, not wetting even a hairbreadth beyond it, and then, at my bidding, you should see the rain instantly cease, the clouds disperse and disappear, leaving the heavens serene and bright as before. Or suppose you should, at my instance, follow me to your city cemetery, and see me there standing before the grave of one whom you had all seen a corpse, and seen there interred some three or four days antecedently; and

¹ Delivered in the Presbyterian Church, on La Fayette Square, New Orleans, January 1852

at my bidding you should see that buried corpse rise, bursting through the earth or the masonry that had been placed over it, and stand forth before you all, alive, healthy, active, and vigorous, as you had known that person for months and years previously; there is not one here, whatever be his theoretic sentiments, who would not feel convinced, for the time at least, that this had been done by the direct interference of God himself, and done to secure some important end. You would instinctively feel, this is a miracle; and could have been wrought only by the power of God.

It is true, some learned men have denied the occurrence, nay, even the possibility of miracles. The laws of nature, they tell us, are fixed and unchangeable, the sequence of cause and effect is invariably the same. And, therefore, every narrative which either asserts or implies a miracle, is necessarily false; or else, it is a myth, a mere fable, or an allegory.

All nations, they tell us, have had their myths; their early religious traditions encumbered with such fables; and why should the Jewish myths, Mosaic or Evangelic, be interpreted by any other rule? (See Strauss' Life of Jesus.) I answer: A bold denial is no argument. A mere assertion that the narratives of miracles found in the Bible, are myths, is no proof. The difference between the character and the occasion of the miracles related in the Bible, and the fables of heathen mythology, is great as that between light and darkness.

In the miracles recorded in the Bible, there is nothing puerile, nothing secret or clandestine, nothing ridiculous. They were wrought in open day, in the presence of many witnesses,—wrought on occasions of great moment, and of deep interest, and wrought for ends worthy of the interference of the Deity. They were wrought to punish gross wickedness, to protect the worshippers of the true God; wrought to prepare the way for the instruction of a select nation, and through them, for the instruction of *all mankind*, in truths of the highest importance to all,—truths which, as all history shews, men could in no other way obtain.

That there is an Intelligent First Cause of all things, that the laws of nature are those which he has seen fit to establish, and that he *can*, if he shall see fit, alter, modify, or suspend for a time, the operation of these laws, no sane mind can doubt.

• If now, *muta be immortal*, if a life of endless duration awaits

him after death, then the destinies of man stamp upon *him* a value immeasurably greater than that of the globe, or of any merely material masses, however vast, however diversified, how magnificently soever they may be arranged.

If man be immortal, then the occasional interruption of the operation of laws impressed upon merely material masses, was an expedient worthy to be employed by the Author of nature, as the very means which could best (perhaps the only means which could) arrest the attention of man, and prepare him to receive with full belief, for his guidance as to his eternal interests, the instruction so presented to him, because such interruption of the laws of nature furnishes attestation unequivocal and decisive, that the instruction so introduced came from God, his Maker; for, "*No man can perform a miracle except God be with him.*"

Such miraculous attestation Moses gave to Israel, in the plagues sent at his word upon Egypt,—in his leading Israel dry-shod through the Red Sea, while the hosts of Egypt, attempting to follow them, perished therein,—in the law given by him from Mount Sinai,—in his causing water to rush from the rock at Horeb; and on many other occasions.

Such attestations Joshua gave at Jericho, and in the preternatural lengthening of the day at the battle in the valley of Ajalon, Josh. x. 12, 13. Such attestation gave also Elijah, when in the presence of all Israel, the priests of Baal called in vain on their gods, while promptly in answer to Elijah's prayer, fire came down upon the altar, and licked up the water with which the victims and the altar had been saturated, and the very trenches around the altar were filled.

In regard to the Mosaic miracles, it is an absolute impossibility that the whole Jewish nation could have been deceived. The actual occurrence of the miracles recorded in the Pentateuch, and their occurrence *as* there recorded, furnishes the only rational explanation of the existence of the Jews, with all their peculiar rites, customs, and religious observances.

They who deny the miracles of Moses, are compelled to deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; because the acutest among all these sceptical deniers, see and admit, that if Moses, the Jewish lawgiver, did really write the Pentateuch, and deliver a copy of it in the presence of all the people, into the hands of the

priests, to be by them laid up in the sides of the ark, there to be preserved as a public and perpetual memorial of their early history, and of the origin of their peculiar religious rites (as in Deut. xxxi. 24-26, it is asserted that Moses did), then all the miracles must have taken place, just as therein related; and in that case, the Pentateuch is a true historic document. The authenticity of the Pentateuch, as the work of Moses, being once established, the accuracy of the narrative, and the truth of the miracles it records, follow inevitably. But *for* the authenticity of the Pentateuch, there is a body of evidence more direct, copious, and forcible, than there is for the genuineness of any book of antiquity.

In like manner, *the books of the New Testament* can be traced back to the times in which *they* claim to have been written. All the earliest writers who mention Christianity, agree in *dating the time when Christianity had its origin*, as the New Testament writers do. Furthermore, the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists are proved to be authentic and genuine, by the universally admitted fact, that the most ancient Christian writers—*even those contemporary with the Apostles*, as Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, &c.—make quotations from the books of the New Testament, and ascribe them to the Apostles of Jesus Christ. (See the Prelections of Michaelis.) Tertullian even appeals to the original manuscripts of the New Testament, as existing in his day. (Vide de Proscriptionibus, sec. 36.) A version of the New Testament in the Syriac language was made at a very early period, probably within less than a century after the time of the Apostles.

It is remarkable, also, that *the early opposers* of the gospel *did not deny the miracles* performed by Christ and his Apostles, but *sought to account for them by magic*, or by natural causes. This is distinctly proved from the writings of the early apologists for Christianity. Moreover, the controversies which arose, and the opposition to the gospel which was made in the early ages of the church, sprang, not from doubts regarding the divine origin of the gospels and the epistles, but rather, because in those early ages many desired to make the teachings of the New Testament accord to their preconceived notions and philosophical theories. (See Mitchell's Guide, pp. 174, 175.) Moreover, it has been shewn by Mr Babbage (9th Bridgwater Treatise) that, on the very prin-

ciples on which Hume based his celebrated objection against miracles, it is immensely more probable, even on the mathematical doctrine of chances, that miracles should occur, than that several independent witnesses should testify falsely to the same statement. The fact, then, being once established, that the miracles recorded in the Bible did really take place, proves conclusively that God, the author of nature, *has given his sanction to the Bible AS TRUE.*

But again, 6th. *Prophecy furnishes another, a distinct, and a conclusive evidence that the Bible is from God.* To foresee the occurrence of future and far distant events, is obviously beyond the utmost stretch of human sagacity. So many agencies are everywhere at work, beyond the control of man—so many influences, from unanticipated sources, may spring up to modify the result of any given series of events, that human foresight is speedily at fault; and although, under ordinary circumstances, *a probable conjecture* may be formed, and a prediction founded on such probability may now and then be verified, yet every one feels that *to predict with certainty, as to time and manner, events yet future, transcends the power of man.* When, in compliance with the earnest entreaty of Pharaoh, that the plague of frogs should be removed, and again that of flies, Moses had said, “*To-morrow shall the plague cease,*” the promise was a prediction; which, being verified at the time specified, Pharaoh knew full well could have been uttered only by inspiration from God. (Exod. viii. 10, 29.)

Isaiah predicted (Isa. xlv. 1-5; xiii. 1, 2, 17-22) the overthrow of the mighty Babylon, by Cyrus the Mede. Many years afterwards that prediction was verified to the very letter; clearly shewing that Isaiah had delivered his prophecy under the guidance of the omniscient Spirit, who alone seeth the end from the beginning. (Isa. xiii. 19, and compare Dan. v. 28-31.)

In like manner, the exact fulfilment of the predictions respecting the destruction of Tyre (Isa. xxiii.); of Sidon (Isa. xxiii.); of Nineveh (Zeph. ii. 13, 14, 15); and those denouncing the fall and degradation of Egypt, at that time the most powerful nation on the globe (Isa. xix.); the predictions uttered by Jesus Christ respecting the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, with all the unexampled horrors of that event—predictions uttered by Christ and recorded by the Evangelists, and published to the world many

years *before* the time of Titus and Vespasian; and the condition of the Jews to this day, a distinct race, scattered abroad everywhere among all the nations of the earth, and everywhere oppressed and despised, so precisely accordant to the reiterated predictions of their own ancient prophets (see Deut. xxviii. 63-66); *all* bespeak the controlling power of unerring wisdom, exerted upon the minds of the prophets, and of the writers of the several books of the Bible, and prove that Bible to be true—to be the *word of God*—the *dictate of inspiration*.

Again, 7th. *The influence upon mankind exerted by the Bible, proves it divine*; or at least well comports with the idea that it is divine.

A communication from God, professing to detail our duties, and to instruct us in truths of the highest importance, might well be expected to prove powerful in its influences, and eminently beneficial to man, far as the knowledge of it should extend; and such, in fact, we find to be the case.

Look the world throughout, and wherever you find civilisation, humanity to the defenceless and to enemies, combined with refinement of manners and dignity of sentiment, there you find the Bible known, and its doctrines promulgated.

To this, there are, I am well aware, some apparently signal exceptions.

In times of old, the Greeks and the Romans were, at one period, eminently civilised and refined; and yet they had no Bible.

True. But among both those people the corruption of morals was incredible; and the lack of humanity to the vanquished in war was extreme. *Witness* their *system of helotry*, with the barbarities it allowed in their domestic establishment; the head of each household having the power of life and of death over his children, and over his slaves—a power often exercised too. *Witness* also *the cruel atrocities practised* by the victorious army of Titus himself, the Delight of mankind though he was called, *on the miserable Jewish captives* crucified by thousands *around* the smoking ruins of the holy city, their beloved *Jerusalem*.

The Persians, Chaldeans, and Assyrians also, as ancient history declares, and as the recent explorations made among the ruins of Persepolis and of Nineveh attest, were nations eminently civilised, and yet they were idolaters, destitute of revelation.

True. But who shall say how far patriarchal tradition respecting the divine attributes and human duties, may have been preserved among these nations, an antidote to the influence of popular superstition, an incentive to noble sentiments and to noble deeds. The hints scattered over the prophetic pages, respecting the usages and the religious notions of these powerful nations of oriental antiquity, fully warrant the position, that the knowledge of the true God was not yet entirely lost among them. (See Dan. ii. 47 ; iv. 8-13, and v. 34-37 ; vi. 25-27, and Jonah iii. 5-9.)

The Chinese also, that great and wonderful nation, a world of humanity within itself, has, from an extreme antiquity, been distinguished by a peculiar civilisation. When Europe was occupied by tribes of rude barbarians, scattered here and there in feeble settlements among its forests, China was populous and powerful, was possessed of a literature and of laws. Even at that early period, China had made great advances in knowledge of the arts, and in useful inventions. In China the *mariner's compass* was even then employed, being attached to vehicles for the guidance of travellers crossing the vast steppes or deserts of Upper Asia. A very singular record, preserved in the ancient Chinese annals, assures us of this fact.

It is well known that the Chinese exhibit annals, or public registers of their empire, claiming an extreme antiquity as far back as B.C. 2300, some claim to B.C. 2600. They speak of an inscription of vast antiquity graven on a rock on the mountain Heng-chau, and ascribed to the emperor Yu, B.C. 2278. This time-worn inscription has been deciphered and copied into their public annals. These annals furnish another striking instance of early civilisation. In the reign of Choan-Kang, who is described as ascending the throne B.C. 2159, a great eclipse of the sun occurred. It was the duty of the royal astronomers to forewarn the monarch of the approach of such phenomena. The astronomers Ho and Hi, who then held that distinguished post, having failed to foretell this eclipse, were for this neglect both executed as traitors.¹ The

¹ See *Chine*, par M. Pauthier, p. 58. Also Du Halde's *China*, vol. i. p. 290. Also Bedford's *Scripture Chronology*, p. 88.

The Chinese annals inform us, that Hong-Chau, the mountain on the rock of which the inscription of Yu was found, almost obliterated by time, was a celebrated mountain in China, to which, in ancient times, their monarchs annually resorted to present sacri-

antiquity claimed for these Chinese annals is unquestionably too great, for the documents now existing among the Chinese, were chiefly compiled by Confucius about B.C. 530; yet it is plain that,

fice to the Supreme Intelligence. Of the inscription above referred to, copies have been published in Europe, accompanied by a French translation.

In 1839, when the learned Orientalist, M. Pauthier, published his work on China, none of the cuneiform inscriptions discovered at Babylon and Persepolis, nor of those found in Arabia Petrea and Syria, were regarded as older than the time of Semiramis (B.C. 2100); and as the researches of Lepsius in Egypt and Nubia had not then been made, this Chinese inscription was considered as the most ancient in the world. For, as no Egyptian monument had then been identified beyond the time of Sesostris, or Ramses the Great (B.C. 2278), the Chinese monument was older by several years. At the present time, an antiquity amounting to B.C. 2300, is claimed for some of the monuments of Egypt. (See *Chine*, par M. Pauthier, p. 53. Paris, 1839.) Nay, Egyptian monuments are by the resolute Lepsius, asserted to be existing as old as 2500 years before Abraham, *i. e.* B.C. 4300. (See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 1847, p. 1035.) We can, however, now add (Dec. 1851), that the still later researches of Mr Stuart Reginald Poole, the results of which have been published in London in his learned work, "*Horæ Egyptiacæ*," seem to prove satisfactorily from the evidence presented by the hieroglyphic inscriptions on the monuments themselves, that many of the Egyptian dynasties were really contemporaneous, and that the chronology of the Egyptian monuments, the true key to it being at length found, does actually corroborate, and very nearly coincide with the chronology of the Bible. To the truth and trustworthiness of the Egyptian chronology thus presented to the world by Mr Poole, Sir J. G. Wilkinson (than whom no man living is a more competent judge) has publicly given his attestation. Moreover, the astronomical calculations on which, in part, Mr Poole bases his system, have been examined, and their correctness has been ascertained and certified by Mr Airy, Astronomer Royal at Greenwich. (See Poole, *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, Preface, p. vii. and Introduction, p. xxii. note.)

The chronological question I reserve for fuller discussion hereafter. The facts only, or what are, in these Oriental annals, stated as facts, am I now concerned with.

In the Chinese annals we find the following curious statement:—

The emperor Yao began to reign B.C. 2357. In the 5th year of his reign (*i. e.* B.C. 2353) a strange event occurred. At the court of Yao there arrived from the South (*i. e.* from countries south of China), a stranger, a barbarian, of the family or race named Yoũ ã-tchång, bearing as a present a huge tortoise divine, aged 1000 years, and above two feet long, and about two feet broad, having on its back characters in writing, Kho-tòu, *i. e.* shaped like tadpoles (*à forme de têtards*), which characters comprised the history of the world, from the earliest times, until then. Yao ordered this strange text to be transcribed; and he named it Kou-ã-liè, *i. e.* Annals of the Tortoise.

Now, since the Egyptians and the Phœnicians were the only nations, who, at that early period, are known to have possessed the art of writing, the learned have concluded these stranger visitors must have been from the one or the other of those nations, most probably Phœnician; and that the strange writing was one of the books of Hermes. (See *Essai sur l'origine et la Formation similiaire des Ecritures Figuratives, Chinoises et Egyptiennes*, par Mon. G. Pauthier, p. 8. Paris, 1842.)

at a very early period, the Chinese were greatly advanced in civilisation.

Moreover, the books now revered by the Chinese as sacred, do, in the wise precepts they embody, give proof of the lingering remains of patriarchal tradition, even among this singular people.

Nor was this the only instance of the kind. Another is mentioned 1242 years later, of a communication of the same nation of Yoñ-èe-tchâng with China. This occurred in the 6th year of Tchung-ooáng, *i. e.* B.C. 1110. (See "Chine," par G. Pauthier, p. 87.) The text of the Chinese historian reads thus: "Certain persons, Yoñ-èe-tchâng came to the court." The annalist in the work entitled, "Li-tai-Ki-ssé," adds, "Yoñ-èe-tchâng is a maritime country of the South, from which three linguists, or interpreters, persons of the highest rank, came to present to the Emperor of China three white pheasants. Tcheoñ Koóng (the uncle of the Emperor, and also the prime minister), presented them *with chariots which indicated the south*" (*i. e.* furnished each with a mariner's compass, or an instrument constructed on like principles), in order to guide them on their return. The year following they set out on their journey. (Martin's China, vol. i. p. 191. Du Halde, vol. i. p. 274. See also Humboldt's Cosmos, vol. i. p. 180, vol. ii. p. 191.)

From the mention made in this curious record of *white pheasants*, birds found only in South Africa (Caffraria), learned men have supposed that these strangers must have been Egyptians. But, since this record, if at all authentic, must relate to events occurring about the time when vessels from Tyre and Sidon sailed to Ophir for gold for the temple of Solomon, it is not improbable that Phœnicians, accompanied by Jews, may have reached China at this early period, bearing with them some of the curious products of the countries they touched at on their voyage, and thus the art of writing may have been conveyed to China. (Essai sur l'Origine, &c. p. 10, and note.)

We know with certainty that Chinese bottles have been found in Egypt, in some of the tombs of high antiquity. Wilkinson's Man. and Cust. 1st series, vol. iii. pp. 106, 107. See Pickering on the Races, pp. 366, 373.

Writing certainly appears to have been in use in China at a very early period. The books possessed by the Chinese, and by them accounted sacred, are certainly very ancient, although it can (I think), be easily shewn, that the oldest of them all are considerably posterior to the earlier Jewish records. China furnishes no monuments to corroborate the claim to antiquity for their written books. Among the Chinese there was also at a very early period a kind of printing in use.

Besides other inventions which may fairly be ascribed to the Chinese, there is a *chemical preparation*, greatly resembling gunpowder, if it was not the thing itself. It is what by some other ancient writers is mentioned as "*the Grecian fire*," and which, as we learn from the Byzantine writers, was brought to Constantinople, A.D. 670, from Heliopolis in Egypt, by Callimachus. Heliopolis was then in possession of an Arab race; and it is argued with great plausibility, that the Arabs had acquired from the Chinese the knowledge of this preparation, which they introduced into Egypt. For among the Chinese have been found also very ancient traces of detonating arms, by them most expressively named *paò*. Indeed, the celebrated Remusat has found proof of the existence among the Chinese of ancient implements or arms resembling cannon.

(See No. VI. Mon. J. Ampère's "Recherches en Egypte et Nubie," in "Revue des Deux Mondes," pp. 410, 411. May, 1847. Paris.)

And we find, in fact, that among the earliest colonies sent forth from among the descendants of Noah, the posterity of Joktan spread towards the East (Gen. x. 29, 30.)

But notwithstanding all the advantages yielded her in her early civilisation, China has remained stationary for ages. She had no written revelation from God. But the once rude hordes of Europe, stimulated by the high truths which the Bible in their possession has diffused among them, have gradually advanced in knowledge, in civilisation, in all that can elevate man, until a mere handful of Bible-taught Europeans, with their energy and their warlike skill, have shewn themselves more than a match for China, and have even compelled the celestial empire to come to terms.

But the exception apparently the most complete, is furnished by the kingdom of the Pharaohs, the monumental records of which carry us back to an almost fabulous antiquity. Thus M. Ampère states, as the result of Egyptian researches up to Dec. 1847 (and chiefly those of the Baron Lepsius), monumental records running back so far as 2500 years *before Abraham*, *i. e.* to B.C. 4300 (*i. e.* 296 years before the date of Adam's creation, as calculated by Usher); and these records come down as low as to A.D. 250, covering a period, altogether, of 4550 years. (See *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Dec. 1847, p. 1035.)

Now, though we unhesitatingly deny this extreme antiquity, and think *we can positively disprove it*, yet these Egyptian monuments do unquestionably present to our astonished view, ample indication of high civilisation at a very remote period; of a knowledge of the fine arts, and, in justice we must add, of a system of ethics purer, more humane and more becoming, that can be found in any other nation on earth, unenlightened by the records of revealed truth. But it should also be observed, this high moral tone is characteristic chiefly of the *earlier ages* of the Pharaohs. As you ascend towards the era of the patriarchs, you find clearer proofs of a high moral sentiment. There is obvious indication of deterioration as you descend the stream of time.¹ This lends confirmation to the idea, that all there was of truth and of moral worth, embodied in the Egyptian's sacred lore, had been derived straight

¹ See the last Lecture in this work under the head, Early Civilisation.

from the patriarchs, and probably from Noah himself. As time rolled on, corruption crept into the system, and fable was super-added to tradition, until, even in the time of Moses, the creed of Egypt was but a chain of myths, strangely connected with a moral code still vastly superior to that of any other myth-loving people of antiquity.

The Pharaoh contemporary with Abraham, evidently had some knowledge of the true God, and revered his authority.

In the time of Joseph, the great-grandson of Abraham, Egypt seems to have risen to much higher power; yet her Pharaoh still respected the worshippers of Jehovah. But in the time of Moses everything was changed. It would seem that a new dynasty must, by that time, have seized upon the throne. State policy predominated over religious scruples, and the superstitions of the Nile reigned over the entire valley, fertilized by its singular waters.¹ But whatever light derived from patriarchal tradition may have still lingered, feebly glimmering among the nations of

¹ How strange these superstitions, how characteristic of the country, and totally unlike those of any other nations.

Thus at one time, obstinate and bloody warfare was maintained between the inhabitants of Ombos, who worshipped the crocodile, and the people of Denderah (where was found the celebrated Zodiac, which occasioned so much controversy in Europe, about thirty years since), who abhorred the crocodile. (See Ampère, in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, April 1848, p. 77.) Another distinctive characteristic of Egyptian superstition was, that the souls of deceased persons were believed to be absorbed in, or identified with Osiris, one of their chief deities, and the supreme judge of the dead: and in the funeral rites, the *dead* is often called *Osiris*. (*Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1849, p. 103.) Hence it was, that worship was paid to the dead by their descendants. Thus, on the monuments at Gournah, Ramses I. is represented as worshipped by his grandson. (*Id.* Dec. 1847, p. 1022.)

At Elithyia, in Upper Egypt, Amenophis III. (the same who is, by the Greeks, confounded with Memnon, represented by the twofold Colossus on the plains of Thebes), is represented as offering religious homage to his father, as one among the gods. (*Id.* April 1848, p. 71.)

The monuments at Silsilis exhibit similar representations of persons worshipping their deceased ancestors (p. 76.) In the magnificent temple formed by excavations in the rocks at Derr, in Nubia, Ramses the Great (b.c. 2278) is represented as one among the gods. (*Id.* Jan. 1849, p. 95.)

In this temple, and even in the sanctuary itself, Ramses is one, in a group of four gods, the other three being Pthah, Amoun, and Phrè: and what is still stranger, the name and sign of Ramses are appended to the side, both of the figure that offers the worship, and of the figures to whom it is offered. In other words, King Ramses is here depicted offering worship to the effigy of himself.

In the still more magnificent temple at Ipsamboul, higher up the Nile, in Nubia, a

antiquity, it seems to have, long since, become extinct over almost the entire world of mankind.

Certain it is that *now*, all nations on the globe that are desti-

similar representation is given, on a scale of colossal grandeur, of Ramses adoring himself, in the second hall of the great temple, to the left of the entrance. (Id. p. 105.)

Nay, as if to cap the climax of absurdities, and shew how utterly blinded men may be by superstition, in some of the inscriptions in the royal tombs, the kings alone are addressed in worship. Sometimes the kings are represented as receiving the prayers of men, and, as intercessors, presenting them to the gods; like the saints whose intercession with heaven is implored in the Catholic churches. And sometimes, even, it is *the gods*, who are represented on the monuments of Egypt, as themselves offering worship to the Pharaohs. (Id. p. 106.)

Another striking instance of this self-worship by the Pharaohs is presented in the hieroglyphics covering a large stone table connected with the great stone Sphinx near the pyramids of Gizeh. This tablet has been nearly covered with sand; but on the part yet exposed, is read the name Thoutmosis IV. behind the king who is presenting worship, and it is read also behind the Sphinx; that is to say, the king adored, for the Sphinx was a symbol of the king. (See Vyse on the Pyramids, vol. iii. Plate 8, and p. 114.)

M. Cavaglia dug away the sand before the great Sphinx, and he thus brought to light a small temple between the huge paws of the Sphinx, and on a stone tablet of this temple is recorded in hieroglyphics, a more recent name, that of Sesostris, doing homage to the Sphinx, which is here named Horus, identified with the sun, an emblem of royalty. (Id. Nov. 1846, p. 685. See Vyse, on Pyr. vol. iii. p. 115.) Nay, to shew that there can be no mistake in the matter, several of the monuments exhibit the names of priests, consecrated to the service of these Pharaohs, as to gods.

In possession of Clot Bey, a French physician in the service of the Pasha, M. Ampère saw a sarcophagus, on which is read the name *Menes*, the earliest Egyptian king. The person whose mummy once occupied this sarcophagus, was a priest, devoted to the service of several of the gods, whose names are read in the inscriptions. These gods, as enumerated on the sarcophagus are, Thot, Phtah, Osiris, and Menes. The man was a *priest of Menes*. (Id. March, 1847, p. 903.) Several similar instances are found, of the names of priests, devoted to the service of certain gods, amongst which the name of a Pharaoh stands, as one of the gods. So also, the Upper Nile was worshipped as a god, and as such it had priests devoted to its service. Thus at Syout, the present capital of Upper Egypt, anciently called Lycopolis, a large and magnificent sepulchre has been explored. It was the tomb of "*a priest of the Upper Nile.*" The Upper Nile, then, was honoured as a god, and as such it had priests specially consecrated to its service. (See Rev. des Deux Mondes, July 1847, p. 225.)

We may form some idea of the extent and magnificence of the tombs of Egypt, from this one fact, stated by M. Ampère. (Rev. des Deux Mondes, Dec. 1849, pp. 10-31.) The tomb of a priest, named Pétéménof, dug in the rock of the mountain near Assasif, exhibits three tiers of apartments, or three stories. It is more extensive than that of any of their kings, and is covered with hieroglyphics and with sculpture of the most beautiful execution. These sculptures and hieroglyphics, which cover the walls of the galleries and of the chambers, are spread over a surface, estimated by Sir J. G. Wilkinson to be upwards of 20,000 square feet, or nearly an acre and a quarter.

tute of the Bible, are ignorant of the true God, are debased by superstitions, often of the most revolting character, and exhibit a depravation of morals, startling, and positively appalling. *Not to this assertion does either India or China, at this day, furnish exceptions.* Wherever the Bible has been introduced by Christian Missionaries, it has become, even among the rudest tribes, the precursor of improved morals,—of marriage,—of the elevation of woman to something like her proper position,—of domestic purity and peace,—of agriculture,—of advancing civilization, and even of literature. It does away with cannibalism, with human sacrifices, and with infanticide. It has already saved from extinction tribes of men, which, by the cruel practices of heathenism, were fast dying out. Of these effects of the Bible, the Sandwich Islands, New Zealand, and sundry other island groups of Oceanica, are illustrations.

Surely, then, these happy and elevating influences flowing from the Bible, wherever it is made known, well and nobly comport with its high claim to a divine origin, and lend confirmation to the other and varied evidences that *the Bible is from God.*

For, 8th, and lastly. *The progress of time, while it may weaken some of the evidences for the truth of the Bible, strengthens other evidences, and constantly furnishes new proofs.* The evidence furnished by miracles, though more than all others, convincing to the original witnesses, and to their immediate successors, must necessarily lose somewhat of its force, the further we are removed by time, from the actual witnesses of them. Were miracles the *only* source of evidence for the truth of the Bible, the force of that evidence might, in time, die out, if no fresh miracles were wrought at intervals to strengthen and renew that evidence. But miracles constitute *one only*, among *many* sources of evidence for the truth of the Bible. Its sublime doctrines, its pure morality, its reasonable precepts, its adaptedness to the character and the circumstances of man everywhere and at all times; and its benign influence upon the individual and upon the community that receive it, furnish additional, forcible, and sometimes conclusive evidence. But we have also what the apostle calls, "*a more sure word of prophecy,*" whereunto we shall do well if we take heed. Prophecy must, in the nature of the case, be often obscure when delivered; and it may remain unintelligible until, from its unexpected fulfilment,

bursts a flood of light that shews at once the truth of the prophecy, and the inspiration of the book containing it.

The intimations concerning the manner of his death, that were occasionally given by Christ in his discourses, were utterly mysterious, even to his disciples. until they beheld the very person of their Master, whom they had seen dying on the cross, and then buried, a bloody corpse, in the tomb of Joseph, now again alive among them. Then all became plain. The predictions delivered by Christ, respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, must, when they heard their Master utter them, have been incomprehensible to the apostles. But those of them who survived that great national catastrophe, must have had their faith in the prescience of Jesus, and their faith in the divine warrant on which they themselves, as preachers of his gospel, were acting, greatly strengthened by the terrible scenes they witnessed, so minutely verifying the Saviour's prophecy. Says one :

“ If a transmitted revelation contain within its pages a prophecy of events, dark and unintelligible of itself, and therefore unfit to cause its own fulfilment ; and if, from time to time, facts occur, explaining instantly, by no circuitous or lengthened process, but clearly and explicitly, the mystic words ; if the explanation of that which till then was dark and mysterious, even to the learned and reflecting, flashes with spontaneous conviction on the minds of multitudes, who now discover for the first time the events to have been clearly predicted ; then, a revelation, however faint from the lapse of time, revives with renewed energy, and claims its reception with a force almost equal to that which it demanded from those to whom it was originally delivered.” (Mr Babbage, 9th Bridgw. Treat. ch. xi. pp. 133, 134.)

Such sudden flashing of conviction seems to have been felt by the 3000 on the day of Pentecost, when, under the address of Peter, they perceived that Jesus of Nazareth was their own Messiah, whose death and resurrection they now discerned had been predicted by the royal prophet David ; while in the miraculous gift of tongues possessed by the disciples before them, they beheld the shedding forth of God's Spirit, as predicted by Joel (Joel ii. 28, 29). So also the present aspect of the sites of ancient Sidon and Tyre—the recovered monuments of Nineveh—the desolate state of Babylon, and of the rock-built cities of Idumea—the en-

the past history and the present condition of the Jews—nay, the very monuments of Egypt (whatever their ultimate influence may be upon the mere question of chronology), are all so corroborative of the writings of the Jewish prophets, that a careful collation of the one with the other is continually flashing fresh and stronger conviction on the minds of many, and is every year brightening the evidence for the truth of the sacred oracles.

The results of learned research among the long-hidden records of the East, furnish also, every now and then, curious coincidences with the statements given in the old Hebrew Scriptures, well calculated to strengthen our confidence in the perfect truth of every part of the Bible.

Thus the annals, both of India and of China, speak of a terrific and utterly destructive flood, in times of remote antiquity; and the Hindoo account is almost an echo of the narrative of Moses. In the early Chinese annals mention is made also of a terrible famine over the whole land, that lasted for seven years, from B.C. 1766 to B.C. 1759. This is said to have occurred in the reign of one of their emperors (Tahin-thân, B.C. 1760), who must have been contemporary with Joseph, viceroy of Egypt.¹

¹ The account of the Flood, as presented in the Chinese annals, seems to describe a local inundation, though one vastly extensive and destructive. In reading this account, one can hardly fail to believe that the story is based upon some indefinite traditional rumour of the great Noachian deluge. This record stands in the book called Chou-King, under the reign of the Emperor Yaô, B.C. 2300. The historian says: "Immense waves rolled over the mountains and covered the hills. These formidable masses of water increased more and more, and threatened to submerge the very heavens." (*Chine*, par G. Pauthier, pp. 12, 13.) Mons. Pauthier contends that this is the description of a local inundation only, given in the exaggerated style of the East. Several inundations are spoken of in these old Chinese writings. (See also Du Halde's *China*, vol. i. p. 283.) The seven years' famine in China, from B.C. 1766 to 1759, under the Emperor Tahin-thân, is mentioned by Pauthier, pp. 65, 66, and also by Du Halde, vol. i. p. 299. London, 1736.

From the monuments of Egypt also incidental confirmation of the accuracy of the Jewish history is gathered. For instance: At Karnak, in Upper Egypt, Champollion discovered, on the south wall of the grand hall of the temple, among the paintings, a representation of the Egyptian Pharaoh Sesoneh, dragging to the feet of the gods a great number of human figures. Of these, each one bears on his breast, written, the name of the people and of the country of which he is a representative. Among them appears very distinctly, written on the breast of one of the figures, *Jaudh Malk*, or Melekh, with the sign beneath it denoting foreign land. These are two Hebrew words, *King of Judah*, written in Egyptian hieroglyphics; just as we write foreign words in Eng-

But there is yet one other point of view in which the progress of time sheds light upon the Bible, and furnishes additional evidence of its divine origin. I refer to the effect of the advancement of science. Many have supposed that improvements in science tend to invalidate the authority of the Bible; but it is not so. Various objections that once seemed formidable, *advancing science* has shewn to be *groundless*. We may, then, safely conclude, that the new difficulties which are now and then raised by modern science, in its various departments, will, when the bounds of human knowledge are yet more widely extended, be shewn to be equally baseless. Had the sacred writers expressed themselves in terms strictly comports with the *present state* of knowledge, their averments must, on many points, have been for ages unintelligible even to the learned, and apparently even false; and many forms of expression, adapted to the *present* state of knowledge, would no doubt, to our more enlightened successors, a few generations hence, appear fully as erroneous as do now those passages

lish characters—the *pachalic of Damascus*—the *Inca of Peru*. Now we read (1 Kings xiv. 25, 26; 2 Chron. xii. 3-9) that Shishak, King of Egypt, took Jerusalem, and carried off the treasury of King Rehoboam.

So that here an event about the end of the tenth century before Christ is recorded in the Book of Kings, and we find it corroborated by the Egyptian monuments: and the name of this King of Egypt is found in its proper place, on the lists of Manetho. (Ampère, Rev. des Deux Mondes. Dec. 1847, pp. 1010, 1011.)

The very portrait of Rehoboam, or what is presumed to be his portrait, is found delineated on this wall at Karnak (Champollion Figeac, pl. 76. Champollion, Monuments, &c. Plates, vol. iii. Plate 305, fig. 3. See Wilkinson, vol. i. p. 137.)

Again, observes Mons. Ampère (Rev. May 1847, p. 414), when noticing the name of Potipherah, priest of On, or Heliopolis, whose daughter Joseph espoused: “The names of men, of women, of places mentioned in the book of Genesis, where the story relates to Egypt, abundantly shew the veracity of the old Hebrew chronicler; for all these names are of Coptic origin; their meaning is found in the Coptic language, which shews, at the same time also, that Coptic was really the language of ancient Egypt.

“Thus Phrahâ, of which we have made the name Pharaoh, means in Coptic, or Egyptian, the *sun*. This is the title which the kings of Egypt take in the hieroglyphic legends, where they are always assimilated to Horus. See the tablet between the paws of the great Sphynx. See Vyse, plate 8 of vol. iii. Vol. iii. p. 115.

“The name of honour conferred upon Joseph, Zophnath-paaneah (Gen. xli. 45), or Psonte-phanech, is not Hebrew, but Coptic, and its meaning is found only in that language.

“The same is true of the name *Moses*. Hebrew has no name like it—no words explaining its derivation; but *Mocha*, or rather *Mo-sheh*, in Coptic, signifies *issued from the waters*. And surely, the child drawn by Pharaoh’s daughter from the Nile, ought to bear an Egyptian, and not a Hebrew name?”

most strenuously objected to at present. As it is, truth is, in the Bible, expressed in terms adapted to popular apprehension : and the proper use of extending science is, to enable us to understand more accurately the real meaning of the sacred record. No one now objects to such expressions as those respecting the rising and setting of the sun, employed in adaptation to popular usage.

And when it is recollected, that the sacred writers could, of themselves, have viewed things, and spoken of them, only in accordance to the notions prevailing in the age and the country in which they lived, it is certainly amazing, it is another indication that their minds were controlled and directed by the *unerring mind*, that they have so expressed themselves (as *e. g.* Moses, in the account he has given in Genesis, chapter i. of the creation), as that while, from the very first, the main facts were all intelligible to any reader, yet the more widely the bounds of human knowledge are extended, the scriptural statements become, not obscure, unintelligible, and confused, but only the plainer, the more beautifully consistent and intelligible. The discoveries of geologists, which warrant the idea that this earth may have been in existence, and been subjected to several successive convulsions, that may have occupied a period stretching through thousands, nay, even millions of years, before man existed at all, must, it was at first supposed, bear with their entire weight against the Mosaic account of creation.

A closer examination of the Mosaic record shews these fears are groundless ; and leaves us only to admire the evidence of supernatural wisdom guiding the writer's pen in the manner in which the book of Genesis opens. The first and second verses of Genesis must certainly have been inspired ; for no mere human sagacity could have so framed the statement, as that from the first it should be intelligible as to the facts, that Jehovah is the creator of all things, and that the earth subsisted in other forms than the present, ere man appeared upon it ; while yet it clearly admits of an interval between the first production of this globe, and the creation of man upon it, long as the vast cycles which geological science may demand for the formation of all the several strata, with their numerous succession of vegetable and of animal deposits.

True, there are difficulties yet remaining. But the lessons of the past must be lost upon us ere we suffer our faith in the sacred

records to falter. Time has already cleared up many difficulties, once as formidable as these now appear.

We have, then, but to wait patiently, and time, and the researches of the learned, will eventually clear up the most perplexing of those difficulties yet in our way, and pour fresh light upon the sacred oracles, rendering plain what is now obscure, and placing the authority of the Bible, as a revelation from God, *on broader, firmer ground than ever.*

Revelation, which is necessarily obscure in some points from the first, and which moreover loses continually somewhat of its force from long transmission, does yet contain within itself the means of its own verification, so that *extending science and advancing knowledge* among men render its meaning but the plainer, and thus throws upon it and around it a light, the evidence of its truth, that shall become but the stronger and the clearer with the lapse of ages. Thus has it been with the Bible hitherto, and thus it will be doubtless in all time to come.

The fulfilment of prophecy, the researches of the learned, and the extension of human knowledge, are continually proclaiming, "ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD."

The Bible is made up of documents of a very great antiquity ; it claims to be inspired ; it betrays nothing at all inconsistent with this high claim, for there is in it nothing puerile, weak, or unbecoming ; it is, in every point, worthy of the origin it claims ; it is attested by many astonishing miracles ; it is supported by various and wonderful prophecies already fulfilled, and by others which are being fulfilled before our very eyes ; its divine origin is witnessed also by its admirable influence in promoting civilisation, humanity, and refinement among men ; and even TIME ITSELF, though it may seem to impair the lustre of its evidence in some points, does, in fact, yield a constantly increasing confirmation of its truth, and elucidation of its worth, as THE VERY VOICE OF GOD.

Conclusion. The one great lesson we hence learn is—"Hold fast to the truth." Be steadfast, be not carried about by every wind of doctrine. Let not your faith in this blessed book be shaken by the plausible objections which every sciolist can start.

The Bible is from God. It is the one sole light that heaven has vouchsafed to illumine our path to life's close. Amen.

LECTURE IV.

THE PENTATEUCH THE WORK OF MOSES, GENUINE AND AUTHENTIC.

THE Pentateuch is a designation familiarly applied to the first five books of the Bible, viz. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. The authority of the Pentateuch, as the work of Moses, and written by inspiration of God, has been held by the Christian church in all ages, and by the whole people of the Jews.

Such is the subject-matter of these books, their close connection one with another, and with all the other books of the Old Testament and of the New, that they constitute an appropriate and necessary introduction to all the rest of the Bible. Without the Pentateuch, the other books of Scripture would be unintelligible; for the Scriptures abound with assertions and allusions to events which are recorded in the Pentateuch and nowhere else; and without the Pentateuch these allusions would be wholly incomprehensible. Keep this fact in mind, and then consider the frequency with which, in nearly every part of the Bible, "*the book of the law*," "*the law of Moses*," and similar phrases are found, indicative of the highest respect; consider also the importance attached by the Jews to the promises of God made to them as a nation, promises found recorded only in the Pentateuch; and then call to mind also the frequency with which, in the New Testament, Jesus Christ, and his inspired apostles after him, refer to events recorded only in the Pentateuch, quote sentiments and doctrines as taught in *the law of Moses*, and which are found only in the Pentateuch. Remember, moreover, how frequently they reason from data, such as laws and precepts laid down in the Pentateuch, and nowhere else; and surely all this furnishes ample ground for the earnestness with which the friends of revelation have always contended for the divine origin of these five books, as the work of Moses and divinely inspired, and as the very foundation on which rests the whole structure of revealed

truth; and for the jealous solicitude with which the friends of the Bible, as the oracles of God, have ever guarded these venerable records from assaults designed to overthrow their authority.

But we find it confidently asserted, "The Pentateuch has not reached us in an authentic form." Again, "There is no evidence whatever that in the time of Moses there existed anywhere, on the face of the earth, *an alphabet* by which such a work as the Pentateuch could have been written and transmitted to posterity." "If the five books of the Pentateuch really had the origin which popular opinion has attributed to them, some mention of them would have been made in the Old or New Testaments; but *they are both silent on the subject*. They frequently speak of the *law of Moses*, but nowhere *name* the books of the Pentateuch."

Again, "At what time the old Hebrew alphabet was formed is not known; but it is of later date than the Phœnician, from which it is derived." Again, "The best authorities assure us that the Samaritan square letters, in which the Pentateuch first appears in history, were invented many centuries after Moses, and were probably adopted about the time of the Captivity." Again, it has been said, "We have no history of the Hebrew text by which it can be traced beyond the Babylonish captivity, one thousand years nearly after the epoch of Moses."

These are bold assertions certainly; that they are in reality baseless will be shewn. But the confidence with which these assertions are made, and the industrious activity with which they are disseminated in every part of our land, render it necessary to examine their force, and to vindicate anew the authenticity of the five books of Moses.

As to the art of writing, and the origin of written characters in which to express the various ideas presented to us in the books of Moses as they now exist, this is a matter not quite free from difficulty certainly, and hereafter I propose to discuss it more fully. At present it may be sufficient to observe, that, were it shewn beyond dispute that neither the Chinese, nor the Egyptians, nor any other pagan nation in those remote ages were in possession of what might with strict propriety be called *an alphabet*, but that they then wrote their records in symbolic signs, representing sounds or syllables, and sometimes distinct ideas, this would not prove that the Hebrews had no such alphabet. Because certain nations had no suitable alphabetical characters in which to write such a record

as the Pentateuch, it surely does not follow that no other people had such characters. If the Pentateuch can be actually traced back to the time of Moses (as we think it certainly can), then there was at that time some mode of writing suitable to be employed in the performance of such a work. If these characters did not exist before the time of Moses, then Moses must himself have invented them, or they must have been divinely taught to Moses. The fact that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch being once established, is itself full proof that, in the time of Moses, there did exist a suitable set of characters in which to write this great work.¹

The origin of those written characters, whether by the invention of Moses, or otherwise, is a separate and distinct question.

Suppose, now, it were proved beyond contradiction, that the characters in which was written the very oldest copy of the Pentateuch known in history, were invented many ages after the death of Moses,—that proved fact would not in the least invalidate the evidence for the authorship of Moses, as the writer of the Pentateuch. Because it is very plain that the copying out of an old document in new and more convenient characters, is neither incredible nor unheard of. The great work of the Baron Lepsius on Egyptian chronology, and the work of the learned Dr L. Ideler, entitled, *Handbook of Chronology*, both printed at Berlin, are both written in the German language, and yet they are both printed in the Roman characters in use with us, and not in the old German letters. Suppose, further, that an edition of all the works of Luther should be now printed in Roman letters, as more convenient than the usual German type, this republication of an old work in new characters, not in use at the place and the time when Luther lived, cannot in the least diminish the weight of the evidence which goes to shew that Luther wrote these books. So, if proved that the characters in which the very oldest copies of the Pentateuch may have been written were invented centuries after

¹ On this subject Lepsius has thus expressed himself:—"No one, now at least, in combating the old view that the inscriptions (on the rocks of Sinai) are traceable to the Israelites, would make use of the argument that the Israelites did not possess at that time a complete system of written characters, which was in frequent use. From the then state of things in Egypt, as we are now acquainted with them, and of which the Jews must have been cognizant in the fertile province of Goshen, it is wholly incredible that they did not possess a running hand as well as the Egyptians, however improbable it may be that, as has been supposed, they borrowed it in any degree from the hieratic character of the Egyptians."—(See Lepsius' *Tour from Thebes to Sinai*, pp. 88, 89.)

the death of Moses, that would not touch the question of the Mosaic authorship of that work. Ezra may, after the Captivity, have revised, corrected, and transcribed in more convenient and more generally intelligible characters, for publication, the five books of Moses, and the other sacred books of his nation that had been written and published many centuries before his time. It is even possible that the Pentateuch may have been originally written in an improved hieroglyphic character; and copied out in strictly alphabetic characters, only in the time of Ezra.

The authority of Professor Norton, of Harvard University, is given for the assertion that the evidence is sufficient to render it *probable*, that the Pentateuch was in existence about a century after the return of the Jews from their captivity, which was the year B.C. 536.

We are also very confidently told that most of the German and other continental writers in Europe regard the first nine or ten chapters of Genesis as *made up of vague data drawn from the mythical traditions of Asia and Egypt*. This last position is examined in detail in the Lecture on the Authority of Genesis, in this work.

Certain it is that De Wette, Strauss, and the other modern German rationalists and mythists, deny the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, especially of Genesis; and utterly scout the idea of its inspiration, as we understand that term.

The position is openly assumed, broadly stated, and confidently relied on by these learned writers, and it is perseveringly employed in all their criticisms and reasonings, on the teachings of these sacred books,—that “*a miracle is impossible*,” and that, *therefore*, a record containing the account of a miracle, is, so far, not historical,—it is a myth, a fable that has grown up and gained a place in popular tradition in the lapse of many ages; and that, *therefore*, “the Pentateuch, which abounds in narratives of such wonders, *could not have been written by Moses*, nor by any person contemporaneous with, or very soon following Moses; it *must* have been the production of a period later by many ages than any actor amid the scenes so described.”

Now this fundamental axiom of these German critics, viz. *that a miracle is impossible*, is a mere assertion, and the reasoning founded upon it is weak as the assertion is bold. It looks so

much like begging the whole question at issue, that the wonder is how any sensible man could commit himself to such reasoning. If there be a God, then a miracle is not impossible: because the power which established the laws of nature, is competent to alter, to destroy, or to suspend those laws. Whether miracles have actually occurred, is altogether a different question.

If man be immortal, he needs direction from an unerring source to aid him in his efforts to render that immortality a happy one. Such unerring source of wisdom is God alone. The necessities of man do, then, demand a revelation from his Maker; and a revelation, that it may gain credence, and accomplish its proper end, must be authenticated in such manner as shall render its divine origin clear and unquestionable.

Miracles furnish the very kind of authentication needed, and the best, perhaps the only mode of authentication practicable, because they bespeak the direct intervention of the God of nature, the God that made us, and to whom we must account.

It is moreover obvious, that the miracles recorded in the Pentateuch are of such a nature, and are so connected with the history given, and with the laws promulgated therein, that the history itself stands or falls with the miracles; and these miracles constitute one of the strongest proofs that Moses, and Moses alone, must have been the writer of these books.

It is certainly the received opinion throughout Christendom, and it now is, and it always has been the opinion of the great body of theologians in all countries, that the Pentateuch, substantially as we now have it, is the work of Moses, the inspired lawgiver of the Jews. This opinion has been maintained by such men as Eichhorn, Michaelis, Eckermann, Rosenmüller, Tholuck, Neander, &c. in continental Europe:—by such as Lightfoot, Stillingfleet, Prideaux, Graves, Butler, Faber, Horne, and a host of others among British writers; and in this country, by Professor Stuart, and nearly every theologian of note.

Moreover, it is a well-known and significant fact, that of those who once questioned the genuineness of these books, or of some part of them, not a few there are, who, after a laborious and careful investigation of the whole field of inquiry, have openly avowed their conviction that the Pentateuch is, substantially, the work of

Moses. Such was the case with the celebrated Le Clerk, and to some extent, also, with Nachtigal and Richard Simon.

The learned Hassé (see Rosenmüller, *Proleg. Pentat.* pp. 10, 11) once denied utterly the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, attributing it (as some now do) to the age of the closing exile; but long afterwards, he altered his opinion, and declared—“*It cannot be denied that the purity of language, the eloquence of style, and the poetic imagery discoverable in Genesis, betray the hand of Moses, and that the age of David (i. e. the writings produced in the age of David) presupposes the existence of the Mosaic writings.*”

The learned Michaelis, whose name is, of itself, in a question of this nature, equivalent to a host, thus writes—“*That Moses is the author of the five books usually called his, is the common opinion of Christians and Jews; and I regard it, not only as perfectly correct, but as certain as anything which can be known respecting the composition of any ancient book.*”

Another accomplished German scholar, in a treatise on the mythical interpretation of the sacred books, published but a few years since, asserts, that “*the Pentateuch, in its present form, must be ascribed to Moses alone.*”

Even the distinguished Hartmann, who is far enough from what we should deem strict orthodoxy on these points, freely admits that the mythical expounders of the sacred books have by no means made good their position, viz. that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses.

It is also well worth noting, that nearly all who have impugned the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch, had previously avowed opinions which compel them, for consistency's sake, to deny the authority of these books. Thus Vater, De Wette, Strauss, deny the possibility of miracles, and deny plenary inspiration. So also, in this country, and among British writers, they who deny the unity of the human races, and contend for a variety of distinct original races, created in several distinct localities; they also who yield to the extravagant claims for a high antiquity in China, India, Egypt, &c. dispute the genuineness of much of the received Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, and deny the Mosaic origin of at least the earlier chapters of Genesis.

Such bias, or previous commitment, is obviously unfavourable to impartial investigation, nay is incompatible with it.

The position is, then, here distinctly assumed. *The Pentateuch is a genuine work of Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver: and it is an authentic work, one to be relied on, because Moses was a prophet, inspired of God.*

If it was the work of Moses, then the Pentateuch must have been written during the sojourn of Israel in the wilderness, *i. e.* in the interval between the Exodus from Egypt and the entrance of Israel into Canaan. Yet the book of Genesis may, not improbably, have been written before the Exodus.

The whole argument for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch is thus beautifully presented by Ern. Fred. Car. Rosenmüller, in one brief sentence:—“*Pentateuchum Mosi auctori tribuit omnis Hebraica et Christiana antiquitas, rationibus quæ vel ex ipso ductæ sunt opere, vel aliis idoneis testimoniis nituntur.*” “All antiquity, Christian and Jewish, assigns the Pentateuch to Moses as its author, for reasons which are either drawn from the work itself, or which rest on other appropriate (sufficient) testimonies.”

Thus in plain terms it is declared (Deut. xxxi. 9-13; ver. 22, 24, 26), *this whole book, from the beginning to the end, was written by Moses*, and was delivered to the elders of the people and the priests, that it might be carefully preserved in the sanctuary of the tabernacle near the ark of the covenant, and read in the hearing of the people on certain solemn festival days. In various parts of the work itself, also, it is said, at one time, that certain laws, at another, that the narrative of certain events that had occurred, were, by Moses, *written in the book*. So, in Exod. xvii. 14, the plots and the doom of the Amalekites were, in obedience to divine command, *written by Moses in the book*. Such is the phraseology (the article being used), as to shew that the writer speaks of some one particular and well-known book.

Again, in Exod. xxiv. 4-7, after the promulgation of the moral law, the Decalogue, we read, “*Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah in the book of the covenant, which he read to all the people.*”

Other prescriptions afterwards superadded Moses was again directed to commit to writing (Exod. xxxiv. 27). Further, Moses

is said, in Numb. xxxiii. 1-2, to have regulated the movements of Israel in their journeyings, by divine command, and by the same command, to have recorded these movements. The book of Numbers closes with these words,—“*These are the commandments and judgments which Jehovah commanded by the hand of Moses unto the children of Israel, in the plains of Moab, near Jericho*” (Numb. xxxvi. 13).

In Deuteronomy, in which are given various explanations of, and additions to, former laws, Moses does, in his several addresses to the people, speak repeatedly of “*this law*,” and “*the book of this law*.” (See especially the 28th chapter, passim, and ver. 61.)

From all this it is plain that the writer of these books claims to be Moses, and asserts that Moses himself committed to writing the laws, and the instructions he had received from Jehovah, and had communicated to Israel; and also, that the books, or rolls containing these writings, Moses had himself delivered to the people.

Moreover, in very many places in the other and later books of the Old Testament, mention is made of “*the law*,” “*the law which Jehovah gave to Israel by Moses*.” Thus, Joshua was admonished, soon after the death of Moses, to “*observe the law given by Moses*,” and habitually to “*read in the book of the law of Moses*” (Josh. i. 7, 8).

So also, on a very solemn occasion, Joshua admonished the leaders of Israel (Josh. xxiii. 3-16) to do all things which were “*written in the book of the law of Moses*” (also ver. 6).

In the open comitia, or great assemblies of the people, held by Joshua, he publicly enumerated, as facts well known to all, the chief events recorded in the Pentateuch, detailing them in order. He also caused the people openly to renew their covenant to serve Jehovah, as their God, in obedience to the law given by Moses, and the account of this renewing of the covenant. he wrote, and added it to the book of the law of God (see Josh. xxiv. 26); which must be, beyond a doubt, the very book which, in chap. i. 7-8, and chap. xxiii. 6, and viii. 32, is spoken of as “*the book of the law of Moses*,” and again in Josh. viii. 34, as “*the book of the law*,” *i. e.* the Pentateuch. David, just before his death,

exhorts his son Solomon (1 Kings ii. 3), to observe all the precepts "*written in the law of Moses.*"

In 2 Kings xiv. 6, we are told that Amaziah, king of Judah, put to death the murderers of his father, but spared their children, as it is written (*i. e.* enjoined) "*in the book of the law of Moses.*" The words which follow, as expressing this injunction, are the very words found in Deut. xxiv. 16. In 2 Kings xxii. 8, we read of the finding in the temple, by Hilkiah the high-priest, of "*the book of the law,*" which, in the next chapter (xxiii. 2), is called "*the book of the covenant.*" In 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14 (which contains another account of this finding of the book of the law in the temple by Hilkiah), the book so found is called yet more distinctly "*the book of the law written by Moses;*" and from this book so found, Shaphan, the royal scribe, read before Josiah, the king, "*promises and threatenings,*" which could hardly have been any other than those found recorded in Levit. xxvi. 3-15, and Deut. xxvii. 11, to the 68th verse of chapter xxviii. as will appear from a comparison of 2 Kings xxiii. 20-23, since Josiah directed the passover to be observed with all the solemnities, and all the rites, which were prescribed "*in the book of the covenant,*" found by Hilkiah; and then it is said in 2 Kings xxiii. 25, that no king arose equal to Josiah, *who turned to Jehovah with his whole heart, according TO ALL THE LAW OF MOSES.* From all this the inference is inevitable, the book of the covenant found by Hilkiah was the *Pentateuch*, the sacred writings which in Joshua, in the first book of Kings, and in the other Jewish Scriptures down to the time of Josiah, were so often mentioned as "*the law of Moses,*" "*the book of the law,*" "*the book of the covenant which Jehovah gave by Moses.*"

Hence it is plain that there is no ground for the position assumed by certain opposers of the Mosaic origin of the *Pentateuch*, who tell us that when, in the Jewish histories before the Captivity, we find such phrases as "*the law,*" "*the law of Moses,*" &c. it was an *oral law* merely, a traditionary history, and traditionary precepts alone, to which allusion was made; a series of prescriptions for the mode of Jewish worship, and for the regulation of manners, handed down by tradition, and not written, unless we except some detached fragments, such as, possibly, *the Decalogue*, the lists of names, or genealogies, and perhaps, also, a bare out-

line of the journeys, and the stoppings or encampments of Israel in the wilderness. Perhaps (they add) these detached written fragments, and these traditionary laws, had been collected together and arranged in order, and committed to writing by Hilkiah, in the document which he presented to King Josiah, under the plausible pretext that it was found by him in the temple.

These authors, ever fertile in conjecture, would have us believe that this book, originating in reality with Hilkiah, though published as the work of Moses, was afterwards revised, improved, and enlarged by Ezra, who finally issued it in the form in which we now have it. But this theory is wholly untenable. Apply in this case the axiom laid down by the celebrated De Wette as a canon of criticism, and by which the rationalistic interpretation is refuted. "*The only means of acquaintance with a history is the narrative we possess concerning it; and beyond that narrative the interpreter, or the commentator, or the critic, cannot go.*"

Of what Hilkiah did in this case we know absolutely nothing but what the narrative in 2 Kings and 2 Chron. tells us.

What authority has any one to say that Hilkiah forged a document, a new compilation of old fragments of history, and of the current traditions and popular legends respecting Israel and the rites of Levitical worship, and that he then palmed this forgery on Josiah as an ancient document, the work of Moses, and found by Hilkiah in the temple? This notion is a mere figment, a groundless fancy, an unsupported assumption, resorted to in order to avoid the necessity of attributing to Moses himself, as its author, the Pentateuch as we now have it.

The Jewish record says that Hilkiah found in the temple "*the book of the covenant of Jehovah.*" We must either receive this account just as it is given, or reject it altogether. If we reject the narrative, we know nothing at all about this book of the covenant produced by Hilkiah; and in that case, and then, of course, the objection against the existence of the Pentateuch as a written document before the time of Josiah, and that against its Mosaic origin, which is founded upon this narrative of the finding of *the book of the covenant* in the temple by Hilkiah, and its being presented by him to the king as a document before unknown to the Jewish monarch and to his court, fall at once to the ground.

The language in which, long before Hilkiah's time, "*the law*

of *Moses*” is alluded to in the Jewish sacred books, shews clearly it was a written, not an oral law, that is there intended: for it is again and again called “*the book of the law,*” or “*the book of the covenant which Jehovah gave to Israel by the hand of Moses.*” Now these allusions are found in passages taken from nearly every part of the whole Pentateuch, as the quotations already herein given may serve to shew.

This theory that Hilkiah palmed off upon the king a forgery of his own—a mere compilation of historical fragments and traditional legends—as a genuine work of Moses, is improbable in the extreme. It rests on one or the other of two suppositions. Either, 1st, That before Josiah’s time there was no written document known as the law of Moses—this we have seen to be contrary to the fact, as distinctly stated in Joshua and 1st book of Kings; or, 2d, That in consequence of the impiety prevailing during several of the preceding reigns, those of Ahaz, Manasseh, and Amon, the law had fallen into neglect; and that every copy of the law had been lost, until this document was produced by Hilkiah: nay, that even this must have been a mere fragment (probably chapters xxvii xxviii. xxix. and xxx. of Deuteronomy, containing the account of the renewing of the covenant on the plains of Moab. Compare 2 Kings xxii. 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, and ch. xxiii.; also 2 Chron. xxiv. 14, &c.), and that this fragment he used as the groundwork for the compilation he prepared and presented to the king.

But this supposition is entirely gratuitous; it is in contradiction of the narrative. Moreover, it is utterly incredible that every copy of the law of Moses should have been lost. Whatever the impiety of the Jewish monarch and his court, there must always have been found some persons among such a people as the Jews, and particularly in the corps of the priesthood, and among those of the tribe of Levi (a tribe entirely devoted to the duties of religion and to the Mosaic ritual), possessed of sufficient reverence for the God of their fathers, and for the institutions of their national faith, to preserve with care the records of that faith by them at the time possessed, and by them deemed authentic and even sacred. That in such a nation such documents should be unknown, even at the court, however idolatrous and dissipated

that court might be, is very improbable; but that every copy in the whole nation should have been lost, is utterly incredible.

But suppose that even this strange and improbable circumstance had occurred, viz. that every other copy of the law in the whole nation had been lost, it surely could not have been very difficult for Josiah, with the aid of distinguished scribes, such as Shaphan, and the more intelligent and studious among the members of the sacerdotal order, to determine the character of the document produced by Hilkiah, by an examination of its contents—a comparison of its prescriptions with the received traditions, and the established forms of worship—and especially from a comparison of its contents with the numerous passages in the book of Joshua, and the other authentic records of their national history in which allusions to, and quotations from “*the book of the law of Moses*” occur; unless, indeed, the advocates of the theory of Hilkiah’s forgery will shew also that Hilkiah altered and interpolated *all the sacred records* of his nation, from the time of Joshua to that of Josiah, in order to sustain and give plausibility to his forgery—a task that must certainly be hopeless.

The authenticity of the document produced by Hilkiah could have been readily ascertained at the time, and a forgery such as is now ascribed to him, would have been totally impracticable.

Nor must it be here forgotten, that the Pentateuch was the statute-book of the land of Israel. It was the fountain of law, the rule of justice, the reference for the settlement of all disputed rights and conflicting claims in all the courts of justice throughout the whole territory occupied by the nation, and by its every tribe. In such circumstances the supposition of the complete loss of every copy of the law of Moses involves a monstrous absurdity. Besides, it is certain that copies of the law were not unknown to Josiah, and to his immediate predecessors. Manasseh, his grandfather, after a career of great wickedness (see 2 Kings xxi. 1, 16, and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1, 11), repented, and turned and served zealously the God of his fathers (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, 19). This, as a Jewish monarch, implies his careful compliance with the precepts given in the Pentateuch. (See 2 Chron. xxxiii. 16.)

Moreover, this finding of “*the book of the covenant*” by Hilkiah occurred in the eighteenth year of the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 3, comp. ver. 8). But from his very accession to the throne, while

yet a mere child, Josiah honoured Jehovah, the God of his fathers, and copied the example of his illustrious ancestor David, engaging heartily in the effort to restore the worship of God in its purity. (See 2 Kings xxii. 2, 6). But this he could not have done without consulting "*the law of the Lord,*" i. e. the Pentateuch, the books of Moses so often referred to in the annals of his nation, and in the devotional songs composed by his royal ancestors David and Solomon, and which were chaunted daily in the temple service. In these annals and sacred songs, the Pentateuch was repeatedly designated as "*the law of Jehovah given by Moses.*" That sacred document it was, a copy of which was, by divine command, laid up in the sanctuary of Jehovah, close by (perhaps in) the ark of the covenant. (See Deut. xxxi. 9, and especially verses 25, 26). In addition to all this, this venerable document was, once every seven years, to be read at the feast of tabernacles, in the hearing of all Israel (Deut. xxxi. 9; 10. 11).

From all this it follows, that the Pentateuch, the book of the law given by Moses, could not have been unknown to Hilkiah, nor to Josiah or his court.

The whole history of Josiah supposes the existence of this work, as a work well known, publicly acknowledged, and revered as sacred by the monarch, and by his whole court. There is, therefore, great weight in the suggestion made by some among the learned, that "*the book of the law,*" found by Hilkiah in the house of the Lord, *was the original document,* the very copy of the Pentateuch delivered by Moses to the Levites, shortly before his death, to be by them laid up *in the side of the ark,* a perpetual memorial. (Deut. xxxi. 24-26.)

The finding of this precious document, THE AUTOGRAPHI PENTATEUCHI, *in the handwriting of Moses himself—the venerable prophet, the revered lawgiver of their nation, the founder of their faith,* may well be supposed to have produced no ordinary sensation at the Jewish court. Occurring as it did, also, at a time when the pious monarch was busily intent on effecting an entire reformation in the nation, and a complete restoration of the ancient worship in its original purity; and while that reformation was still incomplete, it would naturally awaken a deep interest, and call forth a more diligent search into the real provisions of the holy law, as detailed in this inestimable document.

All this will well account for the redoubled zeal manifested by the monarch, to ascertain wherein his reformation, yet in progress, was defective, and to insure its full completion, guided by the prescriptions laid down in this ancient, this authentic document, which had so long lain unconsulted in its sacred and almost forgotten repository. From the time of Joshua, the immediate successor of Moses, down to the reign of Josiah, the very time when, on such a subject, most obscurity might be expected, we meet, in the Jewish scriptures, with mention made of "*the law of Moses*," "*the law of the Lord*," "*the book of the law*," &c. In connection with these expressions we also find reference to circumstances, to doctrines, precepts, denunciations, and to rites and observances, as mentioned in that law, and which we can identify with passages in the Pentateuch as we now have it.

From Joshua to Hilckiah (about B.C. 624) this ancient document had been mentioned and referred to, and quoted from, in all the sacred books of the nation, the public and authentic registry of their history.

Nay, the great business of the reign of this very monarch, Josiah, had been to re-establish the rites and observances prescribed in this great work, the Pentateuch.

The book found by Hilckiah in the temple could not have been the Decalogue alone, as some have contended. It was not merely the 27th and 28th chapters of Deuteronomy, containing the curses, as others have argued: but it must have been a complete copy of the entire Pentateuch, as has been shewn by the learned *Bertholdt*, who remarks: "The solemn celebration of the passover by Josiah, according to the prescriptions of the book which Hilckiah had found, proves that this book (so found) was not Deuteronomy, nor any smaller subsequent compilation, *but the whole Pentateuch*. The directions respecting the passover that are found in Deuteronomy (see chap. xvi. 1-8) are few and incomplete. The principal laws concerning the feast of unleavened bread, which Josiah must have had before him when he gave directions for the celebration of his passover, are only to be found in Exod. xii. 1-20, and Numb. xxviii. 16-25." But Numbers and Exodus presuppose the existence of Genesis, which is introductory to them, and without which they are incomplete, and to a great extent unintelligible.

Furthermore, the readiness with which Josiah and his court received this new-found book of the law, the reverence with which the king consulted it, and the zeal with which he set himself to obey its directions for regulating the rites and observances of the national worship in the temple, all shew that this was not a *new work*, before unknown and unheard of, as De Wette, Norton, and others would persuade us. An anonymous work, of doubtful origin, and previously unknown, men are not wont to receive at once, as authoritative and divine; and that too, even to their own condemnation.

But if it was, as the whole history seems to imply, the venerable autograph copy of the Pentateuch, from the hand of Moses himself, which had been lying, for ages, in its sacred repository, in the sides of the ark; the discovery of this document, almost forgotten, perhaps, but which, when once brought to light, could easily be identified in that age, in that building (the temple at Jerusalem before the Captivity), and under those memorable circumstances, would necessarily awaken an interest strong and abiding in the breast of Josiah, and throughout his court; and thus the new impulse given by this discovery to the monarch's efforts, already previously commenced, for a thorough reformation of religion, is quite natural, and easily understood. The language employed in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14, in relating this discovery, seems to favour this idea of *an autograph document*. "*Hilkiah, the priest, found a book of the law of the Lord by Moses,*" where the word *written*, or *given*, by Moses, may well be supplied. Certain it is, however, that this could not have been *the first appearance* of the Pentateuch.

* In the *historical books* of the old Testament, *subsequent to the Captivity*, ample evidence is furnished that the Pentateuch was in existence at that time, and that it was considered as the work of Moses. When a part of the Jews had returned from Babylon to Judea, we read (Ezra iii. 2) that Jeshua the priest, and Zerubbabel, with their kindred and retainers, built the altar of "*The God of Israel,*" to offer burnt-offerings thereon, "*as it is written in the law of Moses, the man of God.*"

Now it is in Leviticus, chapter vi. and vii. &c. that the law regulating these burnt-offerings is found.

Again, at the dedication of the second temple, we are told

(Ezra vi. 18) they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, which is at Jerusalem, "*as it is written in the book of Moses.*"

With this record of what Ezra did, compare the directions found in Numb. iii. 6, &c. and chap. viii. 6-28. Nehemiah also, in the opening of the book bearing his name (see Neh. i. 7, &c. &c.), does, in prayer, confess the sins of Israel, in having neglected the institutions given by Moses; and then, he pleads, on behalf of the penitent Jews, the promises God had made by Moses, plainly referring to Levit. xxvi. 41. Deut. iv. 26, 27, 28; xxx. 1-5, &c. See especially Deut. xxx. 3-6.

These quotations bring us down to a period within about four centuries and a half before the nativity of Christ, and they completely establish this point: that, as in the time of Joshua, and Amaziah, and of Josiah, so now, after the return from captivity, there were extant among the Jews, books to which, as authoritative in the case, reference was made constantly and publicly, in all that related to the national worship and to public law; books from which were quoted promises and threats, as from Jehovah, the God of their fathers. It is also a point established, that *these books were*, by common consent, through all this long course of time, *attributed to Moses, the inspired legislator and prophet of the nation, as their author.*

And this opinion, be it remarked, was not that entertained by a few distinguished persons only. It was an opinion general throughout the nation; an opinion that had been handed down to them from their fathers, through a long succession of ages.

Great weight is added to this argument, from the fact, that through all this long course of time, everything relating to the civil polity and to the religious establishment of the Hebrews, had been regulated, even from the days of Joshua, in conformity with the directions given in the Pentateuch.

Sometimes, indeed, these sacred books had not been duly consulted, the directions therein contained had been occasionally neglected; but, after a time, abuses had been reformed, and a return had been made to the standard of duty laid down in the Pentateuch. Hence we find that *in the historical books* of the Jews, those leaders of the nation who conformed, and caused the people to conform to the laws of Moses, as given in the Pentateuch, are

commended. Those, on the contrary, who disregarded these laws, are severely censured. Moreover, the several national calamities that came upon them, and at one time, almost to their extinction, are all attributed, in these their national records, to the displeasure of Jehovah, in punishment of their neglect of these very laws contained only in the Pentateuch. *The writings of their prophets* also abound with comminations against those who should be guilty of neglecting, and with assurances of prosperity to those who should cheerfully obey the laws of Moses as given in the Pentateuch.

Yet further is it to be remarked, that *the festivals spoken of*, and the *religious solemnities recorded* or recommended in their historical books, and in the writings of their prophets, *are all such* as had been previously *instituted*, and for which ample directions are furnished *in the Pentateuch*.

Moreover, the authentic records of their national history, the devotional compositions of their sacred bards, used as anthems in the solemn services of their public worship, especially in the temple, and the writings of their prophets also, all contain frequent allusions to the covenant established with their pious ancestor, Abraham, as recorded in Genesis, and to events that occurred to their ancestors in Egypt, at the crossing of the Red Sea, and during their migrations in the great Arabian desert, and to the circumstances that attended the giving of the law, especially at Mount Sinai. These allusions are so numerous, so minutely particular, and so fully agreeing with the accounts given in Exodus, and the following books of the Pentateuch, as to shew that these five books, now attributed to Moses, and very much as we now have them, must have been extant, well known, and highly revered as sacred, among the Jews, during the whole period of their national existence, from the time of Joshua, immediately succeeding Moses, until the last of their acknowledged prophets, and the completion of even the last of these sacred books now found in our canon of the Old Testament.

This point might be largely illustrated by quotations from the Psalms, and all the prophets from Isaiah to Malachi. As a specimen only, examine the following: Josh. i. 7, &c., and compare Psalm i. 2; lxxxi. 3, 5, 10, 11, 12; Psalm lxvi. 5, 6, 7, 15; Psalm lxxvii. 5, 7, and 11-20; see the whole lxxviii. Psalm;

Psalm lxxx. 8 ; Psalm xcix. 6, 7, 8 ; ciii. 6, 7 ; Psalm cv. entire ; Psalm cxiv. Read carefully Psalm cxix. entire ; Psalm lxxviii. 2-15 ; Psalm lxxxi. 4-8, composed about the time of David. Read the whole of Psalm cv. composed perhaps in the time of Solomon ; also Psalm lxxviii. 1-55, of the time, probably, of Rehoboam, or Adonijah. See also Psalm cvi. composed about the time of the Captivity. Compare also 1 Chron. xvi. 8-23 ; xxii. 11, 13 ; 2 Kings xvii. 13, 15, 19. Passages of similar character, are, in the prophets, almost innumerable.

The passages in the Pentateuch referred to in these later books of the Jewish Scripture, are not there given literally ; for such was not the custom of the age : nor could it be expected, in those times, when copies of books were very scarce. Among the Jews, especially, such literal quotation could not be expected. They were accustomed to hear the law publicly read, at their solemn festivals. The impression made upon them would be rather deep as to the facts than minutely accurate as to the words : and this would be the case, even with their prophets and their kings, who must, from childhood, have mingled in the assemblies of the people, and on whose minds the impressions of early childhood, would, of course, be the deepest and most durable.

With this remark in view, compare Psalm lxxviii. 1, with Numb. x. 35 ; also Psalm xciv. 7, 8, with Numb. xiv. 22, 23 : compare Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7, and Numb. xiv. 18 ; with Psalm lxxxvi. 15 ; Psalm ciii. 8 ; Psalm cxlv. 8, also with Joel ii. 13, and Jonah iv. 2. Again, compare Numb. xxiii. 19, with 1 Sam. xv. 29.

No one, who will examine these several passages, can doubt that the writers of these Psalms, of 1 Samuel, of the books of Joel, and Amos and Jonah, do refer directly to the corresponding places in Exodus, in Numbers, and in Leviticus, respectively. The thought, the sentiment is given, and almost the very words.

Take a few more examples, and compare Hos. ix. 10, with Numb. xxv. 3 ; and Hos. xi. 8, with Gen. xix. 24, 25.

In Joel i. 9, 13, complaint is made that the meat-offerings and the drink-offerings were withheld from the priests and from the house of God. But the law prescribing these offerings is found in Levit. 2d chap. and in chap. vi. 14-23, &c.

Compare also, Amos ii. 9, with Numb. xxi. 20-30. Compare Amos iv. 10, with Exod. iv. 3, to Exod. xii. 29-31. Amos

iv. 11, with Gen. xix. 24-26. Compare Micah vi. 5, with Numb. xxii. 2, and to xxv. 5.

Compare also Micah vi. 6, with Levit. ix. 2, 3, &c. Isaiah (i. 11-14) enumerates feasts and religious rites, precisely such as in the Pentateuch are instituted and prescribed with great minuteness, in several places. Compare also Isaiah xii. 2, with Exod. xv. 2; compare Hos. iv. 13, and Deut. xii. 2; compare also Deut. xix. 14, and xxvii. 17, concerning the land-mark, with Prov. xxii. 28, and Prov. xxiii. 10.

Compare Hos. vi. 3, with Deut. xi. 14; and Hos. ix. 10, with Deut. xxxii. 10; also Hos. xiv. 3, with Exod. xxii. 22, 23, and with Deut. x. 18. Compare Amos ii. 7 (profane my holy name), with Levit. xx. 3; also Amos ii. 10, and v. 25, with Deut. xxix. 5; Deut. viii. 2. Compare Amos iii. 2, and Deut. xiv. 2; also Amos v. 11, with Deut. xxviii. 30.

These quotations from nearly all the books of the Jewish sacred writings might be greatly extended; but these are sufficient to shew that in the writings of the Jewish historians, prophets, and sacred songsters, the books of the Pentateuch are everywhere mentioned, referred to, or quoted, as the production of Moses, and as entitled to profound respect, because they constituted *the law of Jehovah*, the gift of heaven by the hand of Moses.

Such has been the belief of the Jews in all ages and in all lands: a belief handed down by tradition, and corroborated by those references to, and quotations from, the work, found in all their sacred books, from the earliest to the latest.

The evidence furnished by the Jewish apocryphal books, which, though not inspired, are yet quite ancient, goes to establish the same point.

When, at length, the Jews had become dispersed in great numbers among the different nations in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the ancient Hebrew, the language in which the Pentateuch and their other sacred books are written, was no longer familiarly spoken, a translation into Greek, then the prevailing language, was made by certain learned men, somewhere about B.C. 200, or possibly a little earlier. This translation, called the Septuagint, or version of the seventy, soon passed into extensive use among the Jews, and from this version, the writers of the New Testament frequently quote.

Josephus, the Jewish historian, a few years later than Christ, unquestionably recognised the Pentateuch as the work of Moses; and he represents this as the universal belief of the Jews, from the very time of Moses.

To a later period it is not necessary to pursue the argument.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, also, which is certainly very ancient, dating, at the latest, within a short period subsequent to the return from captivity, and not improbably considerably earlier, although its origin is not known with absolute certainty, is but a copy, in a different and probably an older set of characters (called by some the old Hebrew or Phœnician), of the very same books that compose the Pentateuch, as now found in the Hebrew Bible, and in the Septuagint version. The Samaritan Pentateuch differs, it is true, in some particulars, from the Hebrew; but it is sufficiently close in its resemblance, to lend strong confirmation to the doctrine of the *Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch*.

Of all the Jewish Scriptures the Samaritans received, as of divine authority, the Pentateuch alone; and that *on the very ground that it was the production of Moses*. After the revolt of the ten tribes, and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel, *Samaria*, the capital of Israel, sought to rival Jerusalem, the capital of Judah. A temple was erected on Mount Gerizim, and a rival worship was there established. But though it was the policy of the Kings of Israel to encourage attendance on the sacrifices and other rites of worship established at Samaria, so as to wean their subjects as much as possible from Judah, and the temple-worship at Jerusalem, yet in Samaria, as truly as in Jerusalem, the authority of "*the book of the law*," given by Moses, was recognised; and the prescriptions given in the Pentateuch were followed (except, perhaps, in the character of the priesthood) as the acknowledged law. (See John iv. 20, 22).

This great schism among the Hebrews, instead of furnishing the occasion for foisting in among the sacred books a spurious document as the production of Moses, must have presented increased and insuperable obstacles in the way of any such attempt. For instance, what King of Judah could possibly hope to succeed in the attempt at such a fraud, so long as the Kings of Israel and the people of Samaria could step forwards and expose it? Such attempt, if made by either Josiah or Ezra, would have been easily

and at once defeated by the Samaritans, who could and who *would* have said, "Up to the time of our separation into two distinct governments, we worshipped at the same shrine, we listened to the reading of the same sacred books. The books you now offer as the work of Moses, the leader and deliverer of our fathers from Egypt; and the promulgator of *all the laws* of our common religion, are a new production. We never heard of them before. Our old men know nothing of such a book. They have had no tradition of any such book handed down to them from their fathers. This work, unheard of until now, is certainly a forgery, it is a modern production, *it cannot be the work of Moses.*"

Such objections and such reasonings would certainly be offered, and they would be fatal to the attempt.

At no time, from the days of Joshua, would it have been possible for any man, or any body of men, to introduce among the Jewish sacred records a modern work, or a modern compilation of ancient fragments and traditions, and to gain for it the confidence and respect of the nation, as a work of Moses. The imposition would have been at once detected.

On solemn festival occasions, which frequently recurred, the books of Moses, *i. e.* the law, were publicly read in the hearing of all the people. (Deut. xxxi. 9-13, 22, 24, 26). The first attempt thus to read publicly a new production, as the work of Moses, must have produced immediate inquiry, and an exposure of the imposition. Hilkiah could not have succeeded in such a fraud, nor could Ezra; although it is highly probable that Ezra collected the sacred books, collated different copies, and prepared and brought into public use a revised and accurate copy of these books, and especially of the Pentateuch.¹

It is, moreover, not improbable, that in his revised edition of the sacred books, Ezra introduced the modern Hebrew characters now in use, as more convenient, in place of the old Samaritan (the Phœnician, as they are sometimes called), formerly used in copies of the law, and which are still found in the Samaritan copies of the Pentateuch. It is also highly probable that from the pen of Ezra (himself an inspired man), if not from the hand of Joshua

¹ "The great work of Ezra," says the learned Prideaux (see his *Connec. of Sac. and Prof. History*, vol. ii. p. 102), "was the collecting together, and setting forth, a correct edition of the Holy Scriptures. This both Christians and Jews give Ezra the credit of."

previously, originated those few passages in the Pentateuch (such, *e. g.* as the close of Deuteronomy, containing a brief account of the death and burial of Moses), which certainly could not have been written by Moses himself—passages on which some of the most popular objections against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch have been predicated.

In addition to the above argument, drawn from references to the facts stated and the language found in the Pentateuch, standing in all the several books of the later Jewish Scriptures, down to the close of the Old Testament canon, a *Christian* must regard it as decisive of the question, in that Jesus Christ does, in very many instances, speak of “*Moses*,” of “*the law of Moses*,” “*Moses and the prophets*,” so as to leave no doubt at all that he was familiar with the Pentateuch, as we now have it. Christ speaks of Abraham, of Lot, of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah. He speaks of Noah and the Deluge; of the bush burning unconsumed in the view of Moses; of the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness; and he speaks also of other incidents, and sayings, and institutions of Moses, almost innumerable; and he speaks of them as recorded in the books that Moses wrote. So far, then, from being true, that the Old Testament and the New are silent as to the Pentateuch, and its authorship by Moses, the Old Testament and the New are *full* of evidence that Moses was, and that Moses alone could be, the writer of those very books we call the Pentateuch.

It is egregious trifling to affirm, that *the other writers in the Bible frequently speak of the “law of Moses,” but they nowhere name the books of the Pentateuch.* The mere name by which a book is designated is of very little importance. The names of the several books, as given in our Bibles, are of modern origin. They are Greek—conferred, probably, by the Greek translators of the Old Testament. These names could not then have been applied to any of the several books composing the Pentateuch; nor could the designation, “*Pentateuch*,” which is also a word of Greek derivation, and of comparatively modern origin, have been applied to these books by any one of the writers of the Old Testament, and for the best of all reasons, *viz.* these names were not then in use at all; they were not invented until long after Malachi, the last of the prophets, was dead.

As to the writers of the New Testament, themselves Jews, the

phraseology current in the nation in their day, to designate the different portions of the sacred record, viz. "*Moses and the prophets,*" or "*the law and the prophets,*" or "*the law, the prophets, and the psalms,*" was necessarily by them employed. Even to this day, the Jews have never discovered any inclination to abandon their own national phraseology for that of foreigners and Gentiles; and least of all in relation to matters strictly Jewish, and connected with their religion and their law. To object to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, the fact that the modern names which are now applied to its several constituent parts were not employed by the ancient Jewish prophets, historians, and bards, in times preceding the first invention of those modern names, is surely a novel expedient.

It reminds one of the terms in which was couched the challenge made by the celebrated Prof. Agassiz (the only instance probably in which that distinguished naturalist has evinced ignorance of the true nature of the evidence he adduces to sustain the position he assumes—See *Christian Examiner* for July 1850) to the theologians, to produce from the Scriptures *a single text* in which the several varieties of colour, features, &c. now found distinguishing the Caucasian, the Negro, Mongul, &c. as different races *are asserted to have been derived from changes introduced in a primitively more uniform stock*. This is prescribing the mode in which alone a writer shall express his thoughts, and that mode one in which, from the very nature of things, that writer could not have contemplated the subject, because it is insisting that a doctrine cannot be taught in an ancient document, unless it be clothed in terms which could only have originated in, and which are inseparable from, the circumstances and the intellectual condition of a distinct, a different, and a greatly posterior age.

Others have contended that all the evidence adduced for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch fails to establish that point. They tell us, that although it may be true the frequent mention of "*the law of Moses,*" &c. made in the Jewish Scriptures before the captivity, and the passages from the Pentateuch cited in those Jewish Scriptures, and the allusions therein contained to laws and to customs, now found in the Pentateuch, and in the Pentateuch alone, do not prove that the Pentateuch was then existing a written document, much as we now possess it, and that it was then

attributed to Moses as its author ; but that all this well comports with the hypothesis, that the Pentateuch is a modern compilation, not older than the Captivity, and that it embodies, through the care of its skilful compilers, certain old traditions, and orally perpetuated laws, together with certain ancient historical fragments, some of which may possibly have been found recorded in a rude, hieroglyphic character, on some plastered altar, pillar, or wall, that had survived the desolations effected at the time of the captivity. *This is a bold hypothesis, but groundless and utterly improbable.* It is a hypothesis advanced in the teeth of many strong opposing facts. It is advanced for the sole purpose of sustaining a favourite theory, and giving plausibility to a foregone conclusion.

It is just about as reasonable a hypothesis as would be that which should maintain that the works of William Shakspeare, the great English dramatic bard, are not the veritable production of the witty and versatile deer-stealer in the age of the British Elizabeth, but that they are a much more modern production, from the hand of a more polished, though now unknown writer, who has skilfully embodied in his work all the witty sayings, and striking sentiments, and magnificent descriptions, and sublime imagery, floating in popular tradition, or found scattered over the pages of writers who flourished a little after the age of the bard of Avon, which traditions and fragments were generally attributed to that eccentric genius.

To maintain such hypothesis of the modern origin of the Pentateuch, is as if a person should undertake to shew that the Pilgrim's Progress and the Holy War were not written by John Bunyan, the poor tinker and Baptist preacher, who so long languished a prisoner in Bedford jail. Oh no ! the preaching tinker was an illiterate man, altogether unequal to the writing of works like these in their pure style of nervous Old Saxon English. John Bunyan (it might be said) was a wonderful man certainly, and endowed with no ordinary genius ; yet genius alone cannot form an accomplished writer. Bunyan doubtless threw out many striking thoughts, and detailed to his friends and associates some marvellous stories, in a singularly allegorical style : still these were mere detached fragments, orally delivered and orally propagated ; until some accomplished and modern admirer of this rude

native genius collected these traditionary allegories (just as Chatterton gave out that he had collected old British ballads, and as M'Pherson pretended that he had collected from the mouth of popular enthusiasm, the traditionary pieces he published as the Poems of Ossian), and reduced them to a regular system, giving them to the world, as we now have them, under the name of the Bedford tinker and preacher.

The refutation of such hypothesis would be effected in a mode precisely similar to that which we pursue in proving that the Pentateuch was written by Moses. That is, we shew that the work was in existence at several successive periods running back to the age of its reputed author, sustain this proof by references to the work, adduced from other authors, or by quotations in those authors from this work, as a work known and ascribed to Shakspeare, to Bunyan, or to Moses, as the case may be. This is all the evidence the case admits of, whether as to the Pilgrim, the Tempest, and Macbeth, &c. or the Pentateuch.

All tradition, and the evidence presented in the whole series of Jewish Scriptures, unite to shew that the Pentateuch, substantially as we now have it, was written by Moses. But if Moses wrote the Pentateuch, then it is a genuine and veracious historical document, and all the wonderful events it relates did really occur. If this be true, then Moses wrote by commission from God; he was divinely inspired. No man, assuredly, could induce a whole nation to receive such a book, and to receive it as containing both the history of their national origin, the law of their religion, the canon of their ritual in worship, and the statute-book of their whole land; and not only thus to receive it, but also to observe with most religious exactness, as the Israelites did for many ages, rites so numerous, so singular, so expensive (and so preposterous, too, if the narrative given in these books be false), unless that nation *knew, beyond a doubt*, that the whole series of events related in that book was true, and that the long succession of wonderful, and *until then*, unheard-of prodigies, *had really occurred before their own eyes, just as the book describes them*.

So plain is it that if Moses wrote the Pentateuch, then the events therein recorded must be true, marvellous though they were, that on this very ground the German mythical interpreters found their strongest, and, indeed, almost their only argument. They

reason thus : “ If Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch, the narrative it contains must be true : because no man could present to a nation a narrative of events which he therein declares had occurred to them, and appoint laws for the observance of certain rites, founded upon the truth of those events, and persuade that whole nation to receive such a book, and to adopt such rites as sacred, unless that people knew, with certainty, that the narrative was true. But the stories given in the Pentateuch *cannot be true*, because *a miracle is impossible*, and the Pentateuch relates as facts, the occurrence of many astounding miracles ; therefore the Pentateuch cannot be historically true, as to its facts ; and therefore the Pentateuch cannot have been written by Moses. It *must* be the production of a later age, after sufficient time had elapsed to allow the formation and general spread of rumours and traditions, becoming more and more marvellous as time rolled on, until they could, without obvious distortion, be presented in one continuous narrative of unparalleled prodigies, as now found in the Pentateuch.”

But certainly, we may reply, if a blank denial is thus to set aside all well-ascertained tradition, and the testimony of historical documents, then inquiry is fruitless, an argument is of no value. Notwithstanding the scepticism of German mythists in relation to the possibility of miracles, and notwithstanding also, their bold denial of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, we must still believe that the Pentateuch was written by Moses.

It is, moreover, well worthy of attentive notice, that *with its claim to Mosaic origin, the character of this venerable document well comports.*

The Pentateuch bears the impress of its reputed author, of the age in which he lived, of the admirable education he had received at the court of Egypt, and of the nations among whom he moved, and by whom he was surrounded. It may be safely asserted, that no man but Moses, or one educated as Moses was, and a contemporary of the age in which Moses certainly lived, could have written the Pentateuch.

In the descriptions therein given, and the allusions made to nations and tribes of men, to historical events, and to geographical matters—such as cities, rivers, countries—their climate, their productions, the prevailing customs of their inhabitants—and

especially in everything which, in these several respects, relates to Egypt and to the regions skirting the Arabian desert, these books exhibit ample and conclusive evidence that they are the work of one who had lived in Egypt, and who had been there most thoroughly educated in the era of Egypt's greatest glory and power.

This point might be largely illustrated, and it has indeed been well illustrated in the work of Hengstenberg, entitled "Egypt and the books of Moses;" also in "Egypt, her Testimony to the Truth," by Osburne; and in "*Recherches en Nubie et en Egypte*," by Ampère; to say nothing of older and more erudite authors. Moreover, the statements found in the Pentateuch concerning the transit of the Hebrews from Egypt, through the Red Sea, the transactions near Mount Sinai, and their wanderings from place to place for many long years in the great Arabian desert, and the circumstances detailed in connection with other events related in these books, are found to agree well with all that can be now ascertained relative to the places mentioned, as they must have been at that time. (See on this subject, "Tour from Thebes to Sinai," by Lepsius; *passim*. See Laborde's Arabia and Petra; fol. *passim*. Paris, 1830. See Robinson's Biblical Researches. See Lynch's Expedition to the Dead Sea.)

Another strong corroborative argument for the Mosaic authorship of these books may be thus stated :

The plan, the arrangement of the several parts of the Pentateuch, the character of the composition, the language and the very style in which it is written, all agree with the character of Moses, with that of the age in which he lived, and of the people for whom he wrote.

The earlier portions of this work, as Genesis and Exodus, are brief in their narrative, concise in style, and simple in structure. Nor is it by any means improbable, that in the earlier chapters of Genesis may be embodied some ancient oral traditions, and some fragmentary historic documents of a remote antiquity. These traditions and legends, if admitted by Moses in his work, were, doubtless, by him carefully selected from sources well known as authentic—reduced to order—and freed from all admixture of popular error and superstitious additions; and were thus by the same master-mind, Moses, so introduced in these books, as that they justly claim respect under the seal of divine inspiration; and

they demand attention, as constituting an introduction to the narrative of events subsequently declared in these books to have occurred in the writer's own time—an introduction indispensable to the right understanding of those events, and of their bearing on the interests of the nation for whom he wrote.

For, certainly, it is obvious that without the book of Genesis, the causes which led to the temporary residence of the Israelites in Egypt, their marvellous deliverance thence, their migrations in the wilderness, and their final settlement in Canaan, with all the astounding prodigies that attended this their exodus, their wanderings, and their permanent establishment, together with all the peculiar rites and institutions of religion adopted among the Israelites, are totally inexplicable.

The book of Genesis, therefore, and the opening of Exodus, constitute a necessary preface to the remainder of the Pentateuch: necessary to prepare the minds of the Israelites for rendering homage to Jehovah alone, as the Creator of heaven and earth—the God of their ancestors—in obedience to the laws in these very books declared to be appointed for them, on His authority.

Moreover, in the account given by Moses of the institution of these laws, he records only those facts in the Jewish history which must have been well known to every Israelite; facts which had given occasion to the enactment of these laws and to the institution of these peculiar rites, as for instance the institution of the Pass-over in Egypt; or facts which might well serve as a motive for the observance of the rites thus instituted, as, *e. g.* the destruction of Korah and his abettors.

The closing book of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy, is somewhat peculiar, but perfectly characteristic of the writer, and of the age to which it is attributed. It is more diffuse in its style than the other books, and it abounds with repetitions. It is, indeed, just such a production as we might look for from an old man, long habituated to govern and to guide a people still unsettled, somewhat rude, and often refractory; but whose interests lay near his heart.

In this book (says the learned Rosenmüller) we hear a leader near his end, recalling to the remembrance of his people, all the (wonderful) events which had occurred to them under his leadership, and earnestly exhorting them to the scrupulous observance

of those laws, and those institutions which, by divine authority, he had established among them; while, in some few instances, he repealed laws previously given, and appointed new ones. In Deuteronomy, he refers to three other books previously written, to the contents of which he appeals, and he urges the observance of the laws therein contained; and from the strange events therein recorded, he draws arguments and reasons for obedience to those laws.

So that, without a knowledge of these other books of the Pentateuch, the readers of Deuteronomy must be utterly at a loss to understand it. The several books that make up the Pentateuch, are, therefore, closely connected together: they constitute the parts of one whole, and any one of these parts being wanting, the work is incomplete.

The fragmentary character of a large portion of the Pentateuch, and the diversity of style found in the different portions of it, have been triumphantly appealed to,¹ as yielding proof that these books cannot be the work of Moses, nor of any one man, but of several persons, and probably at different and distant periods. On the contrary, we contend that the fragmentary character of a large part of the Pentateuch, and the very diversity of style distinguishing the earlier and the later portions of it, are precisely such as we might expect to find in an extended work, written by such a man as Moses, burdened with the cares of government, and continually wandering with a numerous and undisciplined people, from place to place.

The diversity of style perceptible in the different parts of this work will be found, on a dispassionate examination, to be no more than what the course of time and the progress of events in the long leadership of Moses over Israel, must necessarily have produced in the writings of the same man. Had these books been the production of different authors, or were the Pentateuch a mere compilation of old legends and fragmentary documents put together by one man, the style of the different portions of the work must have been greatly more varied,—betraying the authorship of several different hands. Rosenmüller has very briefly stated this point of the argument, thus,—speaking of the books follow-

¹ See Appendix to Two Lectures, &c., by Dr. J. C. N. pp. 114, 115. New York, 1849.

ing Genesis, he remarks : “ Ordo rationis non ubique commodus, et oratio ipsa progreditur scepe per disrupta sine nexu fragmenta, haud raro singulari clausula terminata : *quæ arguunt* (not a diversity of authors, but) *auctorem non continenter scribentem, sed scæpius interruptum, qualem novimus Mosen tot, tantisque negotiis obrutum, continuisque migrationibus distractum.*”—(Proleg. in Pent. p. 6.)

The style of the Pentateuch is certainly not uniform; the latter portion of it, and especially Deuteronomy, is more verbose, more impetuous, more hortatory, and more figurative : precisely what we might expect, if its author be Moses, then an old man, but still active, and deeply patriotic.

The learned Jahn has remarked, on this point : “ The order, the arrangement of the parts, is very peculiar. It is not strictly regular, and connected ; but often abrupt and almost unnatural ; it often consists of successive fragments, broken, unconnected, and these are sometimes wound up with distinct conclusions.”

This, also, is what we might look for, in the production of a man like Moses, distracted by a multiplicity of avocations, writing, not continuously, but with frequent interruptions ; and for that very reason, terminating different parts of his work with special conclusions. The latter portion of the Pentateuch partakes, obviously, of the character of a journal of passing events, interspersed with appropriate reflections, that are expressed mainly in the form of prescription, or of admonition.

This whole work bears the impress of the progress of years, during which, the writer, from varying circumstances, and advancing age, had changed his style and language ; sometimes writing with his own hand, sometimes dictating to an amanuensis, and sometimes, even incorporating into his work certain trustworthy ancient traditions, or extracts from public and authentic records. All this seems plain, and almost self-evident, and it will account for much of the diversity of style found in different portions of the Pentateuch.

Once more. The language in which the Pentateuch is written, Hebrew pure as in the best days of Jewish literature, has been appealed to as proof that Moses could not be the writer of the Pentateuch.

The argument is thus stated : “ *The Hebrew of the Pentateuch*

is almost identical with that of the later prophets; and yet it is very improbable that the Hebrew underwent no change during the space of a thousand years." And certain critics tell us that, in the books written about the time of the Captivity, we find forms of words, phrases, and unusual significations affixed to some words, identical with those found in the books attributed to Moses. (See Rosenm. *Proleg. to Pent.* p. 6, sec. 3.) So De Wette (*Intro. to Old Test.* vol. ii. p. 40) boldly asserts, "The authors of the (so-called) Mosaic books, betray themselves as living at a later age." De Wette is here speaking of the style, and peculiarities of forms, and of phrases occurring in the Pentateuch; and he adduces many particulars to sustain his position.

But, *in reply to this objection*, we aver: It is asserted by critics certainly as learned, as impartial, as candid, and every way as competent to judge, as was De Wette, or any one of all those who take the same ground with De Wette, that the language in which the Pentateuch is written, is certainly very ancient Hebrew; and it is, in many respects, peculiar. The few foreign words which occur in it, are obviously of Egyptian origin. There are very many words and phrases, peculiar to the Pentateuch, and which are not found at all in any of the later books of the Jewish Scriptures. Of these forms, or words, peculiar to the Pentateuch exclusively, the learned Jahn collected upwards of one hundred, and this list was, in a posthumous work of his, extended to above two hundred; while many other phrases, and words, and forms, occurring in the later Jewish writings, are not found at all in the Pentateuch.

The language in which the Pentateuch is written, is indeed very much like that employed in the Psalms, and even in the later Writings; but that there is a very perceptible difference—that the style of the Pentateuch is peculiar to itself in many important particulars, will be very obvious to any one who will attentively read, in his Hebrew Bible, several successive chapters in Genesis, in Exodus, and in Deuteronomy, and then read three or four of the Psalms, in different parts of the book, following it by reading portions in the books of Ezra, of Hosea, of Malachi. Obvious points of difference will be found, although it may not be easy to mention precisely wherein that difference lies, with the critical skill of Jahn or of Rosenmüller. All this notwithstanding, it is cheerfully con-

ceded that there is a great similarity between the Hebrew of the Pentateuch and that of the later books of the Jewish Scriptures; but not greater than might naturally be expected even in the writers of ages so wide apart, among a people like the Jews, who, separated from all other nations, by their religion, their laws, and their abhorrence of strangers, had very little intercourse with foreigners, and might, therefore, be expected to retain their language in greater purity, and for a longer period, than almost any other nation.

Besides all this, the books of Moses constituted not only the classics of their literature, but also the standard of their religious belief, and further still, their ecclesiastical canon, and the law of the land.

In their solemn religious assemblies, the books of Moses were continually read in the hearing of all the people.

In their courts of justice, also, and in all their legal proceedings, both civil and criminal, the *Pentateuch* was the statute-book, the authority uniformly appealed to.

All these circumstances would contribute to render the language, and the peculiar phrasology of the Pentateuch familiar to every Jew, and would tend to keep the language of that document pure, and unchanged, in current use.

Furthermore, from its very structure, it may, I think, be affirmed, that the Hebrew, like the most of the other oriental tongues, is less liable to corruption and to change, than are our Western dialects.

The Orient is proverbially stationary. Its customs, its opinions, and its languages, like the monuments of Egypt, furnish but slight indications of the effect produced by rolling ages.

Of the *Chinese language*, it is asserted by Dr Marshman (confessedly a competent judge in the case), that for 2000 years, Chinese writings show scarcely any perceptible change. The language employed in the works of Confucius, and that used by his commentators, 1500 years after him, exhibit no difference, unless it be that the master is more concise in his style than his disciples. The *language* is the same in both.

In the character of the *Arabic language*, a similar steadfastness is, by competent judges, said to appear. On a comparison

of the Koran with its later commentaries, there is found but little change in the Arabic, from the time of Mohammed.

Why, then, should the great resemblance in the language employed by David, by Solomon, or by the later prophets, to that of the Pentateuch, be deemed an objection to the Mosaic origin of that document?

Another objection, and the last I shall notice, is to this effect:—

Language is of slow growth; and ages are requisite to bring the dialect of a rude and unsettled tribe like the Hebrews to anything like the grace and flexibility of a perfect language. Now the Hebrew of the Pentateuch is equal to that of the best productions of the most prosperous age of Hebrew literature.

It is, therefore, utterly incredible, that one man, Moses, the very first writer in the language, and who alone raised himself to distinction, in a rude age, should have produced a work, which at once presented the language he used in a state of the highest perfection, equal to the noblest of all subsequent productions in that language.

But, now, a moment's reflection will shew that this objection carries but little, if any weight. The language of Homer, peculiar and characteristic though it be, is not inferior in vigour, in expressiveness, or in the flexibility of its forms, to the most polished productions of later ages.

Luther, by his writings, fixed the character of the modern German.

Shakspeare, together with the English version of the Bible, may be said, before and beyond all other works, to have established the standard of good English.

It is well known, also, that among the savage tribes roaming in the wilds of America, there are some whose languages are so perfect in their structure, exhibiting such variety in their combinations, declensions, and expressions, such copiousness, also, in their synonyms, as can scarcely be equalled, and certainly not excelled, by the most cultivated languages of Europe, or even of Asia. (See Humboldt.)

Let but a Luther, a Shakspeare, a Milton, or, above all, a *Moses*, arise in one of these tribes, and who shall say that his literary efforts would not result in a work, the standard of the language for many successive generations? Among a people like the Israel-

ites, rude indeed as to government, and the due appreciation of free institutions, and not rude as to the arts, literature, and civilization, since they emerged from the bosom of the most civilized nation then existing, it is not wonderful that Moses (certainly a man of genius, and thoroughly educated, aye, probably the finest scholar of that highly cultivated age) should, when composing a series of writings which embody doctrines so sublime, narratives so touching, events so various and so astounding, and laws so diversified and so copious as are found in the Pentateuch, have produced a work in which the language he employed at once appeared in almost its perfection, and became the standard of the tongue and the model of succeeding writers.

The purity of the Hebrew in which the Pentateuch is written, and the fragmentary character of its contents, do therefore, so far from furnishing ground of objection against the Mosaic origin of that document, rather confirm and complete the arguments adduced to prove that Moses did write the Pentateuch.

The language is the genuine old Hebrew, with some admixture, here and there, of Egyptian terms; just as we might expect to find in a work of Moses, himself a pure Hebrew, a man of pre-eminent genius, and of vast learning; but of learning acquired at the royal court of Egypt.

Such, then, is the character of the Pentateuch, both as to its language, its contents, its style, and its whole arrangement, that it is exactly the kind of document we might have looked for from Moses, a man of pure Hebrew descent, of commanding talents, great learning, and sound discretion, who, while burdened with many duties, often unavoidably interrupted, and harassed by frequent journeyings from place to place, in command of a turbulent multitude, busied himself in the composition of these books, at intervals, during the long period of forty years; and who wrote Deuteronomy last of all, when he was quite an old man, and near his end. On a careful review of the whole argument, we may safely aver: We have not so much evidence, by a great deal, nor evidence so direct, to shew that the Dialogues ascribed to Plato are really his work, or that the treatise "*On the Sublime*," is the work of Longinus, or that Virgil wrote the *Æneid* and the *Georgics*, nor that "*Othello*" is the genuine work of William Shakspeare, as we have to shew that Moses, the adopted son of Egypt's royal

house, the Hebrew-born protégé of Pharaoh's daughter, the Emancipator and the Legislator of Israel, did really write, and did deliver for safe keeping to the sacerdotal tribe in his nation, as his own work, his great legacy to his countrymen—the PENTATEUCH—substantially as we now have it.

LECTURE V.

GENESIS THE WORK OF MOSES, AND INSPIRED.

IN the preceding lecture was presented the course of reasoning deemed satisfactory in proof of the position that the first five books in the Bible, called the Pentateuch, or the books of Moses, were really written by the great Jewish lawgiver, and by him alone. But inasmuch as the main efforts of the sceptical are directed against the book of Genesis, to shake our confidence in its authenticity, and to shew that Moses did not write it, that point is discussed in the present lecture. In order that the reasoning which will be adduced to establish the Mosaic origin of the book of Genesis may be duly appreciated, it is here prefaced by a brief recapitulation of the argument for the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch, as one document. Thus :—

Among the books we have received from the Jews, and by them deemed sacred, are five, considered as constituting together one work, which is, by the Jews, unanimously, and has been, in all ages, attributed to their great lawgiver, Moses. This book, the Pentateuch, is obviously very ancient. It is introductory to all the other Jewish books ; and it forms the foundation on which rests the system of their faith, and their peculiar rites. It is spoken of, referred to, or quoted from, in all the other Jewish sacred books. On examining this work itself, we find the claim therein advanced, that Moses, the great Jewish lawgiver, did himself write it : and this claim is so put, as to cover the entire document, the whole of the five books of which the Pentateuch consists. This claim is fully corroborated by the manner in which, in every succeeding part of the Jewish Scriptures, from Joshua to Malachi, this document is referred to as “ *the law*,” “ *the law of the Lord*,” “ *the book of the law of Moses*.” That, by the phrases, “ *the law of Moses*,” “ *the book of the law*,” &c. so often occurring in all the

other writings of the Old Testament, reference is intended to the Pentateuch, the whole document including the five books, as we now have it, and not to any mere tradition, or oral law, or to any smaller fragmentary documents, is plain from the character of the phrases themselves, and from the connection in which they occur. This is also yet more obvious from the facts,—

1st. That Moses, on its completion, publicly delivered to the Levites a copy of his work, to be, by them, carefully deposited in the Ark of the Covenant; that it might, with that ark, be sacredly preserved in the sanctuary of their worship. (See Deut. xxxi. 24, 25, 26.)

2d. That it was to be publicly read before all the people, in certain solemn assemblies often recurring. (See Deut. xxxi. 10, 11.)

3d. That in the work itself, many wonderful prodigies are related, as of actual occurrence under the leadership of Moses, and as being well known to all the people.

4th. That on these facts the peculiar institutions of the Jews were based; and the motives to observe these institutions were drawn solely from the deep conviction of their truth.

In a case of this kind, imposition on a whole nation was out of the question. Moreover, this very document, the Pentateuch, was the statute-book of the land. It was the standard authority of jurisprudence, in the practice of the courts of justice, as well as the fountain-head of their religious faith.

This circumstance would, of itself, render imposition and the introduction, at any time, of forgeries, as the genuine work of Moses, doubly impossible.

At no period, from Joshua to the close of the Captivity, could such forgery have succeeded. Hilkiah did not palm, and he could not possibly have palmed, on King Josiah a forged document as the law of Moses. He produced, it is probable, from its ancient repository in the sides of the ark, where it had long lain almost forgotten, the autograph copy of the Pentateuch, in the handwriting of Moses himself. (See 2 Kings xxiii. 8; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.) Ezra did not impose on the people a compilation of his own, as the work of Moses; such forgery would have been impracticable. Ezra merely put forth a new and correct edition of the books of Moses; and probably in a copy, written out in the

present Hebrew letters, more modern, and deemed more convenient than the ancient Phœnician characters. A calm examination of all the facts in the case, will shew to any candid mind, that at no time after the death of Moses would it have been possible for any man, however distinguished, or however adroit, to palm upon the confidence of the people as the work of Moses any forged books, and to introduce such books into general use among them, in regulating the services of their temple-worship and the proceedings of their courts of justice.

There is not, for the authorship of any ancient book in existence, evidence so full, so complete, and so conclusive, as there is for the Moſaic origin of the Pentateuch. For, to avail myself of a brief argument presented by the industrious and judicious Jahn :—

1. The promulgation of no other ancient book was equally solemn, public, and known to all contemporaries.

2. The authorship of no *ancient* book is equally certain, or, in the prevalent scarcity of books, could be handed down to posterity with equal facility.

3. No other book was, like this, preserved in a public and sacred place, and hallowed by the reverence of an entire nation.

4. No other book received, like this, a public and perpetual testimony, from the public observance of laws contained in it, which were never totally and entirely neglected. For, be it remembered, the laws laid down in the Pentateuch were observed (and to this day, many of those laws are observed, so far as circumstances will permit, by Jews in every country under heaven), for these very reasons, that they were written in the books of Moses, and that they were by him promulgated, under authority from that God who created the universe, and who sent the deluge on a disobedient world; and who had given various ample promises to the patriarchs, a part of which he had already fulfilled; and who, finally, had performed many astonishing miracles in Egypt and in Arabia, as recorded in this very book, in favour of the Jews, their ancestors, as His own peculiar people.

Furthermore, when, after the death of Solomon, a schism took place in the Jewish nation, even then, among the schismatic Israelites, or Samaritans, a copy of the Pentateuch, as the work of Moses, the common lawgiver of the whole nation, was carefully preserved,

written in the old Phœnician characters. This work has ever been held in great reverence among the Samaritans, and it has been perpetuated to the present day. Of this Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch, a version in the more modern Samaritan dialect has long been in existence among them. This work, and its version, both agree substantially with the Hebrew Pentateuch.

Moreover, some century or two after the death of the last of the Hebrew prophets, a version of the whole Jewish Scriptures, and first and earliest of the Pentateuch, was published in Greek, which soon passed into very general use. This version is often quoted from in the New Testament. Josephus also, the Jewish historian, a little after the time of Christ, bears testimony to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, and gives an abstract of its history. Lastly, the language in which the Pentateuch is written, the pure old Hebrew, with a few Egyptian words intermixed, the intimate acquaintance which it shews its author to have possessed with the countries, the people, and the customs of those times, especially of Egypt, as it certainly was when Moses lived; and the arrangement of the subject matter contained in the Pentateuch, together with the fragmentary character of much of its contents, and the difference of style perceptible in the earlier and the later portions of the work,—all agree precisely with what we might look for in such a work, if Moses were the author; and all these circumstances are utterly inconsistent with the supposition of any other person than Moses being the author.

Against this strong body of evidence for the authorship of Moses, there is no contrary and contradictory evidence. They who refuse to admit the authorship of Moses, base their refusal mainly on the groundless assumption that a miracle is impossible; and the hypotheses they advance as to the authorship of the venerable Pentateuch, are as various as are their names.

In addition to all this is the fact, that everywhere in the New Testament the Pentateuch is spoken of as *the law*; it is referred to as the work of Moses; he is said to have *written* in the law; and the facts recorded, and the doctrines taught in this law in the Pentateuch, are referred to as taught by Moses; and they are argued from, both by Christ himself and by his Apostles, as undoubtedly true, and as given by inspiration from God. To all this fact must carry great weight. To a believer in the divine mission of

Jesus Christ, and in the inspiration of the New Testament writers, it is decisive.

As illustrations of this point, see John i. 17: "The law was given by Moses." In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Christ represents Abraham as saying: "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded," &c. (Luke xvi. 29, 31.) He argues that the *dead will rise*, from what Moses heard at the *burning bush*. (Luke xx. 37: compare Exod. iii. 1-6. *The perpetuity of the marriage bond*, Christ argues from the *law of Moses* (Matt. xix. 4, 7, 8: compare Gen. i. 27, and Deut. xxiv. 1, 2, 3, 4.) Christ speaks (John iii. 14) of the *lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness*. (Compare Num. xxi. 6, 9.) Christ refers to *Lot's escape from Sodom*. (Luke xvii. 28, 29: compare Gen. xix. 24, 25.) He speaks of the feeding of Israel with manna, in the wilderness, as an undoubted fact. (John vi. 31, 32: compare Exod. xvi. 14, 15, 35.) He asks of the Jews, "*Did not Moses give you the law?*" (John vii. 19.) In John v. 46, 47, Christ says to the Jews, "*Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me; but if ye believe not his writings,*" &c. This is decisive. Read also the dying speech of the martyr Stephen in Acts, 7th chap. See also 1 Cor. x. 2: compare Exod. xiv. 22, and 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13: compare Exod. xxxiv. 29, 33.

Such was the estimation in which the New Testament writers, and Jesus Christ himself, held the Pentateuch, as the *writing of Moses and the word of God*.

Surely, then, if any historical fact can be established, it is an established fact that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch. But if Moses wrote the Pentateuch, then the miracles it records are facts, genuine historical facts, not myths. They are sober truth, not fiction; and if so, then Moses, like all true prophets, wrote as "*he was moved by the Holy Ghost.*"

Against the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, however, many objections are urged, and on various grounds. But Genesis is included in the Pentateuch as a constituent part of it; and equally with the other four of these books it has, from the first, by Jews and Christians alike, been attributed to Moses. The evidence that it is the work of the Hebrew lawgiver is clear and cogent; nor can

Genesis be assigned to any other person as its author. It is found in every copy of the Old Testament, in every copy of the Pentateuch, and in every version of both. Almost as often as the other four books, it is recognised, appealed to, and quoted from, in the later writings of the Old Testament, and in those of the New. The objections now urged against its Mosaic origin are entirely of modern growth; and earnestly and ingeniously have many learned men laboured to prove it, or at least the first eleven chapters of it, to be the production of a time much later than the age of Moses.

The reasons for these strenuous and oft-repeated exertions to disprove the divine origin of Genesis, lie, doubtless, in the supposed contrariety of its statements to certain alleged facts in science; and in its undoubted contrariety to certain favourite hypotheses of scientific men.

And yet it requires but a very moderate degree of attention to the subject to satisfy a candid mind, that Genesis, just as we now have it—the first eleven chapters no less than the rest—must be included in the Pentateuch, as part and parcel of the work of Moses.

Genesis constitutes an appropriate, and indeed an indispensable introduction to the other books of the Pentateuch, and to the whole Bible; which would be lamentably incomplete, and to a great extent unintelligible, without it.

The argument presented by the learned Rosenmüller, to shew that Genesis was written by Moses, is so neat, and so brief, that I here give it entire, especially since it is conclusive as it is neat.

He first exhibits an epitome of the contents of Genesis, thus: The first book of the Pentateuch, known among the Jews as בְּרֵאשִׁית (Barai-shith), by the first Hebrew word with which it opens, and by the Greeks called Genesis, from its contents, which tell of the origin of all things, constitutes a kind of preface to the other four books, inasmuch as it contains the things necessary to be known, for understanding what is related in the other books, and what is there taught respecting the worship of the one God; and it prepares the mind for comprehending the nature and the bearing (*legum complexus*) of the laws promulgated in those four books following.

From the commencement of all things, and the first beginnings of the human race, this book traces the origin of the Hebrew

nation. After relating the dispersion of mankind over all the earth, the book restricts the history to the one family of Heber, and selecting Abraham as the hero (*versoque ad Abrahamum stylo*), the writer busies himself almost exclusively in the affairs of this one man and his descendants; selecting mostly those occurrences which are connected with the magnificent and reiterated promises of God made to those ancestors of the Hebrew nation, and to those actions of these men, by which their faith in God is illustrated. He points out the origin of the *customs* which prevailed among the Hebrews (as *e. g.* Gen. xxxii. 32, their abstaining from eating certain parts of an animal). He indicates, also, the origin of their *sacrifices*; and he gives the history of their *rites*, as, *e. g.* *circumcision*.

In the story of Joseph, this book is more diffuse, and it closes with his death; so that the Jewish readers might know how it happened that their ancestors had settled in Egypt.

That this book of Genesis was *written by Moses*, and by no other man, is argued, because, if Moses wrote the other four books of the Pentateuch, this first book, Genesis, must also, necessarily, have been written by the very same author, since it bears the closest connection with those other books; and *if you take Genesis away*, you will have a work incomplete and headless; a work without a proper commencement.

Without Genesis the Hebrews could not know who was the God of their fathers, whom, nevertheless, they honoured in various modes, as their king and their lawgiver. Without Genesis, they would be in utter ignorance as to what were those promises made by God to their ancestors, and of which mention is frequently made in the other books of Moses; as, *e. g.* the passages found in Exod. vi. 4; xiii. 5; Deut. i. 8; ix. 5; xxix. 13; xxx. 20; xxxiv. 4; refer to Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 18; xvii. 8; xxiv. 7; xxvi. 3, 4; i. 24.¹

When inculcating the observance of the primitive law for keeping holy the weekly Sabbath (Exod. xx. 11; xxxi. 16, 17),

¹ How great must be the force of a preconceived opinion, when De Wette, with these facts before him, ventures the assertion: "It might with equal propriety be said that Genesis was designed as an introduction to the Psalms, or to Ecclesiastes, as to the Levitical law. The book simply records the *uncertain* and *mythical* history of the Hebrew race from Adam till the descent to Egypt."—Intro. to the O. T. vol. ii. p. 31.

Moses does, most obviously, refer to the narrative given in Gen. ii. 2, 3. Moreover, in other respects, such an agreement may be noticed between Genesis and the other books of the Pentateuch, as would naturally be looked for, in the productions of one and the same author. As illustrative of this, compare the removal of the bones of Joseph from Egypt, related in Exod. xiii. 19, with Gen. i. 25. Compare also Levit. xvii. 14, with Gen. ix. 4; and compare Numb. xxiii. 24, and also Numb. xxiv. 19, with Gen. xlix. 9, and Deut. ii. 5, with Gen. xxxvi. 8: also, Deut. ii. 12, with Gen. xiv. 6, and Gen. xxxvi. 20: also, Deut. xxix. 28, with Gen. xix. 24.

It is remarked that the larger part of these passages in Genesis, referred to in the other books of Moses, are found in the latter portion of Genesis, the part after the eleventh chapter of Genesis (but yet Exod. xx. 11, and xxxi. 16, 17, refer to Gen. ii. 2, 3; and the prohibition of the eating of blood, Levit. xvii. 14, refers to Gen. ix. 14, &c.)

From this circumstance mainly, certain learned critics have advanced the idea that the first ten or eleven chapters of Genesis are the production of a much later age; probably about the time of the Captivity. But this view can by no means be sustained.

As this is a point of vital import, I beg attention to the considerations I shall present. These earlier chapters constitute an indispensable introduction to the rest, which cannot be understood without them.

These earlier chapters, also, are themselves distinctly referred to in several passages of the other four books of the Pentateuch, as well as in the later books of the Jewish Scriptures. In the New Testament, also, these references to Genesis, and to the contents of the first eleven chapters thereof, are frequent, distinct, and unequivocal; rendering it certain that Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the writers of the New Testament documents, received the whole book of Genesis just as it now stands in our Bibles, as the work of Moses, and an inspired book. If the New Testament is an inspired book, so also must the whole book of Genesis be inspired, and the production of Moses, undoubtedly.

Christ himself, when *explaining* the law of marriage, in Matt. xix. 4, 5, refers to Gen. i. 27, and Gen. ii. 24, and *quotes the very words*. In Matt. xxiv. 38, 39, *Christ refers also to the flood*, which

destroyed all living creatures on the face of the earth, except Noah, and those with him in the ark, as related in Gen. 7th chapter, compare Gen. vi. 10-13.

To this record of the flood Peter also refers, 2 Pet. ii. 5, and 2 Pet. iii. 6.

The *writer to the Hebrews* refers, in chap. xi. 3, to the *creation*, as given Gen. i. 1, 2; and in Heb. xi. 4, reference is made to the *offering presented by Abel*, and to his *murder by Cain*, as related in Gen. iv. 2-8. The *translation of Enoch*, recorded in Gen. v. 24, is mentioned Heb. xi. 5, and is also referred to by the *apostle Jude* (Jude, ver. 14.) *Paul*, also, in his letter to the Romans, mentions the *transgression of Adam*, the progenitor of the whole human race (Rom. v. 14, 16, 17, 18, and more particularly still in 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14), "*Adam was first formed; then Eve: and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression.*" Here reference is undoubtedly made to Gen. i. 27, Gen. ii. 7, and vers. 18, 20, 22, and to Gen. iii. 1, 7. Further illustration of this point were superfluous. If the New Testament can be authoritative in a case of this kind, then the point is settled; and the entire book of Genesis, the earlier no less than the later portion of it, is the work of Moses, and is an inspired document.

It is demonstrable that under the general designations, "*the law*," "*the law of Moses*," &c. so often occurring in all the historical books of the Jewish Scriptures, in the Psalms, and in the prophets, Genesis, no less than the other four books of the Pentateuch, was included. To make this plain, consult the following passages from these later books of the Old Testament, wherein various portions of Genesis are either directly quoted, or distinctly referred to. Thus Hos. vi. 7, "*They, like Adam (in our version, like men), have transgressed*," &c. see Job xxxi. 33: compare with Gen. iii. 9, 13. Again, with Psalm xlvi. 9; cv. 9, 42. Isa. xxix. 22; lxiii. 16. Ezek. xxxiii. 24, and Micah vii. 20: compare Gen. xii. 1-3, and also the 13th, 14th, and 17th chapters of Genesis.

Again, compare Joshua xxiv. 3, with Gen. xxxii. 9; xxvi. 3, 24. Further, compare Isaiah liv. 9, and Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, with Gen. vi. 8, and vii. 5; and again, Gen. viii. 20, 22. See also Joshua xxiv. 3, 4. 1 Chron. xvi. 16, and Psalm cv. 9; also Jer. xxxiii. 26; and with them compare Gen. xv. 4, 5; xvi. 2, 8. Gen.

xxi. 1, 4, 12 ; chap. xxv. 2, 3 ; xxvi. 2, 4. Compare also Isa. xli. 8, and 2 Chron. xx. 7, with Gen. xviii. 17, 18. Gen. xii. 2, 3 ; xvii. 2, 4, 7 : and compare also James ii. 23. Yet again with Hosea xii. 2, 3, 4, 12, compare Gen. xxv. 26 ; xxxii. 24, 28, and xxviii. 5. Still further, compare Hosea i. 10, with Gen. xxii. 17, and Gen. xxxii. 12 ; and compare Hosea xii. 4, with Gen. xxxii. 28.

To one who will examine into this subject, and inspect the passages which may be cited, it will be abundantly obvious, that in nearly all the books of the Old Testament and the New, Genesis—the former no less than the latter portion of it—is recognised as the writing of Moses, and the word of God.

But it is sometimes boldly contended that the *whole* of Genesis is not the work of Moses, because,

1st, A great part of its contents are of such a character, that Moses *could not* have written it of his own knowledge. He must have received the accounts respecting the creation, and respecting persons and events before the Deluge, *by tradition*, current in his times, and supposed to have been handed down from generation to generation : or else from old fragmentary written documents relating to those obscure events. And

Because, 2d, The book itself, as it now stands, shews unmistakable evidence of several different and distinct documents incorporated together.

This last hypothesis let us first examine, for much weight has of late years been attached to the notion that Genesis is composed, to a great extent, of pre-existing documents.

The celebrated Vitringa was probably one of the first, if not the very first, who suggested the idea of older fragmentary documents having been used in the compilation of Genesis. In a work published at Brussels in 1753, entitled, "*Conjectures sur les Memoires Originaux dont il paroît que Moÿse s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genese,*" &c. *i. e.* "Conjectures as to the Original Memoirs of which Moses availed himself in composing the book of Genesis," &c. by Astruc, this conjecture of Vitringa's was fully carried out, and the writer reckons twelve such original documents, larger or smaller. Eichhorn enumerated *two* such documents, and De Wette contents himself with two. Other learned men have advocated this notion ; and even Parcau, a living writer,

and a distinguished critic, considers it as "proved beyond a doubt, that the book of Genesis is formed of various fragments, written by divers authors, and merely *compiled* by Moses, and thus prefixed to his own history." But from this very fact, Pareau derives an argument for the truth and fidelity of Genesis, as a historical work.

The arguments on which rests this theory of older fragmentary documents having been used by Moses in composing Genesis, are briefly these:—

(1.) Every historian, in treating of times long antecedent to his own, resorts to more ancient documents as his authority; and why should not Moses?

(2.) It is entirely incredible that such lists of names and dates as are given in Genesis, chapters v. vi. x. and xi. could have been orally perpetuated. Brief written documents, or memoranda, seem more likely.

(3.) Genesis contains various repetitions, or double narratives of the same early events.

(4.) The various headings, inscriptions, or titles, found in the earlier chapters of Genesis (see ch. ii. 4; v. 1; vi. 9; x. 1; and xi. 27), seem to authorize the idea, that the portions so headed are distinct documents.

(5.) The variations of style perceptible in these several documents sustain this idea. The style is mostly different from that of Moses. (Compare Gen. 14th ch. and Gen. 23d ch.: compare also ch. 5th, with ch. 10th.)

(6.) Further corroboration is lent to this hypothesis, by the uniform use of the word *Jehovah*, as the name of the Supreme Deity, in certain of these passages or documents; and the like use of the word *Elohim*, as such name, in the others.

De Wette carries out this idea, and divides Genesis into two distinct parts, designated as the *Jehovah* document and the *Elohim* document. The latter he regards as the chief, or original work: the parts in which the name *Jehovah* occurs, he deems interpolations.

As specimens of these two alleged different original documents, take the following: As a part of the *Jehovah* document, in which the name *Jehovah* occurs, are adduced, Gen. vi. 5-7; vii. 1-6. As

a part of the *Elohim document*, in which the word *Elohim* occurs as the name of God, see Gen. vi. 12-22.

In these corresponding passages, the same event is related; but the narratives differ. It may be well to be reminded that when, in the Hebrew text, the word *Jehovah* occurs, it is generally, in our version, rendered *Lord*, and printed in capital letters; while the word *Elohim* is uniformly translated *God*.

To a sober-minded person, who has no favourite theory to sustain or to defend, it seems marvellous that learned critics should have spent so much time and labour in the attempt to establish this theory. The evidence is not sufficient to sustain it, and if it were, no result of any importance would follow. Most assuredly the distinct heading of several different portions of the work (as Gen. ii. 4; v. 1; vi. 9, &c.) does not prove diversity of authorship; for the peculiarity and the importance of these several passages, which are chiefly genealogical tables, may well demand separate headings, to distinguish them respectively.

Nor can the so-called repetitions of narratives establish diversity of authorship.

They are generally introduced as a fuller account, with more particulars of an event which has, in more general terms, been previously stated; and are well adapted to convey a clearer, because a more precise and a fuller idea of the event so detailed. As, *e. g.* the two several accounts of the creation of man, as found Gen. i. 27, 28, compared with Gen. ii. 7, and verses 18-23.

On these two passages a recent writer has remarked (see Dr J. C. Nott's *Two Lectures*, pp. 59, 60): "*Here we have two entirely distinct accounts of the creation of man, and directly contradicting each other.*"

The only rational explanation of these discrepancies which *can* be offered, adds this writer, is, that the Book of Genesis is nothing more than an assemblage of very ancient fragments (or traditions) of *uncertain origin*, put together without order, and *consequently of no historical value* (p. 60).

^s A rash assertion this, and totally groundless. The narratives of the creation of man, as given Gen. i. 27, 28, and again, Gen. ii. 7, and vers. 18, 23, are *distinct*, certainly, but not contradictory. The narrative in the first chapter states briefly the *fact*, that the first pair of the human race, man and woman both, were

created by God on the sixth day. But after the *close* of the sixth day the work of creation was ended, as expressed by the strong figure—God *rested* on the seventh day.

The second chapter relates the same event, viz. the creation of the first human pair, but with greater minuteness, and with sundry particulars as to the *mode* of their creation on the sixth day, and their immediate location in the garden of Eden, which could not well be introduced in the brief general account given in the first chapter, which was designed to teach us simply the fact, that the whole material universe was created by the God of Abraham ; and that at some undefined period, but in the brief space of six consecutive days, this our earth was by Him reduced to its present condition of sea and land,—surrounded by the atmosphere, illumined by the sun, moon, and stars,—covered with its luxuriant vegetation, and peopled by the countless tribes of living occupants, now swarming in its waters, roaming in its forests, and bounding over its plains, or flying through the yielding air ; and that on the sixth day man, in the first human pair, male and female, was produced, the last and crowning work of God on earth.

The *fact* of the creation of the first human pair, and of their creation by God on the sixth day, is alone stated in Genesis, first chapter.

The mode of their creation, and the habitation assigned them, are detailed in Gen. second chap. In the third chap. we are told that God had planted or arranged a garden in Eden for man's accommodation ; but it does not necessarily follow that this was done after the close of the sixth day. When (as is stated in Gen. i. 11) the earth was made on the third day to bring forth herbage, and trees of every variety, what should forbid the garden spot in Eden, designed for man's first abode, to produce on that day all the varied beauty that was to distinguish it ?

Moreover, if early on the morning of the sixth day, Adam was created of the dust of the earth (Gen. ii. 7), there would be ample time before night for the naming of the animals (Gen. ii. 19), and for his subsequent deep sleep and the formation of Eve.

But it is not absolutely necessary to suppose that this naming of the animals took place on the sixth day, or before the formation of Eve, even though it is said, verse 20, *after* the account of the naming of the animals, “ *for Adam there was not found a*

help meet for him," any more than it is necessary to suppose that the production of the beasts of the field out of the ground, and of the fowl of the air, was subsequent to the creation of man ; because in Gen. ii. 19 the production of the animals is again mentioned *after* the statement of the fact that no suitable companion for man was found. The beasts of the field were, no less than Adam, created on the sixth day, Gen. i. 24, 25, and *may possibly* have been created after man was formed, though the order observed in the first chapter leads us to suppose that the beasts of the field were produced before man. But the fowls, mentioned in Gen. ii. 19, in conjunction with the beasts, were certainly produced on the fifth day, as is expressly stated, Gen. i. 21 ; so that the supplementary narrative given in Gen. second chapter decides nothing as to the *order* of creation, but simply states the reasons why certain creative acts were put forth. For man, as lord of all on earth, the inferior animals were produced ; and since before as well as after their creation their nature and capabilities were all obvious to the Creator's eye—as none of the inferior creatures would be a suitable mate for man, and man would see this when all should pass in review before him ; therefore, of a rib taken from the side of the sleeping man, God formed the woman, and that on the sixth day, whether that forming of the woman preceded or followed the naming of the animals. The view here presented of the explanatory character of the supplementary narrative found in Genesis, is in accordance with the judgment of the soundest biblical expositors. Thus the learned Dr Lightfoot (Works, vol. ii. p. 11), when speaking of the production of vegetation on the third day of creation, remarks—“ *This day God plants the pleasant garden of Eden ;*” and in a note he adds, “ The story of Eden, Gen. ii. 9-14, should, in proper order, lie between verses 12 and 13 of this first chapter. But Moses hath reserved the history of that, to be handled at Adam's being placed in it, *because he would despatch his treatise of generals before he comes to particulars.*”

This one remark of the learned old Presbyterian divine Lightfoot furnishes a complete answer to all the objections so often and so ostentatiously urged against the double narratives, the fuller statement of particulars given by way of supplement to a history before more briefly recorded in Genesis, as, *e. g.* in this double narrative of man's creation, as found Gen. i. 27, 28, and Gen. ii.

7, 8, 21, 22. *Moses would despatch his treatment of generals before he comes to particulars.* It is the natural course to pursue—it is the logical order of arrangement.

These two narratives of man's creation are indeed separate and distinct, but *they are perfectly harmonious and consistent.* They are *not contradictory*, for the one is an amplification of the other—it is explanatory of it. And in every historical work we open, we find, towards the closing of one account, a statement in general terms of some important occurrence, which is afterwards related anew with ampler detail of particulars. Of this instances almost innumerable might be cited. So, as if treating of one of a number of quite ordinary cases of the kind as a thing quite natural and to be expected, Dr Lightfoot's opening remark (see his Works, vol. ii. p. 11) on the 2d chapter of Genesis is, "*This chapter is a particularizing upon some generals of the chapter preceding.*"

The various double narratives or repetitions of the same early event, as observed in Genesis, furnish, therefore, no ground of objection against the Mosaic authorship of the entire book.

Again, as to the hypothesis that separate fragmentary documents must have been used in the compilation of Genesis, so far as that hypothesis is founded on the use of two different designations for the Supreme Being, viz, *Jehovah* in some passages, and *Elohim* in others, it may be observed that this, although a somewhat remarkable circumstance, is not peculiar to Genesis nor to the Pentateuch. It is not unusual for the same writer to apply different designations to the same subject in different portions of the same work, and sometimes to use these designations indiscriminately. This may be noticed in several other books also of the Old Testament itself. For instance in *Jonah*, chap. iv. in verses 1, 4, the word *Jehovah* is used as the name of God; in ver. 6, he is styled *Jehovah Elohim*, the Lord God; in verses 7, 8, and 9, *Elohim* is used; and in ver. 10 *Jehovah* is again used. And yet no one would think of making out from this fact that the 4th chapter of *Jonah* is made up of several distinct documents, the work of different authors.

But the book of Genesis does itself furnish materials for the refutation of this theory of two fragmentary documents, distinguished by the exclusive use of the word *Jehovah* in the one, and *Elohim* in the other: for in the narrative, occupying the whole passage

from Gen. ii. 4 to the end of chapter iii., the compound designation *Jehovah Elohim* is used. And yet in the midst of the use of this compound name, Elohim is three times used by itself in Gen. iii. 1, 3, 5; and in the latter part of this same book, from and after chap. xxviii. ver. 10, the names of Elohim and Jehovah are used interchangeably and indiscriminately. This theory of a Jehovah document and an Elohim document is therefore unfounded.

But even if this theory were unanswerably demonstrated; if it were proved beyond successful contradiction that the entire book of Genesis is a mere compilation of fragmentary documents, or of such venerable documents combined with oral traditions interwoven with them; this would not affect the genuineness, nor detract from the value, of the book, as a work compiled by Moses. nor would it impair its authority as a true history in all particulars, a trustworthy document in all points. If with the other books of the Pentateuch, *Genesis was delivered to the Jews by Moses, that fact stamps the whole book as authentic and authoritative.* The character of Moses as an accurate historian, an upright man, and a prophet commissioned of God, is a full guarantee for the truth and accuracy of all that he solemnly delivered to the Jews, to be held as sacred books. Whether a compilation, or an original composition from his own pen, matters not,—delivered to the Jews by Moses, it is sacred, it is inspired, it forms a part of “*the law of Moses.*”

It is worthy of remark, that all the objections urged against the genuineness of Genesis as a work of Moses, are based on the assumption that the author was not inspired; that in writing this book, he must have sought his materials, and gained his information, *solely* from sources accessible to *any* writer of the times.

Admit the inspiration of Moses, and *all* these objections die at once.

Hence the difficulty raised on the ground of the impossibility that the writer of this book could of *his own knowledge* have recorded events occurring at so remote a period as the Deluge, and even in the family of Adam; and that therefore he *must* have collected old traditions, and even ancient written documents, since the long lists of names and dates in the geological tables could

not possibly have been perpetuated by mere oral tradition, is very easily set aside.

Moses gave to the Jews the whole Pentateuch, including *Genesis*, as a document truthful and trustworthy; as a document essential to the right understanding of the character and attributes of the God of their fathers; and as necessary to show them the relation they bore to the only true God, and the service they were required to render to him. In all this, Moses claimed to be acting under commission from the living God; the credentials of his mission being set forth in the wonderful events recorded in those books, the truth of which record was known to the whole nation.

On the truth of these recorded facts, Moses rested his high claim.

On the universal conviction, throughout the whole nation, that these facts *were* all true, known by almost every individual to be true, just as therein recorded, that high claim of Moses was admitted, and those books were received as a message from God. As such, they were carefully treasured up. A copy was kept, with the ark, in the very sanctuary of the nation.

Numerous other copies were made with extreme care, and were used frequently in the public reading of the laws and precepts therein contained.

These laws, and the institutions set forth in this book, were observed, and have been observed among the Jews in all ages, since Moses to the present day, notwithstanding the many eventful changes in their history.

The uniform testimony of their national traditions corroborates the testimony of all their sacred writings, that Moses was God's chosen servant, and that, in giving them the Pentateuch, *Genesis* included, he only presented to them, in a permanent form, *a standard copy* of the doctrines taught, and the laws appointed by Jehovah, the God of their fathers. His official presentation of *Genesis* to the people of Israel, was an open assertion that it is truth, and inspired of God. As such, they admitted it; as such, they have always esteemed it to this day.

Whether, therefore, the earlier events recorded in the first eleven chapters of *Genesis*, viz. the creation, the occurrences in the family of Adam, the translation of Enoch, the flood, the confusion of

tongues at Babel, the dispersion of mankind, &c. down to the calling of Abraham, were gathered by Moses from the traditions handed down through the patriarchs, or were contained in old written documents, brief historical fragments, which he collected, and reduced to order, or whether these early events were before unknown until communicated to Moses by immediate inspiration, is of but very little consequence. The decision of this point cannot affect the argument for the authorship of Genesis, nor that for its truth in every point. The character of Moses as a prophet, and his high commission as the agent through whom God communicated His will to Israel, are a full guarantee for the truth of every statement found in Genesis, as well as for the authority of every doctrine, and every law laid down in the other four books of the Pentateuch.

If Moses compiled Genesis, either wholly or in part, from previously existing documents, he was divinely inspired to select, arrange, to alter, expunge, or add to those documents, *as truth demanded*. If he received the facts merely as handed down by oral tradition, he was, in like manner, guided of God to receive and to record the truth, the whole truth needed in the case, and *nothing but the truth*. And if Moses wrote the whole as communicated directly to him by inspiration alone, then the very truth necessary to be known in the case, and the truth alone, pure and free from all admixture of error, must have been the result of his authorship.

All that *could* have been handed down by *tradition*, it would have been easy for Moses to obtain, in a direct line from Adam himself, and that through a very small number of relaters.

From Adam to Noah, a period of about 1656 years, but one intermediate link was necessary.

Methuselah lived to converse with both Adam and Noah; and Lamech, the father of Noah, was fifty-six years old when Adam died.

Shem connected Noah with Abraham, having lived to converse with both, as Isaac also did with Abraham and with Joseph; and from Joseph these traditions could be easily conveyed to Moses by Amram, who was contemporary with Joseph. (See Dr A. Clarke's preface to his Commentary on Genesis.)

Six persons, then, between Adam and Moses, would have been

sufficient to convey to Moses traditions from the very origin of the human race.

Abundant facilities, therefore, existed for correct tradition, orally perpetuated, from the very first, down to the great Hebrew lawgiver.

But tradition, unaided by direct revelation from God, could not possibly have supplied ALL that is recorded in Genesis. The original chaotic condition of the elements, and their subsequent reduction to the present order of things; the successive order observed in the production of light, of sea, and of dry land; of vegetable forms, and of living animals swarming in the air, the water, and on the dry land; the mode in which, and the time when Adam was formed, and subsequently Eve: all this must have been as unknown to Adam himself, without a revelation from God, as it would be to us. For plainly Adam could not, from his own consciousness merely, after his creation, nor from his observation on events thereafter occurring, have ascertained the mode of his own creation, from the dust of the earth; nor the mode or the successive order in which other objects around him had been produced, any more than Professor Agassiz, or any other naturalist, however distinguished or skilful he may be, can, from the structure, the habits, or the locality of animals as observed now, ascertain the manner, the time, or the place of their original production.

The *origin* of things lies beyond human observation, human experience, and human consciousness; and to pretend to adduce *demonstration* on points so remote and so inscrutable, is positively *absurd*. The knowledge of the *origin* of things must be learnt by immediate revelation from God, or it must forever remain unknown.

All these and similar facts, if included in *patriarchal tradition* (which is scarcely probable), must have been revealed to Adam by his Maker. Still even in that case the spirit of inspiration would have been necessary for Moses (*and he had it*) to preserve him from error, in stating the facts he records, however these facts might have reached him. We receive Genesis as a true history on the authority of Moses, who selected and arranged its contents, and gave it to the Jews. For Moses was a man, the whole of whose illustrious career proclaimed him commissioned from the God of nature to make known to the Jews and to man-

kind these truths, otherwise unattainable, as well as to promulgate the laws of the Jewish worship, and the *Decalogue*, that matchless rule of duty to all mankind.

We do, therefore, still maintain the Mosaic origin and the divine authority of Genesis, no less than of the other books of the Pentateuch.

As such the Jews have always esteemed it. It is found in every copy of the Hebrew Bible, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and in every ancient version of the Jewish Scriptures.

Genesis is indispensable as an introduction to the other books of the Pentateuch, and, indeed, to all the others of the sacred writings. Without Genesis, they would be almost unintelligible.

If Genesis were totally lost, no existing documents could supply its place.

Truths, now generally admitted as incontrovertible, because taught in Genesis, would be to us lost and irrecoverable; or if remembered, they would be held on doubtful authority, unsustained by sufficient evidence.

Genesis, from the very earliest portions of it, is referred to; the statements it contains are recognised as true, and they are assumed as the basis of argument; and the very language of Genesis is quoted again and again, in nearly every book of the Old Testament and of the New; and this is so done, as to shew that Genesis was, by all these sacred writers, regarded as a part of the writings of Moses, and a document of revealed truth.

Against this strong array of evidence, the counter arguments are few and feeble. The alleged *impossibility* of its Mosaic origin, on the ground that the miracles it records are fables, *because a miracle is impossible*, and because it takes a long course of ages to introduce the rumour of such prodigies into popular belief and popular tradition, is a *mere assumption*, absolutely *atheistic in its origin*, and unphilosophical in its nature; for it involves a *petitio principii*; it is, in fact, a mere begging of the question at issue.

The objections based on the fragmentary character of certain portions of the Hebrew Pentateuch, especially of Genesis, and on the traditionary character of certain portions of its contents are

utterly worthless ; and for the very plain reason, that the publisher of a document is not necessarily the original composer of every sentence it contains. The act of publishing a work endorses its contents, whether historical or didactic, with the whole authority of the publisher. That Moses actually published, *i. e.* openly delivered to the Jews, the book of Genesis, no less than the other four books of the Pentateuch, as forming, together, the one authoritative document, containing the truths, the doctrines, and the laws which Jehovah himself directed him to communicate to them, has been abundantly proved. (See Deut. xxxi. 9-13, and also verses 22-26.) That official act—of so delivering this book to the Jews—pledged the character of Moses as a man, and his authority as an inspired prophet, *to the truth of all contained in the entire document, from first to last* : a pledge unaffected by the mode in which he might have obtained, originally, possession of these facts and statements ; whether by direct revelation to his own mind, or by the diligent collection and collation of oral traditions, by means of ancient documents of written fragmentary history.

As an inspired prophet, Moses was guided to select and arrange, to write and to publish the truth, and the truth alone, whether revealed to him in visions and dreams, or inward suggestions from God's Holy Spirit, or gathered from patriarchal traditions, orally perpetuated, or found by him in old written documents ; whether two chiefly—the Jehovah document and the Elohim document, as Eichhorn supposed and as De Wette contended ; or whether there are a dozen such original documents, used in the compilation, as Astruc conjectured in 1753. However its materials may have been derived, matters not.

Moses delivered Genesis to the Jews as a part of God's message to them. For us, that is enough. *If Moses delivered Genesis to the Jewish church, in the wilderness, then Genesis must be an inspired book, and true, every part of it.*

This argument, standing as it does, without an objection that will bear a moment's calm examination, is perfectly conclusive.

The manner in which Christ speaks of Moses, and of some of the most marvellous of the events recorded in Genesis, would, in the estimation of every sober-minded inquirer, settle this question

fully and for ever, notwithstanding all the subtle arguments of Strauss, and the bold assertions of De Wette, echoed among us here by the ephemeral writers of our day.

The question of the Mosaic authorship, and the inspired character of the book of Genesis, ought to be regarded as for ever settled.

It is incomparably more likely that objections now raised against the authenticity of Genesis, and the whole Pentateuch, and against the genuineness of any part of it, as the work of Moses, spring from the prejudices of the objector, and from the ignorance on many essential points bearing on the subject, which at this great distance of time *must inevitably attach* to even the acutest, the most industrious, and the most profoundly learned among these objectors, than that a whole people should have received such a book as the Pentateuch, the standard of their religious faith, and the statute-book of their nation and of their land, and should have held it in sacred estimation through the whole long period of their national existence, about 1500 years, nay, for thirty-five centuries, reckoning to the present time, as the work of their great Lawgiver, and should all this time have reverently obeyed it as such, while yet, all the time, even from the very first, they have been in error as to its origin. The thing is incredible. The supposition of it is palpably absurd.

It is an interesting fact, and strongly corroborative of the foregoing argument for the Mosaic origin of Genesis, that by *many distinguished writers of pagan antiquity*, Moses is alluded to, and sometimes designated by name, as the great original Lawgiver of the Jews, and the most prominent among the *writers of their sacred books*. The testimony of these ancient authors is the more important, because they were, almost without exception, prejudiced, not in favour of the Jews, but *against* them, their religion, and their laws.

Thus Josephus, in his work against Apion (lib. i. sect. 26), quotes passages from the works of Manetho (the author who furnishes the famous list of Egyptian kings and dynasties), and also from Cheremon, Apollonius, and Lysimachus, besides some other ancient writers, both Greek and Egyptian, works extant in his day, though now lost. The passages thus quoted by Josephus agree in admitting that Moses was the leader of the Jews, when

they departed from Egypt; and that he was the founder of their laws.

We may be certain that Josephus quotes these passages correctly, because they contain, also, insinuations highly discreditable to the Jews. (See also Josephus, lib. i. sect. 32 and sect. 34. See also Bishop Newton on Moses and his writings.)

Eusebius also (Præp. Evang. lib. ix. chap. 26, 29) produces passages of like import from Eupolemus and Artapanas.

Strabo, the geographer, also (Geog. lib. xv.) gives an account of the law of Moses as forbidding images, and limiting worship to one invisible Being. (See also Warburton's Div. Leg. vol. i.; and Leland against Morgan.)

Celsus, also, refers to this very passage in Strabo, and frequently mentions Moses; and alludes to various circumstances in the Jewish history, shewing that he was familiar with it.

Justin (from Trogus Pompeius) tells us that Moses, being driven from Egypt, led a band of exiles, and encamped at Mount Sinai, and there consecrated the seventh day a sacred solemnity; or, as he calls it, a perpetual fast. (Just. Hist. lib. 36, c. ii.)

Pliny the Elder (Hist. Nat. lib. 30, c. i.) speaks of Moses as an eminent magician: referring, undoubtedly, to the miracles he wrought.

Tacitus mentions Moses as one of the exiles from Egypt, who persuaded his companions to follow him as a celestial guide. He notices his journeyings in the wilderness, the relief of the people's thirst, and their receiving *laws* from Moses. (Tac. Hist. lib. v. c. 3, 4.)

Juvenal mentions Moses as the author of a volume preserved with great care among the Jews, and in which the worship of images and the eating of swine's flesh were forbidden, and in which circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath are enjoined. (Juv. Sat. xiv. v. 96, 106.)

Longinus cites Moses as the lawgiver of the Jews; and he quotes from Gen. i. 2, "*God said, Let there be light, and there was light,*" as a specimen of the true sublime. (Long. de Sublim. sec. 9.)

Numenius, a Pythagorean philosopher of Apamea, is quoted both by Eusebius (Præpar. Evang. lib. ix. sec. xi. 10) and by Origen (Orig. cont. Cels. lib. iv.) as speaking of Moses by the

name of Musæus, as a leader of the Jews, who, by his prayers, brought dreadful calamities upon Egypt. This Numenius it is who is reported to have said that "*Plato was only Moses speaking Greek.*" (See Doddridge's Lectures: also Lardner's Testimony, vol. iii.)

Josephus, in his catalogue of Jewish sacred books, expressly mentions the Pentateuch, the five books, as the work of Moses.

Philo, an Egyptian Jew, a little posterior to Josephus, acknowledged as canonical no other books than those contained in the Hebrew Bible, *including the Pentateuch*. Philo was a cool-headed philosopher.

Porphyry, an acute, learned, and bitter enemy of Christianity, admitted the genuineness of the Pentateuch, and acknowledged that *Moses was prior to the Phœnician historian, Sanconiathon*, who flourished before the Trojan war.

And it is worthy of remark, that amid all the disputes that arose in the first four centuries of the Christian æra between the friends and the enemies of the Gospel, the genuineness of the Pentateuch, as the writing of Moses, seems never to have been called in question. Even the apostate Julian the Emperor admitted the authority of the books of Moses. These objections fade away and disappear, as you advance towards the time of Moses. They are of modern growth exclusively.

But we are told that these, and other objections that are now put forth with a triumphant air, spring from the modern advance in science. So be it, then. Base your objections on scientific ground exclusively, and on that ground the friends of the Bible and of Moses will cheerfully meet them.

But on the ground of criticism fairly applied to the Pentateuch, as an *ancient document*, attributed from the very first to Moses, the Jewish lawgiver, as its author, the evidence is all *against* the objector. There is not evidence so full, so appropriate, so conclusive for the genuineness of the works of Herodotus, of the annals of Tacitus, nor even of the Commentaries of Cæsar, nor for the work attributed to *any* ancient author,—no, not by a vast deal,—that there is for the genuineness of the whole Pentateuch, as the work of Moses. Whether entirely the composition of his own pen, or partly made up of ancient traditions collected by him,

or of old historical fragmentary documents compiled, collated, and incorporated into the work, matters not. Genesis, together with the other four books of the Pentateuch, was by Moses, an inspired prophet, publicly delivered to the Jewish nation as a message from God. As such it was received. As such it has been preserved, revered, and honoured by them to this day. As such it was recognised by Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

The genuineness of the book of Genesis as the work of Moses, is, then, beyond rational doubt. And, *if a genuine work of Moses, an inspired book, a revelation from God it must be.*

LECTURE VI.

CREATION IN SIX DAYS.

Exod. xx. 11.—“In six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.”

By the Israelites as they lay encamped at the foot of Mount Sinai, this brief sentence was heard sounding among the clouds and the lightnings that flashed around that mountain's lofty summit—heard in the awful tones of Jehovah's own voice as he spake in the hearing of the entire people, all the words of the Ten Commandments,—the one supreme law, for the regulation of the conduct of man, wherever found, in all his relations to God, to his fellow-men, and to himself. *These words are a history in miniature of this world's creation.*

They were uttered, and they are recorded, as the *reason for the institution of the weekly Sabbath*, and they present the *one and original ground for the observance, by man, of one day, for rest, after every six days' toil.* “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore JEHOVAH BLESSED THE SABBATH DAY, and hallowed it.”

Every Sabbath day you hear this declaration read in the solemn convocation of the worshippers of God. In childhood, you committed it to memory. It is taught to *your* children. It is read in thousands of assemblies convened for the worship of God, every week: and thousands and thousands of children, in every country of Christendom, and at scores of missionary stations in almost every part of the heathen world, are taught to repeat these

words as true ; sacredly true ; beyond a doubt true. *Is the assertion herein contained really true? And if so, in what sense is it true?*

Such are the points I propose now to discuss.

If the Bible be from God, as I have endeavoured briefly to shew, then the fourth commandment contains, in these words, a true account of the creation of this world. If so, and if we can ascertain the genuine meaning of these words, we have *the truth* on this great subject.

Now certain it is that all truth, like its author and its original fountain, God, is immutable, eternal, and invariably consistent with itself. No two truths can possibly be contradictory of each other. If, then, I have found *one truth* distinctly marked, and fully proved, I may safely lay that one truth up, in my heart of hearts, as a jewel of priceless value, durable, incorruptible, and beyond the reach of change.

Ten thousand difficulties may be thrown around it. Its bearings upon, and even its consistency with, other known truths, may be obscure, and beyond my ken. Yet *if it be a truth*, it is connected with all other truths, and it is perfectly consistent with them all, and with each one of them : and although I may not be able now clearly to discern that consistency, and much less to point it out to the satisfaction of others, yet consistent with them it must be, and *it is* ; and time will shew it

On this ground it is that the friends of the Bible, deeply convinced, from evidence which is deemed appropriate, full and conclusive, that the Bible is, in sober verity, a revelation from Almighty God, hold it to be truth, pure and unmingled.

We do, therefore, believe, that this revealed truth *must* be consistent with all and with every truth, be it derived from what source it may. We are persuaded that no one truth which God may discover to us in his works, can (by any possibility) be found to contradict any truth He has revealed to us in his word. And, therefore, when, as the result of scientific investigation, or of antiquarian research, a position seems to be established which presents an aspect of hostility to any statement found in the Bible, *we pause*, until further investigation shall yield clearer light ; perfectly satisfied that *the truth*, when really elicited by science, or when gleaned from antique monuments, will be found, *not to*

contradict, but to *confirm* the statements made on the page of inspiration.

Thus it has always turned out hitherto, and thus we are persuaded it will yet turn out in every future instance.

We worship the God made known to us in the Bible; and we hold the statements therein contained to be *the most certain of all truths*.

A position taken, no matter what be the learning, or the scientific skill, nor how world-wide may be the celebrity of him, or of those by whom that position is taken, if *it be inconsistent with, or contradictory of*, Bible statements, we regard with distrust. We cannot at once class it with undoubted truths. We would have it subjected to the most rigid scrutiny, until its real character shall be ascertained beyond the possibility of a cavil.

In all past instances, the result of patient and thorough investigation has justified our firm confidence in the Bible, nor can we doubt that so it ever will be hereafter. And yet the enthusiastic devotees of mere science charge the friends of the Bible (and especially the clergy) with being bigoted adherents to antiquated notions, opposers of free investigation, and enemies to science.

A host of names might be cited in refutation of the charge, such as those of Buckland, Pye Smith, Chalmers, Hitchcock, not to insist on such as Mantell, Silliman, Henry, Conyheare, Richardson, Hugh Miller, Ansted, Lyell, all friends of revelation, and communicants in the Christian church, no less than eminent for scientific attainments.

True, the friends of the Bible are not willing to have crude conjectures and theories, at best but half established, substituted in place of the teachings of inspiration.

We would not have wild hypotheses, which, though defended by plausible arguments, are obviously *not proved*—proclaimed to the world as demonstrated truths—before which every position, previously regarded as truth, is to give way the moment it is found inconsistent with these novel and ever-varying theories.

As such baseless theories, it seems to me must be ranked most of those novel dogmas now most pertinaciously advocated, and industriously propagated among us by means of essays and lectures, and dissertations almost daily issuing from the press, and quoted

and lauded and defended in many of our literary periodicals and public journals.

Of such is the *nebular hypothesis*, as it is termed, which seeks to account for the origin of suns and of planets (our system and our earth included), from a kind of fire-mist filling the vast expanse of nature.

Of this attenuated substance, different masses are, by the advocates of this theory, supposed to have been put in motion, each mass revolving round its own appropriate centre, and gradually contracting, and in so doing, throwing off portions, ever and anon, which become planets, each turning round upon its own centre, and moving also in its own peculiar path, or orbit, around the parent mass, which becomes, in due time, a sun, the centre of a system comprising it, and all of the several inferior masses, or satellites, thrown off from it, and revolving round it.

This nebular hypothesis has been pronounced a mere theory, ingenious, perhaps, but not proved, and it was so pronounced by no less an authority than that of Sir John Herschel. (See his Opening Address at the meeting of the British Association at Cambridge, June 19, 1845.)

In regard to this nebular hypothesis, I would not be understood as asserting that it may not, after all, be the true one, but only that it is not yet *proved* to be true, and it cannot, therefore, be safely used as the basis of any argument.

But I do earnestly protest against the use which some writers have shewn themselves ready to make of this hypothesis, so to account for the origin of the several systems making up the universe, by mere natural causes, as virtually to exclude God from all direct agency in the creation.

Another of these crude hypotheses, is the *doctrine of development*, or of *progression*, as it is sometimes designated, which seeks to account for the production of all animals, and of man himself, by gradual progress, from the simple mass of a minute jelly-point, quickened by electric forces, to higher and yet higher forms of organization, until, finally, man appears—an improvement upon his prototype, the *ape*, or *ourang-outang*.

This doctrine, though once strangely sanctioned by the great name of Lamarck, has, by late writers of the highest authority, been condemned, as being not only not sustained, but plainly con-

tradicted by the latest discoveries among the fossil remains, included in some of even the oldest deposits. Sir C. Lyell, speaking of this theory of the progressive development of animal and vegetable life, and their successive advancement from a simpler to a more perfect state, asks very significantly, "*Has it any foundation in fact?*" and then he adds, "No geologists, who are in possession of all the data now established respecting fossil remains, will, for a moment, contend for this doctrine in all its details."—(Principles of Geology, chap. ix. p. 131, 8th ed. 1850.)

Again, he says, p. 143, "We have already vertebrated animals in the most ancient strata." Again, p. 144, "In this succession of quadrupeds we cannot detect any signs of a progressive development of organization."

Consult also, Footprints of Creation, by H. Miller, pp. 204, 205. On this doctrine of development, Mr Ansted, in his neat work entitled, "The Ancient World," says, "In making use of the word *succession*, I have no intention of assuming a gradual modification of species, in the way of development of a higher organization, as if animals originally created imperfect, were subsequently, and by manifest gradation, at length enabled to perform functions of a higher kind; for *this is by no means the case*, so far as the observations of geologists have hitherto been able to determine," (p. 55.)

Again, he says, p. 66, "Some persons conclude that there was a succession, and a gradual development of higher types of existence, in a certain order of creation. But, so far as geology, in its present state, affords evidence on the subject, *the facts seem decidedly opposed to any such view*."—(See also pp. 391, 392.)

So also the celebrated Professor Owen, in a paper read before the British Association, when met at Plymouth, in 1842 (see Report, p. 202), remarks,—"Though a general progress may be discerned, yet the interruptions and *faults* (to use a geological phrase) negative the notion that *progression* has been the result of self-developing energies, adequate to the transmutation of specific characters; but on the contrary, support the conclusion that the modifications of osteological structure which characterize the extinct reptiles, were originally impressed upon them at their creation, and have been neither derived from im-

provement of a lower, nor lost by progressive development into a higher type."

On this subject, consult also Sir C. Lyell's remarks on the celebrated theory of Lamarck. (Princ. Geol. b. iii. chap. 35, 36, pp. 544-568, 8th edit. Lond. 1850).

Testimony equally explicit and decided against the doctrine of progressive development is given by Richardson, H. Miller, Ansted, Professors Owen and Hitchcock, and other distinguished men, and testimony corroborated by scientific facts, decisive in the case.

The theory of progressive development may now be ranked among the dreams of the past. Most laboriously argued, and earnestly defended, and industriously propagated of late, has been the *doctrine of a separate and distinct origin, for the several different races of mankind*, or divisions of the human family—a doctrine which denies their descent from one human pair, the common ancestors of all men; and, strange to say, this astounding dogma is pronounced by men of note, in the scientific world, to be not inconsistent with the teachings of the Bible!

Another doctrine is favoured, at least, by some geologists of name, and is boldly contended for by not a few of the prominent ethnologists and archæologists, and even by some of the historians of our day, especially in France and Germany. This doctrine assigns to our globe, not only as a distinct planet, but also *as now constituted* and subsequent to the last of the great cataclysms, or convulsions of which geology treats, and with it assigns to man as its occupant, a *vast, an absolutely fabulous antiquity*, running back, according to some, thousands of ages antecedent to the date assigned to Noah's deluge, and even to the date of the creation of Adam.

These, and some kindred dogmas, are conjectures at best: fortified, it is true, by some few admitted facts, and seconded by a great deal of plausible reasoning, but, most assuredly, *not proved*. These several dogmas I propose hereafter to examine, but not now. To us it seems but reasonable and right to require that, until a position is fully established as truth undeniable, it be kept under advisement, and subjected to close and searching scrutiny, if it present the appearance of hostility to revelation. *This we*

ask, and this is all we ask. If, after thorough investigation, it be found to be truth, it will not be at variance with the actual teachings of the Bible.

We contend not for any merely human system, either of doctrines or of chronological dates: we contend only for the truth of the Bible itself.

If, on any point, we have misunderstood or misinterpreted the Bible, we shall gladly avail ourselves of *any* means for rectifying our opinions, and coming at a nearer and a clearer view of the meaning of God's veritable teachings, let those means reach us from what quarter they may.

But, if it be once shewn that any one assertion made in the Bible is erroneous, then my confidence in the Bible is shaken, and my confidence in that particular book, or portion of the Bible, in which the error is shewn to exist, is gone, utterly gone for ever.

The Bible may still be the best and the noblest book on earth—it may contain the most ancient history that is authentic, the finest thoughts, the most magnificent imagery, the most spirit-stirring poetry, and the purest system of morality too (all this the Bible certainly does contain), but if, in any part essential to its integrity as a whole, it involve one false doctrine, one erroneous assertion, it cannot be a revelation from God. Because God, who is the fountain of all truth, can never embody a lie in a communication proceeding from Him. A solitary assertion, an insulated sentence or paragraph (such *e. g.* as the story of Christ's interview with the woman taken in adultery, and with her accusers recorded in John viii. 3-11), may have been foisted into the sacred record by carelessness or the mistake of early expositors and of subsequent transcribers; possibly such interpolation may have been designedly made, from some unknown quarter, and yet the doctrines and the history of the Bible may remain unaffected, as it would be in the case just supposed.

But a passage, containing particulars essential to the integrity of a narrative or record, which involves, and on which rests a doctrine that is oft repeated in various forms and in different places, more especially if that doctrine be *vital to the system of religion* taught in the Bible, cannot be shewn to be unworthy of credit,

without shaking utterly and irretrievably, all confidence in the truth of the Bible.

Such vital doctrine is, unquestionably, *the common origin of all the races of men from one and the same human pair.*

Whatever the difference of anatomical structure, colour, features, habits, or mental capacity now found among men, all men have sprung from the one original pair created in Eden, and *all nations of men are of one blood*; else Genesis is a fallacious document, the epistles of Paul must be rejected, especially Romans and Hebrews, and the letters to Timothy; and the book of Acts records a falsehood as truth. But if so, then the whole gospel is virtually nullified; for if there were other original pairs, besides Adam and Eve, formed by the Creator as the progenitors of the several races of men, then, since Christ died for the children of Adam only, and since no one of us can now tell with absolute certainty from what race he is sprung, it must be impossible to decide who is or who is not entitled to look for a participation in the benefit of the Gospel salvation. Happily for our peace as believers in revelation, although the naturalist may *conjecture* that different races of men are indigenously in different regions of the earth, the idea is *a conjecture merely*. To adduce proof is impossible; because the grounds of evidence on this subject lie beyond our experience, utterly beyond all range of human observation. As an eminent philosopher, Dr Hutton, has said of geology: "Geology treats of the changes effected on the earth's surface *since its creation*. About the *origin* of the earth, it teaches, and can teach, literally *nothing*." (See Richardson's Geology, p. 92.)

So it is equally true of natural history: it treats of the nature, the properties, and the habits of organized bodies now existing, or that have existed upon the earth. But of the *origin* of those bodies it teaches, and it can teach *absolutely nothing!*

The doctrine of the diversity of origin for the several races of mankind is founded on *hypothesis* merely; it is opposed by strong probabilities, and it is directly in the teeth of the teachings of the Bible.

It is bare hypothesis against revelation.

Again. It has, with confidence, been asserted, that the certain

results of geological explorations shew conclusively that the heavens and the earth could not have been created in the short space of six natural days—six revolutions of the earth on its axis. But the Bible seems to assert that so it was; and if the teachings of geology were actually inconsistent with the Bible statement, when rightly understood, I, for one, would unhesitatingly reject geology, and keep to Moses.

But they are not at all inconsistent, as I hope to shew.

True, I have not, as yet, met with any exposition of the first chapter of Genesis, shewing its accordance, in all *minute particulars*, with the well-ascertained results, the *demonstrated doctrines* (as they may be designated) of *geology*. But the great facts presented in the Mosaic cosmogony are so accordant to the great facts brought to our knowledge by sound geology, that the wonder is, not that we cannot discern a strict agreement in all minute points, as detailed in Genesis, but that, in an age so remote as that of Moses (nearly 3500 years since), when, as all we know of antiquity assures us, the facts brought to light by modern geological research were unknown and unimagined, even by the most learned, and by Moses himself; still, the great Hebrew Legislator, in a description of the creation, comprised in a few lines, and composing altogether but one brief paragraph, has given us an outline of the events attending creation, which was, from the first, and to the most ignorant reader, intelligible as to the leading facts, viz. that the heavens and the earth are the production of an Almighty God; and that, after our globe had existed for some undefined period, in a mode different from the present, it was, at some remote point in the past, reduced, by the same Almighty God, to a condition fitted to receive its present varied occupants, man included, which were, in gradual succession, brought into existence to dwell upon it. And yet this brief outline of the history of creation is found to be rendered not absurd, but only the clearer and the more intelligible, the further science extends her discoveries, and enlarges our acquaintance with the structure of this earth, and with the nature and disposition of its several component parts.

For modern research has shewn that man, and the existing races of animated beings, are of a comparatively modern date.

That the earth itself, in the various strata or beds of rock lying one above another, and which, by different agencies, have been made accessible to our research, contains the remains of several successive races of animal occupants of this globe which lived and flourished, each race during its appropriate period, and which perished by successive convulsions of nature, that left their remains, the proof of their existence, imbedded in the soil they had occupied; left there when it was submerged, time and again, beneath the invading waters of the great deep.

Extensive observations, made with great care by many independent and competent explorers, and made in almost every region of the earth, throughout the length and breadth of Europe, in Northern Africa, in Russia, in Hindostan, in Arabia, in Palestine, in Egypt, in the West Indies, and over a large part of both North and South America, yield similar results. On this subject, therefore, there is no room left for doubt. This earth must have been existing for many long ages. It has been tenanted by many successive races of living occupants, and it was subjected to several great and vastly extensive changes on its surface, in periods of time running back, it may be, for thousands or possibly for millions of ages before man was created on the earth.

Now Moses tells us that *in the beginning* God created the heavens and the earth. This declaration is perfectly intelligible, and quite reasonable. But how far back before our time, or before the creation of man, this *beginning* may have been, Moses does not say; nor does he furnish any data on which we might found a computation as to the interval between that beginning and our time.

The next statement Moses makes is, that this earth was without form and void, and covered with darkness, land and water being commingled in one chaotic mass. And from *this state* it was that the earth was gradually reduced to its present condition, and peopled with its present occupants, at the period with which his history commences. Moses does not say that such was the condition of the earth when it was first brought into being, and that God proceeded *immediately* to prepare it for the reception of man. His narrative is not inconsistent with the idea of myriads of ages between the first creation of the earth and the chaotic state immediately preceding the creation of man, and of the living races,

his contemporaries. And a very long interval geological facts certainly require us to suppose.

So far, then, there is entire harmony between the deductions of science and the teachings of Genesis. This agreement has, again and again, been pointed out by distinguished scholars in the scientific world.

Thus says Richardson in his classical work, modestly entitled "Geology for Beginners" (2d edit. p. 82): "Among the most valuable and most satisfactory of the first lessons taught by geology, must be enumerated the conviction, which its very earliest inquiries serve to convey, of the perfect harmony of the science with revelation, and the groundless nature of those fears which many well-meaning but mistaken persons so needlessly entertain, of the possibility of collision between the two." "It may suffice to dispel such fears if we state, that in all essential points, and we would particularly instance *the date of the creation of man*, we find the records of Scripture fully and completely confirmed by the evidence of physical facts." (p. 84.)

Professor Silliman of Yale College, in his Introduction to the American edition of Dr Mantell's Wonders of Creation, remarks: "While the science of astronomy is, in fact, inconsistent with the *apparent* movements of the heavens, and therefore with the popular phraseology of the Scriptures, if taken literally, which allude to physical objects as they appear to the uninstructed mind, not as they are in reality; so that now all agree in understanding the language of the Scriptures as being applied to the *appearances* of the heavens, of which alone mankind in general can form any just conception; geology presents not even this discrepancy, but on the contrary, a substantial agreement in its facts with the Scripture." Again: "The Scripture declares *there was a beginning*; and geology proves that there was a time when neither plants, nor animals, nor man existed." Again: "The consistency of geology with the early Scripture history, is susceptible of a perfect and triumphant defence." (Vol. i. p. 23, Mantell's Wonders of Geology, 6th edit. London, 1848.)

Dr Mantell himself remarks, that "while the Bible reveals to us the moral history and destiny of our race, and instructs us that the existing races of beings have inhabited the earth but a

few thousand years, the physical monuments of our globe bear witness to the same truth." (Vol. i. p. 29.)

The celebrated Bishop Berkeley, who lived before the discoveries of geology burst upon the scientific world, could (as appears from an eloquent passage cited by Lyell, in the 5th edition of his *Principles of Geology*, vol. iii. p. 250), even from the limited knowledge of fossil remains then obtained, perceive that the frame of our globe must be of vast antiquity; and yet he regards that antiquity as no way inconsistent with the historical account of events recorded in the book of Genesis. (See also Lyell's *Princ. of Geol.* 8th edit. London, 1850, p. 739.)

The great English geologist, Sir C. Lyell, does, in the 8th edition of his *Principles* (1850) express, although in measured terms, a similar judgment as to the harmony of geology and the Bible. He argues at length the recent origin of man (pp. 144, 145). In the concluding remarks he says: "*We admit the creation of man to have occurred at a comparatively modern epoch*" (p. 773). Again, on p. 740, stands this striking observation, "That many signs of the agency of man would have lasted at least as long as '*the shells of the primitive world,*' had our race been as ancient, we may feel fully persuaded, as was Berkeley."

In relation to the harmony of science and revelation, as to the creation of man, the present learned Bishop of London has eloquently remarked, in one of his sermons: "As we are not called upon by Scripture to admit, so neither are we required to deny, the supposition that the matter, without form and void, out of which the globe was formed, may have consisted of the wreck and relics of more ancient worlds, created and destroyed by the same Almighty Power which called our world into being, and will one day cause it to pass away."

Mr Richardson also says: "The comparatively modern period of the creation of man, and the inferior age of our race to that of the globe which we inhabit, is a fact revealed by Scripture, and confirmed by science." The same internal evidence which convinces us of the extreme antiquity of our planet, affords the like satisfactory proof of the comparatively modern period of the origin of our species. (*Geol.* p. 89.)

But after all, Moses certainly does say, that "*in six days Je-*

hovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is ;" which seems to imply that the entire universe was produced, and fashioned to its present form, in the brief period of six days from the first creative act.

Such was long the understanding of the passage, and such is still the interpretation that many good men give it; and certain it is that the phrase "*the heavens and the earth*" is often used in the Bible to denote the entire universe, *the whole material creation*.

If this were plainly and necessarily the only interpretation the passage will bear, then the teachings of Moses would be inconsistent with the conclusions drawn from the facts of geology; and, in that case, no alternative would be left us: we must either reject the Pentateuch, or reject the doctrines of geology.

Now certainly, in the interpretation of a document so ancient as the Pentateuch, and that too, in relation to a subject so obscure as the creation; if facts well ascertained, and doctrines absolutely demonstrated, present irreconcilable contradictions to the interpretation we *had* deemed most natural; the proper inference would seem to be, that the error lies rather in our imperfect interpretation than in the veritable meaning of the document, forming part of a book proved to be inspired, or in the doctrines carefully based on scientific ground.

To remove this difficulty, some distinguished men (among whom, at one time, was Professor Silliman) have conjectured that the word *day*, in the 1st chapter of Genesis, and in Exod. xx. 11, denotes, not a natural day of twenty-four hours, but an *indefinite period*; in which indefinite sense, the word certainly appears to be used in some other passages in the Bible. This interpretation they deem corroborated by the correspondence between the successive steps of the creation, as related by Moses, beginning with reptiles and fishes, the lowest forms of animal life, and thence passing on up to those of higher organization, and lastly to man, and a similar series of successive races of extinct animals, found imbedded in different strata in the earth, beginning with simpler forms in the lower strata, and gradually exhibiting a higher organization in the several series nearer to the present system.

Nay, some have conjectured that *all* these strata of extinct animals were deposited in the period intervening between the

creation of Adam and the subsiding of the waters of Noah's deluge. This theory has been put forth anew by a recent American writer.¹

If this interpretation and its attendant theory could be established, it would at once remove all difficulty. But it cannot. Against its adoption lie several objections that are weighty—are indeed insuperable. For,

1st. The narrative in Genesis is a plain statement. In one part of it, the word *day* is evidently used in its ordinary sense, to denote a natural day of twenty-four hours. To interpret the same word, in the same passage, in two senses so different and so wide apart as must be done on the hypothesis of indefinite periods, and that without anything in the passage itself intimating a change in the meaning attached to it, is contrary to all rules of sound interpretation.

In the fourth commandment, the fact that God employed six immense periods of time in the work of creation, and then rested a seventh period that may have extended through many ages, would hardly strike one as presenting a cogent reason why man should rest one natural day of twenty-four hours, after every six natural days spent in labour. To say the least, this interpretation is a forced and an unnatural one. (See a curious note on this point in Hugh Miller's *Foot Prints*, p. 308.)

But, 2d. The analogy pointed out in the series of the Mosaic six days' creation, and in that of the strata of fossil remains, does not hold good throughout, either as to number, or, strictly speaking, as to order and structure; although there is a general resemblance which is very striking.

3d. *The time intervening between the creation of Adam and the egress of Noah from the ark, is too short to allow the deposit of all the known strata of extinct animals.* Fossil remains of former races of now extinct animals are found through various strata of rock, lying one over the other, to a thickness or a depth estimated as equal to six miles.

Ages innumerable, and the occurrence of one great convulsion of earth after another, must have been required to give time for the existence, and enable us to account for the destruction and

¹ Epoch of Creation, by Dr Lord, 1851, passim, and especially p. 244.

the successive accumulation of these various races, in the rocks gradually formed by the deposit from overspreading waters.

In some countries there are beds of chalk many hundreds of feet in thickness (Richardson, pp. 450-154), and in others vast masses of limestone; and this chalk or limestone is composed of countless myriads upon myriads of minute microscopic shells, each of which was once the habitation of a living creature, as completely organized as were the living creatures once tenanted the most splendid of the beautiful shells that adorn the centre-table or the mantel of a modern lady's parlour; but so minute, that millions upon millions of them are included in a cubic inch of the rock. What countless ages must have elapsed ere, from such materials, masses of chalk or of limestone, miles in extent, and hundreds of feet in thickness, could have been formed. Why, even the soft limestone found abundantly in Alabama, a rock which abounds in fossils lying through its entire mass, like the fruit in a plum-cake, is, in many places, seven and even nine hundred feet thick, as is proved by the borings made in various parts of Greene and Sumpter counties for Artesian wells. And this rock is comparatively a recent deposit. In his late report on the geology of Alabama, Professor Toomey, of the University of Alabama, very justly remarks (p. 123): "The whole of what is called rotten limestone once existed in the state of soft mud, *a sedimentary deposit formed gradually at the bottom of a deep sea*; and hence the remains of marine animals and shells found in it."

Now, we may well ask, could the waters of Noah's deluge, however tumultuous, have brought together, and deposited over the region where now it lies, this vast mass of limestone, when that deluge lasted less than a year? It is utterly incredible.

And, for the entire series of animal deposits known to exist for miles in thickness, and consisting of several distinct layers of the remains of whole races that lived their allotted periods, in different ages, and perished; furnishing evidence in their very structure, and in the nature of the materials in which they lie imbedded, that, in the times of their several existences, the surface of the earth presented widely different aspects, and that the very elements amid which they had their existence were essentially

different from what they now are, as to the nature and the proportions of their constituent ingredients. To account for all this, any amount of time we may reasonably assign between Adam and Noah would be utterly insufficient. It might almost be said, that time enough for all these deposits would hardly result even from the utter rejection of Usher's computation of dates, and the adoption of the wild fables of Hindostan, which counts in cycles of the past back through hundreds of millions of years.¹

Why, even to form the present Delta of the Mississippi river, below New Orleans, which is a mere alluvium, a deposit newer by many ages than the limestone of the prairies, and which is even still in progress, the time requisite would, if we assume the constancy in past ages of the present laws of nature, and rate of progress, require (as the accomplished French explorer in Egypt, Mons. J. Ampère, tells us Sir C. Lyell has computed) sixty-seven thousand years.² (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1846, p. 667. See also *Princ. of Geol.* pp. 218, 219, 8th edition.)

The alluvial deposit of this Delta is less than three hundred feet thick, and it lies on the surface of the earth, where it has never been subjected to any very great pressure, such as that exerted by the waters of the ocean, hundreds of fathoms deep, upon the materials beneath, composing the bed of the sea. What array of figures, then, will suffice to express the length of time requisite to form the varied deposits included in the compact substance of the strata of rock, piled one upon the other to a depth of six or seven miles?³ Compared with such a period, the interval between Adam and Noah is but a point—a mere moment of time.

Besides all this, it must be borne in mind that, 4th. *If the flood of Noah was the grand agent in making the deposits, and form-*

¹ If the theory I have proposed to account for the Deluge be correct, that the beds of ancient seas were then upheaved, and now form the lands, although this might account for many of the marine deposits, yet it would not account for the different strata—some of marine, some of fresh water origin—and other strata containing land animals and reptiles. These strata of diverse origin, alternating one with another in various places, shew that there must have been repeated alterations of level, and that these changes must have occupied a vastly prolonged period of time.

² The time computed some years since by Dr Dickenson of Mississippi, for the formation of this Delta, was 13,000 or 14,000 years.

³ Hitchcock, *Relig. of Geol.* p. 21.

ing the strata known to exist, there must have been human beings entombed among the animals, and covered up with them in the deposits made by the subsiding waters of the Deluge.

How comes it, then, that among all these various strata, embodying fossil remains, found at various depths, and in different countries, all over the globe, no fossil human remains have as yet been disinterred? True, a few such human fossils have, at times, been spoken of; but all such are now known to be of modern origin, imbedded in rock of very recent formation, as at Guadaloupe (see *Wonders of Geology*, vol. i. pp. 86, 87), or petrified through the influence of well-understood local causes (See *Lyell's Princ. Geol.* pp. 713-717, London, 1850.)

A curious instance of a human body, completely petrified in the space of a very few years, has been reported in the newspapers, within the last year. The body of a man, apparently that of an Irish labourer, wearing corduroy trousers, found at Morrison, in Illinois, and the whole completely turned into stone. (See the *Presbyterian*, Dec. 13, 1851, p. 199.)

Dr Mantell, after describing a conglomerated mass, consisting of beads, knives, and sand, which was obtained from a ship stranded off Hastings on the English coast upwards of a century ago, where it was imbedded in silt and sand, says: "The cementing material had been derived from the oxidation of the blades of the knives." He also remarks, that from the bed of the Thames, large masses of a firm conglomerate are occasionally dredged up, in which Roman coins and fragments of pottery are imbedded, the stone through which these articles are intermingled being formed of sand and clay solidified by ferruginous infiltration. Dr Mantell follows these statements with this important remark: "The consolidation of sand, gravel, and other detritus, by this agency, is taking place everywhere; on the shores of the Mediterranean,—on the coasts of the West India Islands, and of the Isle of Ascension,—and on the borders of the United States. Thus, the remains of man at Guadaloupe,—of turtle in the Isle of Ascension,—of recent shells and bones of the ruminants at Nice,—of ancient pottery in Greece,—and of animal and vegetable substances in Great Britain, have become imbedded and preserved."—(Vol. i. p. 84.)

Indeed these modern conglomerates, in which pottery and other

fragments of man's workmanship are imbedded, are now so numerous, especially in Greece, that, in the absence of other monuments, they would sufficiently mark the human era in the earth's history.—(Lyell's *Princ. Geol.* p. 708.)

In such conglomerates, or in caverns where they lie intermixed with the fossil bones of animals, and often of extinct species, fragments of human bones are often found in Sicily, in Franconia, in Wales, and in the south of France. But all these human remains are comparatively recent.

It is not (see Lyell's *Princ. Geol.* p. 716) on the evidence of such intermixtures that we ought readily to admit, either the high antiquity of the human race, or the recent date of certain lost species of quadrupeds. Again, he remarks: "The human bones, therefore, in the caves, which are associated with such fabricated objects, must belong, not to antediluvian periods, but to a people in the same stage of civilization as those who constructed the tumuli and altars," (p. 715.)

In the opinion of those most competent to judge in the case, that point is therefore settled. No human fossils occur in the older deposits; no relics of man have been found deeper or older than the alluvium, *i. e.* the deposit of soil made by rivers, local inundations, and the disintegration of mountain crags, appertaining to the present system of our earth's surface; none anterior, even to the deluge of Noah, nor coeval with it. Why it is that no remains of human beings entombed beneath the waters of the Noachian deluge, have as yet been discovered, I will endeavour hereafter to explain.

The argument presented more than a century ago by Bishop Berkeley, in proof of the *recent origin* of man, is *equally in point against the hypothesis* now under review, *viz.* that all known fossil remains must have been deposited during the prevalence of Noah's deluge, or in the ages intervening between that deluge and the creation of Adam. "To any one (says Berkeley) who considers that on digging into the earth, such quantities of shells, and in some places, bones and horns of animals are found, sound and entire after having lain there, in all probability, thousands of years, it would seem probable that guns, medals, and implements in metal and stone, might have lain entire, buried under ground forty or fifty thousand years, if the world had been so old. How

comes it, then, that no remains are found, no antiquities of those numerous ages, preceding the Scripture accounts of time; that no fragments of buildings, no public monuments, no intaglios, statues, basso-relievos, medals, inscriptions, utensils, or artificial works of any kind are ever discovered, which may bear testimony to the existence of those mighty empires,—those successions of monarchs, heroes and demigods, for so many thousand years! Let us look forward, and suppose ten or twenty thousand years to come, during which we will suppose that plagues, famines, wars, and *earth-quakes* shall have made great havoc in the world; is it not highly probable that at the end of such a period, pillars, vases, and statues now in being, of granite, or porphyry, or jasper (stones of such hardness as we know them to have lasted two thousand years above ground without any considerable alteration), would be a record of these and past ages! Or that some of our current coins might be dug up, or old walls, the foundation of buildings, shew themselves, as well as the shells and stones of the *primeval world* which are preserved down to our times!" (Alcephron, or the Minute Philosopher, vol. ii. pp. 84, 85. 1732. See also Lyell's Princ. Geol. p. 739. 1850.)

The same argument on this point, but arranged according to the present state of scientific knowledge, is thus beautifully presented by Mr Richardson: "The whole vast series of aqueous deposits are crowded with organic remains, with fragments of the weeds, plants, corals, shells, crustaceæ, fish, reptiles, birds and mammalia, relics of the vegetable and animal existence of the ancient earth; *but no fossil remains of the human form have yet been discovered in the solid rocks themselves, or in any, since the accumulations of silt or mud, which date from the most modern æra, the yesterday, as it were, in the infinite history of the past. It is only in these accumulations of the historic period that we discover the remains of even the most ancient families of mankind: that in the British Isles we meet with the implements or utensils of the ancient Britons, or the coins and weapons of their Roman invaders; that in Italy, we find the Cyclopean structures and works of the Etruscans, a nation who appear to have preceded the Romans in the occupation of Italy, and to have excelled them in civilization and the arts of life; while vestiges of the Pelasgi are alike discovered in similar deposits in Greece; and in the New*

World, traces exist of the Talteques, a people who seem to have been the predecessors of the Mexicans, and their superiors in knowledge and improvement. *In the solid rock, we repeat, no traces of man are discernible.*

“ Yet had the human race been really the aborigines of the physical history of our planet; had they actually existed in its primeval times (and, I may add, this reasoning is equally as forcible against the hypothesis, that all the fossiliferous rocks were deposited during the post-Adamic down to the Noachian æra, as it is against the hypothesis Mr Richardson is opposing), then their remains would unquestionably have been found scattered throughout its various deposits, from the oldest to the most recent in the series. No impediment exists to their conservation. Our bones, composed of the same elements as those of the animal races, are equally capable of being kept from destruction. The same battle-field has preserved the bones of the horse and his rider; the same cavern, which in earlier æras gave shelter, during life, to the hyena and the bear, and retained their skeletons after death, has alike preserved the remains of those human occupants, who, at a later period, found, in the same retreat, a refuge and a tomb.

“ But a still stronger proof of the modern date of our species (and, we may add, of the pre-Adamic date of those vast beds of animal fossils) exists in the obvious fact, that if man had really been an inhabitant of the earth during its earliest history (when these fossils were deposited), his skeleton, or the mere fragments of his osseous structure, *would have constituted the least of those relics* which he would have bequeathed to the soil of which he was an inhabitant. We should have discovered his mighty and majestic works, which so far transcend, in duration, his own ephemeral existence. We should have found his cities and his structures overwhelmed in the waters of ancient seas, or buried beneath the ejections of primeval volcanoes; his majestic pyramids sunk in the beds of ancient rivers; his mountain temples hewn on the surface of the deepest and the oldest rocks. We should have encountered his bridges of granite and of iron—his palaces of limestone and of marble—the tombs which he reared over the objects of his affection—the shrines which he erected in honour of his God.

“ But, in the absence of these or any other traces of man in

any, save in the most superficial deposits, we are compelled to acknowledge the chronology of Holy Writ, to recognise the complete and satisfactory accordance of science with revelation, and to admit that the existence of man has not extended beyond the five or six thousand years upon the earth, which the Scriptures assign as the period of his creation." (Richardson's Geology, pp. 89-91.)

These extracts are long, but they are appropriate and eloquent. The argument they present against the contemporaneous existence of man, and of the races of extinct animals and plants, whose fossil remains we find imbedded in the several geologic strata, almost to the very deepest, is forcible and conclusive.

From all these considerations it is plain, the theory of independent periods, as the meaning of the six days of creation, and that also of the post-Adamic, or of the Noacho-diluvian origin of the several fossil strata now found in the crust of our globe, must be abandoned. (Foot Prints of Creation, p. 308, note.)

What, then, is the meaning of the narrative given in the 1st chapter of Genesis, and of the declaration in Exod. xx. 11, "*In six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all things that therein are!*"

This declaration, embodied in the fourth commandment, I take to be an epitome of the entire narrative given in Gen. ch. i. from ver. 3 to the close of the chapter.

Genesis 1st chap. and ver. 1 informs us, that at some undefined period in the boundless past, occurred the original production of the material universe, by the power of God.

With the third verse of that chapter seems to commence a narrative of the *manner* in which, after the last great geologic convulsion, which left this globe in a state of wild and dark chaos, as described in v. 2, *without form and void*, the earth was gradually arranged, illumined, made fertile, and peopled with living tenants, and with man also, in a series of divine creative acts, running through six successive natural days of ordinary length.

The 1st chap. of Genesis, from v. 3d to the end of the chapter, does then present us with a history of the re-ordering of our planetary system, more especially of this earth, after the last great geologic catastrophe, prior to man's creation.

That catastrophe, as this narrative leads us to conclude, was a general one, and left the whole earth in what may be called a

chaotic state, the land and water being commingled ; and the very atmosphere seems to have been so far affected by the general disturbance, as that it was not capable of transmitting the light of the sun, and heavenly bodies, until the fourth day.

During the continuance of that chaotic state, the latest deposit of geologic strata known to us, and prior to the alluvium now in process of formation, may not improbably have been made ; and then, in the course of six successive days of the ordinary length, God saw fit to arrange this earth, clothe it with vegetation, people it with living creatures, and finally, on the sixth day, place man upon it : after the appearance of the sun and the moon to rule the day and the night respectively had taken place on the fourth day—the atmosphere having, by that time, been divinely prepared, duly to transmit the light, as now. Hence, in language adapted to express the idea of the arrangement of the earth to its place in the solar system, He who, in Gen. i. 1 is declared to have created the entire universe at some undetermined period in the past, and who, in various other passages of Scripture, as well as in the record of the events of the fourth day of creation, is said to have made the stars also, is in Exod. xx. 11 said to have created in six days heaven and earth, the sea, and all things therein ; because, in the six consecutive days occupied in reducing the chaotic mass to the condition in which we now behold our globe, He (the original creator of all things out of nothing) was pleased to order this earth, provide it with living tenants, and to spread out *visibly* before them the expanse of heaven, adorned with all its glorious luminaries by night and by day. Although its substance had been existing long before, the Creator then re-established, in a manner obvious to the perception of its new occupants, the relation of this earth with the sun, moon, and stars, in the series of creative acts, filling up six successive days.

In this sense, and not as directly referring to the *original* production of the substance of the earth, and of the system to which this earth belongs, do I understand the declaration contained in the fourth commandment. That *original* production is recorded in the first verse of Genesis. But it has been asserted that the word בָּרָא (*barah*) used in Gen. i. 1, means literally to create, to produce from nothing ; while the interpretation I have here given of the narrative of the six days' creation, is equivalent to inter-

preting it as meaning only the same as פָּצַח, fashioned out of pre-existing materials.

This objection I would answer in the words of Bishop Pearson : “ We must not attempt weakly to collect the meaning of *creation* from the use of any one word. For בָּרָא is used promiscuously with פָּצַח, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effect, and with יָצַק, which rather implies a formation out of something ; and from which comes the word יָצַק, a potter. In Gen. ii. 3, 4, and Isa. xlv. 12, בָּרָא and יָצַק are used interchangeably—I made the earth and created man upon it. Compare also Ps. cxv. 15, and cxxi. 2, with Isa. xlii. 5, and xlv. 18. Compare, also, Isa. xvii. 7, with Eccl. xii. 1. The LXX. translate בָּרָא indifferently with ποιεῖν and κτίζειν.

“ Again, יָצַק is usually rendered by the Jewish Targum, סָבַב, and by the LXX. though generally καταστρεῖν, yet sometimes κτίζειν. That it has the same signification will appear by comparing Gen. ii. 4, with Isa. xlv. 12, and not only so, but by the single verse, Isa. xliii. 1, ‘ Now thus saith the Lord יהוה, that created thee, O Jacob, יָצַק, and he that formed thee, O Israel.’

“ Lastly, all these are conjointly used in the same validity of expression, in Isa. xliii. 7, ‘ Every one that is called by my name : for יָצַק, I have created him for my glory, יָצַק, I have formed him, yea יָצַק, I have made him.’ ” (See Pearson on the Creed, p. 79, note †. Kitto’s Cyclop. Bib. art. Creation.)

To cut off the last lingering doubt on this subject, it may be remarked, that while in Gen. i. 1, to express *original* creation, the word בָּרָא is used, in the fourth commandment, Exod. xx. 11, the word used is not סָבַב but יָצַק, which shews that so far as the words of the Hebrew text can decide the point, the idea there conveyed is rather that of the due arrangement and garnishing of the earth out of pre-existing materials than that of original creation.

As to the *date* of the original creation of the earth’s substance we know literally nothing. Nor is it my intention to enter now upon an examination of the chronological era of Adam’s creation. In the narrative itself, as given in the Bible, nothing is said respecting the date of creation. On this subject the computations of learned men vary greatly ; and the different versions of the Old Testament, and even the different copies of the Hebrew text itself, shew an unaccountable variation in the numbers they record, and

consequently, in the chronological data they furnish. The Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch differs from the Hebrew, and the Septuagint from both. Archbishop Usher, as the result of much learned research, has computed the creation of Adam at about B.C. 4004; and this is the date generally adopted in the Protestant churches at least, and where the English language is spoken. This is the date introduced into our English Bible, and to this date all other events are chronologically adjusted. The Church of Rome is understood rather to favour the Septuagint chronology, which allows a greater age to our system. But of the Septuagint itself, there are two distinct lines of copies. Of these, one furnishes numbers which, when compared and computed, would make the date of man's creation about B.C. 5708; and the other about B.C. 5878.

A computation of the numbers given in the received Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, yields B.C. 4111 as the date of Adam's creation: while the history of Josephus, the Jewish writer, nearly contemporary with Christ, gives B.C. 4658. So that the chronology by Usher, which we have been accustomed to follow, *is by far the most contracted of all.*¹

It is very obvious that, from a variety of causes, chronological computations are always subject to great uncertainty. But happily the mere date of creation is not of vital importance, either to the credit of the Bible, or to the interests of religion. Adopt what chronological system you choose, the fact of the creation of the universe, and all it contains, by Jehovah, the God of Abraham, and the fact that this earth was, in six days, from a previous chaotic state, prepared by Jehovah for the reception of man, who, upon the sixth of those days, was created and placed in Eden; and that this first origin of man occurred somewhere between six and eight thousand years ago, still stands.

The difficulty we may find in merely arranging chronological dates, cannot affect the truth of the facts recorded, nor the credibility of the narrative containing that record.

The objection which is sometimes urged against the distribution of the several creative acts over six consecutive days, as though such distribution were unbecoming the wisdom and the greatness

¹ See the Eng. Univ. Hist. Ano. vol. i. pp. 69-72. Preface, pp. 51-53. See Hale's Chronology, vol. 1 pp. 210-264. Jackson's Chronology, vol. i. pp. 34-68.

of God, is utterly futile. If God so willed it, as Moses relates, that the creative process should proceed at a certain rate only, and should occupy any one definite portion of time; or that it should continue and be repeated through successive portions; since His wisdom qualifies him to discern what is best, so His almighty power enables him to carry out into execution the plan he approves, and to do it just when, and where, and as he approves.

For all that has yet been adduced to the contrary, we can still cordially believe the account given by Moses of the remodelling of our earth from a chaotic condition, the wreck, possibly, of former worlds; its being replenished with living occupants, man included, by the operations of God, in six successive days; and the ordering of its atmosphere, so as that its living tenants should receive on the fourth day the full benefit of the sun, moon, and stars, as resulting from the earth's position among the planets in the solar system; and we can still perceive that these facts, so interesting in themselves, are to us a valid reason for religiously observing a weekly Sabbath, according to the record in Exod. xx. 11, "*In six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*"

The Mosaic account of creation, as thus understood, is reasonable in itself, and consistent with all known scientific facts. It is indeed beautiful, and worthy of God, as a comparison with the cosmogonies held and taught among the boasted nations of antiquity will shew.

Of the Egyptians, Diodorus asserts, they held that, in the beginning, the heavens and the earth had only one form, being united in their nature; but having become separated afterwards, the world took the character we know behold.

By the movement of the atmosphere the igneous parts arose, which gave to the sun and other heavenly bodies their rotatory movement, and a solid matter was precipitated to form the sea and earth, from which fish and other animals were produced, much as now, in Egypt, on the subsiding of the inundation of the Nile, myriads of insects come forth from the mud.

This was also the system of the Phœnicians. This system assigns no part, in the formation of the universe, to an intelligent Cause.

Diogenes Laertius states, on the authority of Manetho and Hecataeus, that the Egyptians held *matter* as the *first principle*; and that the sun and moon were their first deities.

But though it is difficult, from the imperfect and often conflicting statements found in Greek writers, to gather the truth respecting Egyptian dogmas; and although nowhere on the monuments thus far explored, spread though the pictorial records are over many acres of surface, is there found any symbol or character representing the idea of One Supreme Intelligence;¹ still it is not improbable that the ancient Egyptians did admit the existence of a Supreme Intellect pervading the universe, much as the human soul pervades the body; yet, in conjunction with this, they admitted a male generative principle residing in the sun, and a female generative principle residing in the moon.²

It was chiefly in the Thebaid, where the worship of Cneph as the Supreme God prevailed, that this less irrational hypothesis was held.

Lower Egypt has, from time immemorial, been grossly idolatrous. (Eng. Univ. Hist. Ant. vol. i. p. 14.)

The Egyptian mythology as stated by Lyell (Princ. Geol. p. 10), he has gathered exclusively from the Greek writers, who certainly held many erroneous notions about Egypt. Plutarch asserts that the Egyptians maintained the doctrine of successive destructions and restorations of the world. These were celebrated in the famous hymns of Orpheus, said to have been brought from the banks of the Nile. These catastrophes were determined by the return of the great cycle or great year, when, after a long period of revolutions, the heavenly bodies returned to the same relative position in the heavens. This great year was variously estimated. According to Orpheus it consisted of 120,000 years, to others 300,000, and according to Cassander it was 360,000 years. (See Pritchard's *Egypt. Mythology*, p. 166, &c.)

The ancient Chaldeans, or Babylonians, held a strange hypothesis. The material of the universe they deemed *eternal*, unoriginated, and incapable of destruction. It was reduced to form by

¹ See Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, 2d series, vol. i. p. 178.

² See Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs*, 2d series, vol. i. pp. 214-217. Dr Pritchard's *Analysis of Egyptian Mythology*, book ii. chap. 1 and 2, and chiefly p. 165.

their supreme god Belus. Before his intervention they represent the earth as a dark chaos, peopled with horrid monsters. On reading their description of this chaos, one can hardly resist the idea that they must have seen the isaurians, the mastodons, and other fossil monsters revealed to us by modern geologic research. (See Jackson's Chronology, vol. i. pp. 120, 216.)

Many of the ancient sages held the universe to be eternal—a necessary emanation of the Infinite Essence. This was the opinion of Aristotle and of some of Plato's followers. (Universal Hist. vol. i. p. 3.)

Ocellus Lycanus, a little anterior to Plato, maintained that the universe is, of itself, eternal and perfect, incapable of beginning or of end. Yet he also maintained the existence of God, and that from God man had received his faculties and powers. His tenets plainly involve an inconsistency. (See also Bishop Cumberland's Sanchoniatho, pp. 1-4, 13-27; id. p. 3.)

Of the notions held on this subject by the Hindoos it is not easy to gather a clear idea. The Indians counted time by periods including each many millions of solar years. By *creation* they understood a series of renewals,¹ or renovations of the order of things; and man is but an accidental incident to these renovations. The first three of the great ages have already passed, equal to 3,888,000 years.

We are in the fourth of these ages, and of this fourth age 4946 years are already gone, forming a great or divine age. Of these great ages seventy-four form a reign of Manou, and fourteen reigns of Manou form a kalpa. Or it takes one thousand great ages, formed of forty mortal ages, to compose a kalpa or period of 4,320,000,000 of years, which immense duration constitutes only *one day* of Brahma, or rather of the *manifestation* of the world.

But the period of the disappearance of the world, *i. e.* of its absorption into the essence of Brahma, is of equal duration. Therefore, according to the Gentoo belief, as the present is the fifty-sixth manifestation, the world has already stood, in its present renovated state, 5,620,000 years, and it² ought yet to continue 4,320,000,000 years in all.² So boundless are the dreamy no-

¹ See Faber's Pagan Idolatry, vol. i. pp. 121-140.

² See Maurice's India, vol. ii. pp. 341-351; vol. iv. p. 699; vol. vii. p. 845. See Asiatic Researches, vol. ii. p. 112.

tions presented in the Hindoo system of cosmogony. And yet there are those who pretend to regard them as based on truth and confirmed by astronomical calculations.¹

A comparison of the several points presented in this system of the Hindoos will at once detect incongruities.

I may here remark that the outline of the Hindoo cosmogony, furnished to Sir C. Lyell by Professor Wilson, who now occupies the chair of Sanscrit literature in the University of Oxford, England, agrees substantially with the sketch above presented. Thus, "We are told in the institutions of Menu, that the first sole Cause with a thought created the waters, and then moved upon their surface in the form of Brahma the Creator. On awaking from sleep, Brahma always finds the world a shapeless ocean, and his first effort is to effect the emergence of the land, and to form the firmament; after which he vivifies the earth in succession with plants, animals, celestial creatures, and men.

"At the end of a day of Brahma, which lasts for many thousand ages, he is said to rest, and then all existing forms are destroyed. As soon as he awakes the world is renewed, to be again destroyed and again renewed after each *kalpa* or day of Brahma's existence," &c. &c.²

The Chinese also exhibit what they call history, running back to a remote antiquity, but less extravagant than that of the Hindoos. They record events as far back as the sixty-first year of Hoang-Ti, the first monarch of their first cycle, B.C. 2637. But others of these writers, as *e. g.* the renowned historian Tchou-hi, go back to B.C. 3400. There are, again, other historians among the Chinese, who record many *reigns*, or remote periods before this, reaching back to a *first man*, whom they name Pan-Kou, or

¹ See Bentley's Letters on Hindu Astronomy, preface, p. xiv.; also pp. 181 and 195. Asiatic Researches, vol. vi. p. 540, &c. Delambre's History of Astronomy, vol. i. pp. 347, 400, 441; also Discours Preliminaire, pp. viii. and ix., Paris, 1817, 4to; also Lepsius, Chronologie der Egypter, vol. i. pp. 3-6.

² In the cosmogonies of India and of Chaldea we find traces perhaps of patriarchal tradition respecting chaos before man's creation—perhaps of doctrines obtained in some unknown way from the Jewish Scriptures: and possibly this idea of successive destructions and renovations may have been suggested by fossil animals disinterred in very remote ages. See Lyell's Principles of Geology, pp. 5, 6, 7, 10th edition. See also L'Univers Pittoresque, Asie, tom. iii. Inde, pp. 163-172; also L'Univ. Pit. Chine, par M. Pauthier, pp. 20-23. A kalpa or day of Brahma is reckoned at 4,300,000,000 of our years.

Hoen-Tu, which means *primordial*. To him, as the Hindoos also to Menou, they assign the control of nature, and the work of creation; and the Chinese make this *primordial* man Pan-Kou the first emperor of China. His era, they declare, was ninety-six millions of years before Confucius, who lived B.C. 479; so that, according to these modest chroniclers, the first emperor of China flourished only 96,002,131 years since; and this same first Chinese emperor created the world, or at least reduced it to its present order.¹ (See *Chine*, de M. Panthier, p. 20.) And yet there are men who would have us adopt these absurd Chinese fables as veritable history, and as entitled to credit in preference to the modest and rational account given by Moses; who tells us that in the beginning, or originally, the whole material universe, the earth and all the heavenly bodies, were created by one God, who was known and worshipped among the Jews under the name of Jehovah. But Moses specified no time, no point in the boundless past, when this grand effect was produced. Nor does Moses say whether the creative act was performed instantly and at once, or by a process involving the employment of subordinate agencies that may have spread through long successive cycles of ages. The one grand fact only, that the entire universe is the work of Jehovah, does Moses state. So that, in truth, even if the nebular hypothesis, which represents suns and systems as being produced by a very slow and long-continued process, from the most impalpable of all substances, an attenuated fire, mist, a mass of gas charged with caloric, should be established by sufficient proofs, the adoption of it as true would in no way militate against our cordial belief in the Mosaic cosmogony.

For all that Moses teaches to the contrary, *time* may (as an

¹ The Chinese have a fabulous chronology similar to that of the Hindoos, and almost equally extravagant. It includes dynasties of monarchs, the Tien-hoang, and the Ti-hoang, each of whom held the sceptre during 18,000 years; but after this their lives dwindled to so narrow a span, that the reigns of nine monarchs are comprehended in 45,000 years. The ten *lis* or ages, which elapsed from Pan-Kou to Confucius, is variously estimated from 276,000 years to 96,961,740. These eras may certainly vie with those assigned in the Vedas and Puranas. There is, however, this important distinction, that while the successive Hindoo yugs, or ages, extending to millions of years, form the sacred chronology of that people, the Chinese treat their own fabulous records not only with contempt as puerile, but with horror as profane. (*Ancient History of China*, Edinburgh Cabinet Library, vol. i. p. 40.)

elegant writer on geology expresses it) *be an essential element in the process of original creation.*¹

After the wonderful epitome of cosmogony, given in the first verse of Genesis, Moses proceeds, in Gen. i. 3-47 (and he briefly reiterates the same doctrine in Exod. xx. 11), to describe the manner in which the earth, from a previous chaotic state, was reduced to its present order, clothed with verdure, peopled with living races, and with man, and illumined by the rays of the sun and the other luminaries of heaven; and that this renovation was effected by a series of creative acts which occupied six successive days, and were discontinued on the seventh day. For this very reason *we* are required to keep holy a weekly Sabbath. “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, for *in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day*: wherefore Jehovah blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.”

¹ Mr Mitford, in his learned History of Greece, gives this noble testimony to the value of the Mosaic writings:—

“Since the deep researches of modern philosophers in natural history, assisted by the extensive discoveries of modern navigators, through the great enlargement of our acquaintance with the face of our globe, have opened so many sources of wonder, without affording any adequate means to arrive at the causes of the phenomena, new objections have been made to the Mosaic history of the first ages of the world, which, it has been urged, must have been intended to relate, not to the whole world, but to those parts with which the Jewish people had more immediate concern. Many, however, and insuperable as the difficulties occurring in that concise historical sketch may be, some arising from extreme antiquity of idiom, some, perhaps, from injury received in multifarious translations, and others from that allegorical style, always familiar and always in esteem in the East, invention still has never been able to form any theory equally consistent with the principles of the most enlightened philosophy, or equally consonant to the most authentic testimonies remaining from remotest ages, whether transmitted by human memory or borne in the face of nature.” (Mitford’s Greece, vol. i. pp. 2, 3.)

LECTURE VII.

POPULOUSNESS OF THE EARTH IN THE DAYS OF CAIN, AND THE LONGEVITY OF THE ANCIENT PATRIARCHS.

GEN. iv. 15.—“The Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.”

GEN. v. 27.—“And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years: and he died.”

THE selection of these two very striking passages from the antediluvian history is a sufficiently intelligible intimation of my purpose to examine some of the more specious objections which have been boastfully urged against the Book of Genesis, and against the historical facts it records.

Of these objections, two demand a more special attention.

The one is drawn from the story of Cain, the murderer of his brother Abel, and from the populousness of the earth at that time, which the story seems to imply:—a populousness much greater, it is said, than the doctrine that Adam and Eve were the sole progenitors of the entire human race, will warrant.

The other objection has respect to *the long lives of the antediluvian patriarchs*: a longevity which, we are told, is utterly incredible; and which can be shewn to be fabulous, from the sure testimony of contemporaneous monuments.

I. *The story of Cain*, though short, is an affecting and instructive one.

The first man that was born of woman, he was the first to stain the annals of humanity with a dark and bloody crime.

From the Mosaic narrative it would appear that Cain was a tiller of the ground, while Abel, his younger brother, busied himself chiefly in the care of flocks of sheep. Instructed, no doubt, from their infancy, to revere and to worship God their maker, one occasion there was, on which both the brothers brought sacrifice

to God. The offering of the younger, which was of the firstlings of his flock, was accepted of the Most High. Cain, who brought of the fruits of the ground, was not accepted. “*The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but unto Cain and his offering, He had not respect.*” Gen. iv. 4, 5.

The reasons for this difference were doubtless just and good: but the result was, that “*Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell.*” A gloomy, dissatisfied, and even revengeful spirit was awakened in his breast. The writer to the Hebrews (see Heb. xi. 4) accounts for the difference in the acceptableness of these two offerings: *By faith Abel offered a more acceptable offering than Cain.*¹ But we know that *faith* has respect to *the word of God*.

There must, then, have been some divine precept given to the first human family respecting sacrifices, a precept which, in the offering of Abel, was complied with, and in that of Cain was disregarded.

Hence, it has been reasonably argued, that the worship of God by *bloody sacrifices*, symbolical of the one great atoning sacrifice for sin, afterwards to be made in the death of Christ the Lamb of God, had been already instituted by direct command of God at this early period; and not improbably this institution was appointed immediately after the Fall.

A supposition which is strengthened by the recorded fact, that after sentence had been pronounced by the Most High upon the sinning pair, a sentence which assured them that they were mortal, Jehovah himself condescended to clothe them with skins, probably of animals slain, by God’s teaching then vouchsafed to them, in order to be offered in sacrifice to God; in anticipation, and symbolic representation, of the promised seed of the woman.

It is remarkable, also, that no record is found in holy writ of permission given to man to use the flesh of animals as food until after the Deluge. (See Faber’s *Pagan Idolatry*, vol. i. p. 43,

¹ On this passage (Gen. iv. 7), Mons. Cahen, the learned author of a recent French translation of the Bible, remarks: “Both the brothers had brought an oblation; but the younger brought of the most valuable of his possessions: and the elder at hazard, without choice, and *without having cut the offering in pieces*, according to the customary rite. (Jarchi.) The Samaritan text employs here a word, which expresses an action, as it were, to cut into morsels. The Septuagint seems also to follow this reading (*La Bible, Traduc. Nouvelle. Paris, 1831, par. M. Cahen.*)”

note.) We know, also, that from the remotest antiquity, and in nearly every nation under heaven, as far back as historic records or even tradition reaches, the practice of offering in *sacrifice* animals *slain* for the purpose, has prevailed.

It is a further and a very rational inference from these considerations, that if God appointed in the family of Adam worship by bloody sacrifices, he must have appointed also *a ritual*, or mode of worship, *a priesthood*, or persons to officiate in this worship, and probably also *a place* where this worship should be publicly offered by the whole assembled family or community. And although the narrative in Genesis makes no explicit mention of these several divine regulations, yet many circumstances incidentally made known in these ancient documents comport with this view, and confirm it.

The solemn blessing given by the dying patriarchs to the first-born son (Gen. xxvii. 27-29, 33-36, xxviii. iv. and xlviii. 14, 17-19) looks very much like an open consecration or induction to a sacred office. The blessing of the first-born included also a double portion of goods (Deut. xxi. 17), obviously, as it would seem, to meet the expenses incident to the worship which his position, as the head of the whole family, required the first-born son to maintain. Hence, also, the profound deference shewn in ancient times to the patriarch or head of the family; and hence, also, the great authority he exercised over all his descendants, however numerous.

That there was also some one particular spot where stood the altar, and where, in the presence of his whole family, the patriarch, or the father, officiated in the solemn worship of God, by the offering in sacrifice on that altar, suitable animals slain for the purpose, is rendered highly probable by several considerations.

There is also good reason to believe that this worship was offered at regular stated seasons; and that these seasons were the weekly recurring Sabbaths, every thoughtful reader of the word of God will readily perceive.

That there was in patriarchal times, and even in the family of Adam, some one place more especially devoted to this worship of God by sacrifice, has been shewn to be highly probable by Mr Blunt of Cambridge, England, in his very interesting work, entitled "*Undesigned Coincidences.*"

“*To stand,*” or to do things “*before the Lord,*” is a phrase oft occurring in the patriarchal history, and generally (as Mr B. has observed), in what seems to be a *local sense*. We read of Abraham, and again of Jacob, “*building an altar to the Lord,*” and offering sacrifice thereon (Gen xii. 7 ; xxii. 9 ; xxxv. 1, 3.) Jacob built an altar at Bethel to the Lord. When he came out of the ark after the flood (Gen viii. 20), Noah builded an altar to the Lord. When the angels, who had forewarned Abraham of the approaching doom of Sodom, had left Abraham, and were gone away, “*Abraham,*” as we read, “*stood yet before the Lord*” (Gen. xviii. 22), *i. e.* he stayed to plead with God on behalf of those devoted cities, and to plead in the place best suited to such a service, the place where God was by him usually worshipped.

Accordingly, it follows immediately after, “*and Abraham drew near, and said.*” Again, we read, that the next day “*Abraham gat up early in the morning* (probably his usual hour of prayer), *to the place where he stood before the Lord,*” *i. e.* the same place where he had been pleading the day before ; and, in all probability, the altar he had built when he first came to Mamre, for at Mamre he still resided.

So also when Isaac purposed to bless his son before he died, it was to be done *before the Lord* (Gen xxvii. 7), *i. e.* before the altar erected by Isaac at Beer-heba (Gen. xxvi. 25.) So also, afterwards, among the children of Israel in the wilderness, before the great tabernacle was built, when any man would “*seek the Lord,*” he went out to the tent erected for that purpose by Moses, outside of the camp, where, with appropriate solemnities, he could perform his devotions “*before the Lord*” (Exod. xxxiii. 7)

The offerings presented by Cain and Abel respectively, seem to have been brought to one and the same place. One would judge, at least, that they were in view of each other, so that the acceptance of Abel's offering, and the rejection of Cain's, were known to both of them.

This appears to have been an act of private devotion, performed by each for himself, not the public worship attended by the whole family ; else it would have been conducted by Adam in person as the head of the family, just as in later ages, Job offered sacrifice for his sons and his daughters daily, lest they should have offended God by sin (Job i. 5.) Yet private though

this worship offered by Cain and Abel was, it was still offered *before the Lord*, i. e. in the place consecrated to worship. Hence when afterwards, as a consequence of his great sin, Cain wandered away from his first home, and from the society of his parents and his kindred, he is said to *have gone out from the presence of the Lord*; for in thus wandering away, he left behind him the place and the altar where God was worshipped, and where even the symbol of God's presence may have been visible to the eye, as it was afterwards in the Shekinah, or cloud of glory, above the mercy-seat in the Holiest of all, in the tabernacle first, and then in the temple. To approach the consecrated spot where the altar stood, was "*to draw near unto the Lord*," it was "*to stand in the presence of the Lord*." To remove to another land was to *go out from the presence of the Lord*. So to remove was to leave behind him the place and the institutions of God's worship; i. e. saith Poole, "*egressus est e loco presentie Divinæ, hoc est, e loco Ecclesiæ congregatæ*."

Hence we can see how utterly void of force are the cavils against the credibility of Genesis, as an inspired book, on the ground of such expressions as this, "*Cain went out from the presence of the Lord*," just as though the story of Cain, as recorded in Genesis, taught, or at least implied, that the Lord is in some places and not in others. (See this objection urged in "Two Lectures," &c. by Dr J. C. Nott, p. 61.)

The rejection of his offering seems to have kindled in the bosom of Cain fierce and deadly resentment, no less than sullen discontent. This wicked temper God condescended to notice, and he was pleased to remonstrate with Cain on account of it. "*If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door*."

This latter expression is generally understood to imply that even the consciousness of unworthiness need not plunge him into despair, since, for the expiation of guilt, a sin-offering was provided, *sin* (i. e. a sin-offering) *lieth at the door*: for the word here standing in the Hebrew text is used to denote both these ideas, viz. the sin itself, and also, sometimes, the victim offered in expiation of sin.

The very terms, therefore, in which this divine admonition is expressed, corroborate the idea that even Cain presented his offer-

ing *before the Lord, i. e.* in a consecrated place; *e. g.* at an altar, sheltered, most probably, by a rude tent or hut, at the door or entrance of which the beasts intended for victims were usually laid before the ceremony of the offering commenced; just as afterwards, among the Jews, the victim about to be sacrificed was laid down before the door of the tabernacle (Levit. i. 3.) All this tender remonstrance from the Most High failed to soften the heart of Cain; and soon afterwards, we find he killed his brother Abel when they were in the open field. The deed of blood was probably committed in secret, unknown for a time even to their parents. But to God all things are open. He called the murderer to account, charged home upon him the foul crime, pronounced him accursed upon the earth, and the earth accursed to him, so that its tillage should not yield to his hands a full return. "*A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.*"

At length the conscience of the wretched fratricide seemed to awake; he declared that his punishment was too heavy for him to bear, and he expressed an apprehension that every one who met him would aim to take his life. This fear, at least, God was pleased to quell. "*Therefore whosoever shall slay Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.*"

As to what may have been this mark, various and most fanciful have been the conjectures hazarded, especially by the Jewish rabbins. Some supposed that Cain was turned black, as a negro; others that a letter was made to appear on his forehead as if stamped or branded there; and others, again, have imagined that this mark was a bloody wound, ghastly and horrible, impressed upon his face. Idle suppositions all; especially since the words employed in the sacred record rather convey the idea of a *pledge* or *token* given of God to Cain, in order to assure him that his life should be *secure* from violence. The word here translated *a mark* is the same that is elsewhere rendered *a sign* (Gen. i. 14.) M. Cahen translates it,—"*He gave to Cain a sign that none should kill him,*" adding in a note,—"*A sign. A man known, designated and marked as a great criminal (un grand coupable) undergoes a punishment the most enduring, the least tolerable—the contempt of all society.*" — (Traduc. Nouvelle La Bible, Cahen)

Of the nature of this token we are in total ignorance. No law, so far at least as the sacred record shews, had as yet been given to man awarding death to the murderer. This was done afterwards, on the subsiding of the Flood (*Gen. ix. 6*); and this statute was re-enacted in the code of laws given to the Jews (*Exod. xx. 13*; *Numb. xxxv. 16 18.*)

As yet God did not see fit to proclaim this penalty, nor to order its infliction. Cain, the first murderer, was suffered to live—a prey to remorse, and shunned by his fellow-men. He became a fugitive from his home and his kindred, and settled in the land of Nod, to the east of Eden, which many have fancied must have been Shushan, Susiana, or Chusistan, in Persia. The French translator, M. Cahen, suggests from the Septuagint form of this name *Ναδὸ* (*Naid*), that it may possibly be the same as *Nedida*, in Arabia, which is to the east of Nubia. From this it would seem that M. Cahen supposes the garden of Eden to have been Nubia.

In this land of Nod, wherever it may have been, Cain had a numerous posterity, and there he built a city, called after the name of his son Enoch. The posterity of Cain—as though the soil had been cursed to them no less than to their father—became skilled in the various mechanic arts rather than in agriculture: and the fact that Cain inclosed himself within the ramparts of a city, well comports with the character of one living in the constant fear of violence.

The Jews have a tradition that Cain became a turbulent and mischievous person; that he organized and headed a band of robbers, and harassed his more orderly neighbours, until he filled the land with violence.

Another tradition represents him as at length wandering, a wretched outcast, in the forests, disfigured by the murderer's mark, and grown shaggy as a wild beast; and that thus, being encountered in the forest by Lamech, whose sight was defective, he was by him taken for a wild beast, and so was unwittingly slain; and hence the speech of Lamech to his wives. (*Gen. iv. 23, 24.*) All this is mere fable.

But now, this narrative of Moses does itself present a serious difficulty.

The murder of Abel, and the sentence pronounced upon Cain

took place before the birth of Seth, the third son of Adam, mentioned in the Bible. (Gen. iv. 25.) At the birth of Seth, Adam had lived one hundred and twenty-nine years only. Where, then, it is asked, were the people from whom Cain could fear violence? Abel and Cain are the only two children of Adam mentioned in the Bible as yet. Abel was now dead: so that, besides Cain himself, the only human beings then on earth were Adam and Eve. From whom could Cain possibly fear violence?

Besides all this: "When Cain had settled in the land of Nod, mention is made of his wife. Where did he obtain this wife? No daughters of Adam are mentioned until after the birth of Seth. The whole story found in the 4th chapter of Genesis does then plainly imply that there were other men on earth at that time besides Adam and Eve and their descendants. Otherwise, Cain could not have been troubled by the fear that some one would kill him; and otherwise, he could not have obtained a wife; unless we *suppose*, for which we have no warrant, that Adam had many other children, not mentioned in the Bible. And even *then* we must admit the monstrous idea of incest in the family of Adam himself—brothers marrying their own sisters."

Weighty though this difficulty may for a moment appear, it has in reality but very little force. It is disingenuously put. It assumes, against *all* probability, that the first human pair, they on whom God himself had laid the special benediction of fertility; "*Be ye fruitful and multiply*,"—a pair the most perfect and the most vigorous the world ever saw,—should have lived together for the space of one hundred and thirty years of vigour unabated, and yet the whole fruit of their union should have been three sons only, with no daughter; and of these sons, the third was not born until the last of these one hundred and thirty years. This surpasses all belief.

Moreover, the assumption here made does not accord with the text of Moses: that text not only allows the supposition, but it distinctly asserts that Adam had other children, sons and daughters both. (Gen. v. 4.) The record of this fact does, indeed, follow the record of the birth of Seth; but this begetting of sons and daughters is not necessarily limited, and it cannot truly be limited, to the eight hundred years after the birth of Seth. It is most naturally understood as applying to the one hundred and thirty years before,

as well as the eight hundred years after that event. It is a general declaration, teaching us that Adam and Eve had many other children besides the three sons, the names of whom alone are recorded. The narrative in Genesis does therefore freely allow, nay it imperatively requires us to hold, that in the earlier part of his life Adam had many children, daughters no less than sons. The first human pair were created perfect and mature in all their powers.

The circumstances mentioned in this chapter, and on which rests the very difficulty now under examination, plainly shew that during the first one hundred and thirty years of Adam's life, his family must have increased rapidly, and his descendants must have multiplied to a great and extraordinary extent : because the whole spirit of the Mosaic narrative is inconsistent with the supposition of any other human beings, except Adam and Eve and their descendants. Population had evidently reached a considerable number by the time of Abel's death. But this population had as evidently sprung solely from Adam and his wife.

An old eastern tradition has it that Cain and Abel, at least, were born each with a twin sister. And certainly, since God had expressly blessed Adam and Eve that they should *be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it*, it is irrational to suppose that due provision would not be made for the supply of wives to the sons of Adam, as they severally reached manhood.

Nor is it philosophical, or rational either, to undertake to determine the rate of the increase of the human family in *the very first ages of the world*, according to those laws which *now*, under circumstances so entirely different, regulate and restrict the increase of population. Take the Mosaic narrative as it is, as one whole ; make but the most natural supposition in each case, to account for the several events recorded, and it will be found that no extravagant calculations, no monstrous deviations from the well-known course of nature, will be needed, to shew the entire consistency of all the parts, and the strong probability of the whole. Figure to yourself one human pair placed on the earth, in perfect health and vigour, with climate and all other circumstances favourable, to serve as the propagators of the human race ;

allow to them and their offspring but the ordinary degree of fecundity, and all becomes plain and consistent.

As to the charge of incestuous marriages in the first human family, the necessity of the case required such marriages at first. Indeed, even on the supposition of the creation of many distinct original pairs, as progenitors of the several races of men, the same would be indispensable, in each original family; since the countries of their origin must have been too widely remote from each other, to have allowed the intermingling of these several races, until at each central point of origin, many generations had arisen.

But the second generation at least, in each of these central points, could have sprung only from what the objection specifies as the incestuous union of brothers and sisters, the offspring severally, of each of these original pairs. Besides, the great object proposed by the supposed creation of several original human pairs, at distinct and widely separated points, would be defeated, if, to avoid incestuous marriages, the first offspring of these different pairs had intermarried. The immediate intermingling of these several roots provided for the production of distinct races of men, would have rendered the formation of distinct races impossible. To avoid at once incest in the first marriages, and the intermingling of races meant to be kept entirely distinct, no way is left but the supposition advanced by Professor Agassiz, viz. that man was produced, not by the creation of one original pair, or of several original pairs, but that whole communities of men, just as bees in swarms, were created in several different zoological provinces. Unless this supposition, which is void of all probability, and which is at least directly in the teeth of the Mosaic narrative, be adopted, you cannot explain the propagation of mankind, without admitting the union of brothers and sisters in the marriages of the immediate descendants of the first human pair or pairs. Nor would the same objections then lie against such unions as now: as a little reflection will serve to shew. In the second generation they would be no longer necessary: and even with us, the intermarriage of first cousins, however undesirable it may be esteemed, as a general thing, is neither unknown nor regarded as sinful.

After the second generation among Adam's descendants had arisen, the marriage of brother to sister may have been divinely prohibited, although of this we find no record. Certain it is, that

in ancient times the connection in marriage of very near relatives, even half-brothers and sisters, was viewed with little of the abhorrence we feel ; nay, it was positively tolerated. Thus Sarai, wife of the patriarch Abraham, was his half-sister. (Gen. xx. 12.) And even in the time of King David, the intermarriage of those who stood in a relation so near as that of children of the same father but by different mothers, was neither unknown nor deemed altogether unlawful ; as is plain from the remonstrance urged by the distressed Tamar, on her brutal brother. (2 Sam. xiii. 13.)

But certainly the objection against the descent of all mankind from one pair, on *this* ground, comes with but an ill grace from those who so highly extol the ancient Egyptians, since it is well known that among the Pharaohs of old, as well as among the Ptolemies in later times, the marriage of brother and sister was allowed, and was even customary. A similar custom seems to have prevailed at the court of ancient Persia.

This objection being disposed of, it is not difficult to shew, that without resort to the supposition of any miraculous fecundity, the descendants of the one first human pair, might, by the close of one hundred and thirty years from Adam's creation, have been sufficiently numerous to form several distinct settlements, and several towns, which might have been spread over an extensive district of country ; so as to warrant the fear expressed by Cain, and to account for his applying himself to the building of a city or little town, which he named Enoch, after his son. A very simple calculation will settle this point, and shew that from this one pair, allowing the birth of a male only every second year, nearly three thousand persons might have sprung, and been then alive and vigorous ; and these, including a large body of descendants from Abel, who may well be imagined disposed to resent and to avenge the murder of their progenitor, might have been already scattered over a large extent of country at the time of Abel's death, enough to account for the fears of Cain.

Why, at this very moment, when the descendants of President Edwards, the author of the immortal treatise on the "*Freedom of the Will*," are contemplating a general family meeting, it is calculated that the descendants of the illustrious metaphysician number about two thousand, although he has been dead hardly a century, January 1852.

If, however, the chronological dates of the Septuagint be adopted (and every year serves only to increase the probability that this is the true chronology), then, Seth not having been born until the year 230, a very easy calculation will shew there must have been more than a hundred thousand persons then alive, who may have been spread over a country as extensive as Alabama and Louisiana united. (See Bedford's Scrip. Chron. Tables, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and pages 205-211. Lond. 1730.)¹

It is easy to ridicule such calculations, and to call them extravagant and absurd. But ridicule is no test of truth.

That no more than three sons of Adam are mentioned by name in Genesis furnishes no proof that these were all the offspring of his union with Eve. The probabilities are strongly against such comparative sterility; and the testimony of Genesis is explicit that Adam had other children, and of both sexes.

These three sons are alone mentioned, because of the extraordinary incidents in the history of Abel and of Cain; and because, in the line of Seth, the true religion was preserved, and from him Noah, the father of the postdiluvian world, was descended. The objection against the authority of Genesis, and with it the objection against the unity of the human race as sprung from one pair, that is based on the fears, the marriage, and the wanderings of Cain, are untenable and groundless. For, let it be remembered, that when an objection against a statement either found in the Bible or made by any competent witness, is based upon the *impossibility* of the fact alleged, the moment it is shewn that upon any reasonable supposition it might be true, the objection is answered, it becomes powerless, even though the particular supposition made should happen not to be the right one. The reason is obvious. In shewing that, on any reasonable supposition, the fact in question *might be true*, might have occurred, you shew that *it is not impossible*: and of course the objection based upon the ground that it *is impossible*, and that *therefore* it cannot be true, dies at once.

¹ A calculation by no means exaggerated or very improbable, would yield some eight or ten thousand at the close of one hundred and thirty years; and by the termination of the two hundred and thirty years assigned in the Septuagint as the date of Seth's birth, there might have been upwards of two hundred thousand living persons. The calculation given above, which is the lowest, will meet the objection.

Another objection may here be briefly noticed, viz. that urged against the long lives ascribed in Genesis to the earlier patriarchs. Thus we read that Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years; Methuselah nine hundred and sixty-nine. Noah seems to have been about five hundred years old at the birth of his sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Gen. v. 32; and Noah was six hundred years old at the time of the flood, Gen. vii. 11. His entire age, at the period of his death, was nine hundred and fifty years, Gen. ix. 29. It follows, therefore, that before the flood, men must have lived about ten times as long as now. To remove this difficulty various suppositions have been resorted to. Some have supposed that the years mentioned in the ages of the antediluvian patriarchs, were lunar, not solar years; *i. e.* that they were months. But this explanation is inadmissible; it would reduce the period between the creation of Adam and the Deluge from 1656 years, the lowest computation usually maintained, to about 138; a period utterly insufficient to account for all the events recorded, and for the large population spoken of, as in existence on the earth before the Deluge. Other interpreters have supposed that the numbers have been inadvertently increased tenfold, and that Adam was ninety-three instead of nine hundred and thirty years old; Methuselah ninety-six; and Noah ninety-five years old, at the time of their death, respectively.

But if this be the true explanation, the interval between the creation and the flood was only 165 years, which is incredible; then, also, the Deluge itself could have lasted but a few days, which is directly contradictory of the Mosaic narrative; and then, also, many of the patriarchs must have had children at ten, and and some of them at five or six years of age. All this is utterly inadmissible.

The truth seems to be, that, for reasons doubtless good and wise, God suffered men in the earlier ages of the world to live and to retain their vigour to a very advanced age, for the more rapid peopling of the earth, and for the readier transmission, by tradition, before a written revelation was given, of the vital truths of religion.

Before the flood, so far as the Mosaic record enables us to judge, the life of man was, in length, double what it was in the first centuries after the flood. In the period succeeding the time of Noah,

man's life was reduced to four hundred and six years, and then it seems to have been rapidly shortened. Abraham died at the age of one hundred and seventy-five years, Gen. xxv. 7. Joseph died at one hundred and ten, Gen. l. 22. Moses lived to the age of one hundred and twenty, Deut. xxxiv. 7; and thus gradually was human life shortened, until, in the time of the Psalmist (Ps. xc. 10), it was reduced to its present standard, about threescore years and ten.

But we are told the extreme longevity ascribed in Genesis to the patriarchs is utterly incredible, because it is unnatural; and moreover the recorded ages of persons contemporary with some of these patriarchs, as found on the monuments of Egypt, shew clearly that the account given in Genesis is exaggerated.

I answer. The assertion that such longevity in ancient times was *unnatural*, is gratuitous. Even apart from the direct appointment of God, to which we unhesitatingly refer this great longevity, it is far from being impossible; it is not even improbable, that, before the Deluge, and perhaps also for some ages thereafter, the original vigour of man's frame, fresh from the hands of his Maker, together with the influence of a congenial climate, possibly of a purer atmosphere, a more equable temperature, a more wholesome diet, simpler habits of life, and other causes to us unknown, may have combined and contributed greatly to prolong the life of man.

The Mosaic account of this longevity is certainly corroborated by the traditional history of all ancient nations that has reached our times. For Manetho, who wrote the story of the Egyptians, Berosus, who wrote the Chaldean history, and those authors who give us accounts of Phœnician antiquities; and among the Greeks, Hesiod, Hecataeus, Hellenicus, Ephorus, &c., do unanimously testify that, in the first ages of the world, men lived to be nearly one thousand years old. (See Burnet's Theory, b. ii. ch. iv. : see also Stackhouse on Gen. v. 13.)

Besides, admitting that in Egypt men did not in patriarchal times reach the advanced ages recorded in Genesis, that could not disprove the fact that such longevity was reached in other regions (say in Asia, as recorded by Moses).

Is it any proof that temples built of sand-stone, and obelisks of granite, and of sandstone both, cannot have stood in Egypt un-

injured for two or three thousand years, because it is found that, in these United States and in Europe, marble, and granite itself, gradually crumble, eroded by time after a much shorter period? Facts shew the reverse; for it is but a few years since the obelisk now standing in La Place de la Concorde, in Paris, was brought from Egypt, and erected there, and already it shews the destructive power of the climate, the sharp edges of its beautifully sculptured figures are fast wearing away, while its twin-fellow at Luxor still stands, after the lapse of about 4000 years, uninjured, and fresh as at first! (See Ampère, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 1847, p. 1010.)

Moreover, it is a mere assumption that the names on these monuments are those of persons contemporaneous with the long-lived patriarchs mentioned in Genesis. The men of extreme longevity were antediluvians.

The monuments of Egypt, though certainly very ancient, were *as* certainly built long after the flood.

It is not true, then, that the annals of Egypt and of the East shew that, in the patriarchal times, men's lives were not longer than now. In all those oriental annals, some of the earliest of the men therein commemorated, are represented as having attained a very great age.

I recollect meeting with the names of several monarchs, mentioned in the hieroglyphics, whose age must have been considerably greater than that of Moses, one hundred and twenty years.

For instance, the reign of Menes, the first king, and first of the Theban dynasty in Egypt (mentioned by Eratosthenes), was sixty-two years. That of Apoppous (the Pheops of Manetho), was one hundred years, wanting but one hour; he was the twentieth king. The reign of Moncheiri, the sixth king, was seventy-nine years. (See Drummond's *Origines*, vol. ii. pp. 395, 411.) This Pheops is now placed as the fourth king of the sixth or Memphite dynasty: he began to reign at six years of age. (See Henrick's *Egypt*, vol. ii. p. 145.)

So also the Chinese annals represent the emperor Fo-li to have *reigned* (not lived merely, but *reigned* on the throne as monarch) during the long period of one hundred and fifteen years; Xinnum, one hundred and forty; Ho-an-ti, one hundred; and Hao-hao, eighty-four years. Yao reigned one hundred years; and these

monarchs are, by the Chinese registers, assigned to a period not far from Noah.

The *lives* of these monarchs *must*, therefore, have been from one hundred and ten or fifteen, to one hundred and seventy or even one hundred and eighty years. (See *Historia Sinica Martini*, and Bedford's *Scripture Chronology*, p. 7; Du Halde's *China*, vol. i. pp. 270, 282; *Chine*, par M. Pauthier, pp. 24-30.)

Now it is somewhat remarkable, that while in our day it is objected against the Mosaic account of patriarchal longevity, that no instance of life much longer than the present average is found recorded on the monuments or among the hieroglyphics of Egypt, it is but a few years since *one* argument advanced by the friends of the Bible as corroborative of this very account of the long lives of the patriarchs, was derived from the fact, that some of the earliest of the Egyptian kings are represented as living, and even reigning several centuries each. (See Faber's *Pagan Idolatry*, vol. ii. pp. 49-53.)

Thus in the table of Egyptian kings given by Eratosthenes, Menes, the first Egyptian king, who was long supposed to be the same as Mizraim, lived two hundred and fifty years; his successor, Thoth, or Athmothes, lived two hundred and seventy-six years. These are represented as nearly contemporary with Arphaxad, the son of Shem, and with Salah, Eber, and Peleg. (Bedford's *Script. Chron.* p. 62.) This Mizraim, or Menes, is represented by some to have been the son of Ham, and his death at two hundred and fifty two years of age was lamented by the Egyptians as premature. "This" (observes the quaint old chronicler, Bedford, p. 61) "is a fair time (two hundred and fifty-two years old) for a man whom the Egyptians lament as cut off in the flower of his age; and this, and the death of Athmothes at two hundred and seventy-six years, the grandson of Ham, is a good approach to the longevity of those patriarchal times, since Athmothes came to the throne when he was two hundred and seventeen years old, and he died when he was two hundred and seventy-six, though not so old as Salah, four hundred and thirty-three; which many accidents might hinder." "And thus," observes the same old writer (Bedford, *Chron.* p. 68), "by comparing the longevity of the kings of Upper Egypt with their contemporaries in Scripture, we find the history of both confirmed." There are, however, other difficulties

attending the received understanding of the Mosaic record respecting the patriarchs. According to the chronology commonly given in our Bibles, Lamech, the father of Noah, was *contemporary with all his ancestors*. He was already fifty-six years old when Adam died. Noah was eighty-four years old at the death of Enos; and at Noah's death, Abraham was fifty-eight years old. Shem, the son of Noah, and one of those saved with Noah in the ark, not only lived all the days of Abraham, but he survived him thirty-three years. Shem must, then, have been living one hundred and nine years after the institution of circumcision, as the seal of God's covenant with Abraham, the father of the faithful. Arphaxad lived eight-two years, Salah one hundred and seven, and Heber one hundred and seventy-two years after the establishment of that rite, if Usher's Chronology be admitted, and yet no mention whatever is made of these the pious ancestors and kindred of Abraham, all yet living when that covenant was made. Were these venerable patriarchs actually living at the time when this solemn religious ordinance was established, the utter silence of the sacred historian respecting them is unaccountable.

Again: when God intimated to Sarah that she should bear a son, she deemed it incredible that she, at the age of ninety, should conceive, her husband also being about one hundred: *he, as good as dead*, says Paul.

But, if the common chronology be retained, we must suppose that fertility even in persons much older, could have been nothing strange to this venerable couple; for Shem, their own ancestor, was yet living, whose first child was born after the flood, when Shem was upwards of one hundred years old: and Abraham at least, and most probably Sarah also, must have seen, and might often have conversed with Noah himself, who lived till Abraham was fifty-eight, and Sarah about forty-eight. But Noah was about five hundred years old when his children were born. Another computation places the birth of Abraham a few years after the death of Noah: but the argument is scarcely affected at all by this difference of computation. The incredulity of Abraham and Sarah is utterly inexplicable, if they had been so long contemporary, or so nearly contemporary, with Noah and Shem, as the chronology of Usher implies.

This is, most assuredly, a difficulty of some magnitude; and against the received computation of dates, it bears with overwhelming force. That computation allows an interval of three hundred and fifty-two years only, between the Deluge and Abraham.

Against the shortness of this interval, many and constantly increasing difficulties are presented. But in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the dates assigned for this period, and those also in the Septuagint, or Greek translation, which here agrees with the Samaritan, relieve us entirely of this difficulty. According to the LXX. there had elapsed, instead of three hundred and fifty-two years, no less than one thousand and two years (and even the Samaritan copy gives us nine hundred and forty-two years), between the flood and the birth of Abraham (see Hale's Chronology, vol. ii. p. 33), an interval which affords ample time for all the events recorded in Genesis, and for those also that are registered in the archives of ancient oriental nations, saving, perhaps, those of Egypt alone. Ample time is also, by adopting the Septuagint chronology, afforded for the gradual decrease in the length of human life, and the consequent limitation of the period of fruitfulness in marriage, until, by the time of Abraham, the promised birth of a son, at the age then attained by the father of the faithful, and his wife, was very naturally heard with surprise and incredulity.

True, we are told, that the researches of the latest explorers among the monuments on the banks of the Nile, have brought to light records, which extend from A.D. 250, the most modern, back to 2500 years *before* Abraham. This would imply that these monuments are 1498 years older than the flood, even according to the Septuagint chronology. According to the chronology of Usher, as commonly printed in our Bibles, these discoveries would shew the oldest of the Egyptian monumental records now known to be 2148 years before the flood, and no less than 492 years before Adam was created. (See Ampère in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 1847, pp. 1019, 1035). But these dates are certainly exaggerated, as I hope hereafter to shew. (See *Revue*, &c. Nov. 1846, p. 688).

But suppose it should be shewn beyond dispute,¹ that these

¹ For instances of varying interpretations of the monumental hieroglyphics among

dates do actually stand recorded on the monuments; that would not, of itself, authenticate them as correct.

The vanity of nearly all oriental nations has led to palpable exaggerations of antiquity in their earlier annals; and none more so than the Egyptians.

A nation that gravely records the reigns of their earlier kings as lasting hundreds, and in some instances, thousands of years, as the Egyptians do, may well be supposed to have made fabulous records among their hieroglyphics. In some instances it has been proved, that the hieroglyphics have been altered. (See *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, April, 1848, p. 77, also p. 66). New names and dates have been written over older ones, that were erased to make room for them. This I can shew. Such alterations have been observed, and pointed out by Ampère. He has shewn also that at Beit-Oalli, Champollion has made out one Ramses more than the monuments record. (See *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1849, p. 87, and p. 93.) This substitution of Cartouches has been observed also at Medinet Habou. (*Rev. &c. Dec. 1847*, p. 1028.) At Thebes and at Amada also (see *id.* Jan. 1849, p. 93.)

But, should we even allow all that can be claimed for the antiquity of these monuments; after all, these monuments present only the unsupported assertions of one people against the authority of the Bible, supported as the Bible is, by an array of evidence, great, various, and augmenting and strengthening every year. Nay, suppose the worst; suppose that we should be compelled to abandon the Septuagint chronology, as well as that of Usher, even this (of which there is no probability at all), would be merely equivalent to admitting that the mode of numerical notation used in the earliest copies of the Pentateuch, and of its ancient versions, has not been made out with entire certainty, and that, therefore, mere chronological dates were not designed to be included, *as an essential part*, in revelation.

Even this concession would leave every doctrine, every precept, every promise of the Bible, distinct, full, and glorious as before.

even the ablest Ægyptologists, Champollion, Rosellini, &c. (see *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1849, p. 87, note. See also, *id.* Nov. 1848, pp. 687, 688.) Wilkinson and Osburn both notice similar variations in interpreting the hieroglyphics.

But this concession we do not make : on the contrary we contend that the very oldest of the Egyptian monuments, when rightly interpreted, falls entirely within the Mosaic chronology, according to the ancient Greek version. By the help of the recent researches of Mr R. S. Poole, we can now place this position in a light of strong probability, if not certainty.

This point will be briefly set forth at the close of the Second Lecture on the Deluge.

LECTURE VIII.

ANTEDILUVIAN GIANTS.

GEN. vi. 4.—“ There were giants in the earth, in those days.”

ON the first four verses of this chapter, a living writer has hazarded the remark : “ Is it possible that any one can regard this as a part of genuine revelation ? Does it not, on the contrary (as many modern commentators think), bear on its face strong evidence of having been borrowed from the ancient mythologies of India and Egypt, which it so closely resembles ? Are not ‘ *the sons of God*’ a mythical creation of the human brain ? The whole conception is utterly opposed to the monotheism of the other Hebrew books : and the New Testament tells us, in plain terms, that *Christ* was the *only son of God*.” (See Two Lectures by Dr J. C. Nott, New York, 1819, p. 61.)

This criticism betrays but little acquaintance with the peculiar phraseology of the sacred books, and with the writings of the most learned and judicious expositors of those books. As to borrowing from oriental mythology, it may be remarked that the ancient *Indian* mythology cannot be traced with certainty beyond an era very long posterior to that of Moses. If there be borrowing in the case, the Gentoos must have borrowed from the Hebrews. As it respects Egyptian mythology, it was, *toto cælo*, different from the teachings of the Mosaic legends, as I have elsewhere shewn. (See my Lecture on the Character of Moses as a Statesman, in this work. See also Pritchard’s *Egypt. Mythol.* pp. 406, 408.)

The New Testament does, indeed, tell us that Christ is, in a *peculiar* sense, the *Son of God* ; that Christ is the *only begotten Son of God* (John i. 14, 18 ; iii. 16, 18.) But it tells us also that all believers in Christ, all truly devoted persons, are also *children of God*, sons and daughters of God. (John i. 12. Rom. viii. 14. Philip. ii. 15. Hos. i. 10 : comp. Job. i. 6. Luke iii.

38.) What is there, then, to forbid the idea, that the term *sons of God*, was, from the remotest ages of even the antediluvian world, applied to the pious, and to those who avowed themselves worshippers of the one only living God?

Thus understood (and this is a natural, and, as I believe, the generally received interpretation of these passages), the story related in Gen. vi. 1-4, is perfectly consistent with the monotheism pervading Genesis entirely, no less than the other books of the Hebrew Scriptures.

True, during the first three or four centuries of our era, there was extensively prevalent among Christian writers, an idea, that, by *sons of God*, mentioned in Gen. vi. 2, 4, "*who saw the daughters of men that they were fair,*" &c., spirits were meant, *i. e.* angels clothed in bodies assumed for the purpose; that these incarnate spirits wooed and won the fairest among the women of that time; and that, from this strange union, sprang a race of men, gigantic in stature, and lawless in their lives. And St Austin was very confident in this matter, distinctly asserting that instances were well known, and even not unfrequent, of demons (*i. e.* spirits in human shape, and called *incubi*), having carnal connection with women; so that, he says, it were foolish to doubt the fact.

But these monstrous stories undoubtedly originated in a false interpretation of this passage, by some Jewish writers, and not improbably they may have originated in the form of the phrase used for "*sons of God*," as found in some ancient copies of the Septuagint translation of Genesis. Philo did certainly translate "*sons of God*," *angels of God*.

Josephus also asserts (Antiq. b. i. ch. iv.) that *the angels of God, mixing with women, begat an insolent race* (not much unlike that of the heaven-storming giants celebrated in Greek mythological fables), *overbearing right with power*.

We cannot wonder, then, that nearly all the early Christian writers, called the Fathers, very few of whom knew anything of Hebrew, and who almost invariably used, and drew all their ideas of Bible truth from the Greek translation of the Old Testament called the Septuagint, should (as Dr Whitby has clearly shewn in his "*Writings of the Fathers*" that most of them did, as *e. g.* Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Athenagorus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, and even Eusebius, &c.) have held.

this strange opinion of the meaning of Gen. vi. 2, 4. It is perhaps hardly necessary to remark that our copies of the Septuagint read this passage (*υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*), as our English version does, "sons of God." In the closing words of ver. 26 of Gen. iv. we read that in the days of Enos, the son of Seth, "*then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.*"

By that expression is undoubtedly meant some marked change in the religious sentiments or the religious rites of men, perhaps both: and not improbably this change prevailed chiefly in the family of Seth. Rosenmuller thinks it denotes the re-ordering of the rites of God's worship.

Monsieur Cahen, a learned French Jew of Paris, in his recent French translation of the Bible, commenced in 1831, says, in a note on Gen. iv. 26—"This might well be the origin of prayer addressed to the Eternal, as designated by his quadriliteral name יהוה, Jehovah, here translated *Lord.*" This may be so. But as the word translated *called upon* may mean "*called upon themselves,*" *i. e.* called themselves by the name of the Lord, it is the generally received opinion that, in the time of Enos, the descendants of Seth, seeing the great and increasing wickedness prevailing among those of the race of Cain, did, in order to separate themselves more fully from the impious, assume a designation expressive of their reverence for the true God, and so called themselves, after his name, *the people of Jehovah.*

These are they who, in Gen. vi. 2, 4, are spoken of as *sons of God.*

It is, however, true that the word translated *began*, in Gen. iv. 26, does, in some of its forms, mean to *pollute* or *profane.* Hence many of the old Jewish rabbins believed and taught that here, in the family of Seth, and so early as in the time of Enos, was the origin of idolatry, especially the worship of the sun and other heavenly bodies.

This hypothesis is rendered quite plausible, from this consideration, that although in the line of Seth piety and the knowledge and the worship of the true God were preserved, yet the great body, even of the descendants of Seth, although possibly designated *sons of God*, just as the whole of Europe (Turkey excepted) is now called *Christian*, did in fact become very corrupt and grossly wicked. As such Seth's descendants (Noah and his family alone

excepted) perished in one indiscriminate ruin with the descendants of Cain in the flood.

That Cain and his descendants became wicked, impious idolaters and deniers of the one living God, is an inference from the marked distinction made in Genesis between "*sons of God*" and daughters of men. This idea is farther confirmed by the passage in the letter of the Apostle Jude (v. 4-11), where, speaking of some who "*denied the Lord that bought them,*" he adds, "*Woe unto them, for they are gone after the way of Cain,*" *i. e.* they had thrown off all respect for God.

There is a very curious passage in the work of the Jewish writer Maimonides on idolatry, in which he explains this passage in Gen. iv. 26 as recording the origin of idolatry. Dr A. Clarke, in his Commentary on Gen. iv. 26, thus quotes the passage from Maimonides at length:—"In the days of Enos the sons of Adam erred with a very great error, and the counsels of the wise men of that age became brutish; and Enos himself was one of those that erred; and their error was this. They said, forasmuch as God has created these stars and spheres to govern the world, and set them on high, and imparted honour unto them, and they are ministers that minister before him, it is meet that *men* should laud and glorify them and give them honour. For this is the will of God, that we magnify and honour whatsoever He magnifieth and honoureth, even as a king would have those honoured who stand before him; and this is the honour of the king himself.

"When this thing was come up into their hearts, they began to build temples unto the stars, and to offer sacrifice unto them, to laud and glorify these with words, and to worship before them, that they might, in their evil opinion, obtain favour of the Creator. *And this was the root of idolatry, &c.* And in process of time there stood up false prophets among the sons of Adam, who said that God had commanded and said unto them, *worship such a star*, or all the stars, and do sacrifice unto them thus and thus, and build a temple for it, and make an image of it, that all the people, women and children, may worship it. And the false prophets shewed them the image he had feigned out of his own heart, and said it was the image of such a star, which was made known to him by prophecy. And they began, after this manner, to make images in temples, and under trees, and on tops of mountains and hills,

and assembled themselves together and worshipped them, &c. And this thing was spread over all the earth, to serve images with services different one from another, &c. &c. And the wise men that were among them, as the priests and such like, thought there was no God save the stars and spheres, for whose sake, and in whose likeness, they had made these images; and as for the Rock everlasting, there was no man that acknowledged Him, or knew Him, save a few persons in the world, such as Enoch, Methuselah, Noah," &c. (See Maimonides in the Mishna; and also Ainsworth on the passage. See also Dr A. Clarke on Gen. iv. 26.)

This curious and very ancient history of the rise and gradual spread of idolatry¹ is quite probable. Certain it is that the sixth chapter of Genesis presents us with a brief sketch of the spread, if not also of the origin of that wickedness which eventually caused the destruction of the ancient world by a vast deluge; and as chief and prime among the agencies working to that issue, we find mentioned the intermingling of the worshippers of the true God with the impious descendants of Cain. "*The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose.*" This incongruous alliance seems to have been fraught with evils on all sides. (See Havernick's *Introductio Pentateuch*, pp. 110-112.)

We know, indeed, that even now, under the Gospel, the connection in marriage of the devout Christian with the decidedly worldly is discountenanced at least, if not forbidden. "*Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers;*" and those who would marry, are assured that it is right so to do "*only in the Lord.*" (1 Cor. vii. 39.) Nor can it be doubted that such marriages of the believer with the unbeliever are often the occasion of much anxiety and sorrow, especially in regard to the training of children. But in those antediluvian marriages of the pious with the impious, of the sons of God with the daughters of men, there must have been a something more than to us is now apparent—a something peculiarly offensive to heaven, and peculiarly fertile of evil. For the visitation immediately follows of a certain brief interval during which God would yet bear with the increasing wickedness of men ere he would sweep them all from the face of the earth. (Gen. vi.

¹ See also Faber's *Origin of Idolatry*, vol. ii. pp. 34-36, and Sir Wm. Drummond's *Origines*, vol. iii. pp. 424, 425. Jackson's *Chronology*, pp. 60-63.

3.) Then follow the remarkable words, *There were giants in the earth in those days.*

- By many, perhaps by a majority of the readers of our good old English version, it has been supposed that these *giants* were persons of very large stature and huge dimensions—an entire race of such monsters—and that they werè the fruit of the marriage of the pious race with the wicked—of the sons of God with the daughters of men. But this can hardly be; for these giants (whatever that term may import) are here stated to have been existing before the fruit of these unlawful marriages was born. Thus we read, “*There were giants in the earth in those days.*” And, AFTER THAT, “*when the sons of God went in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.*”

This whole passage seems to me to convey the idea simply that now the attention of men was directed exclusively to the affairs of this life, and that physical beauty and physical perfection became the great objects of desire. The result was a race excelling in physical proportions and physical power; an athletic, healthy, active race—full of energy, full of enterprise, and signally successful in their worldly pursuits. The whole end and aim of this pre-eminently vigorous race seem to have been pleasure and distinction. This they secured; for as in the very nature of things it could have been only a few comparatively of the one race that would intermarry with the other and produce the more vigorous race, the physical perfection, the boldness of the achievements of this mixed race—*these mighty ones*—might and would attract attention, awaken admiration, and render them *men of renown*, which were of old.

The natural tendency of all this would be to increase the prevailing forgetfulness of God, to encourage luxury and idolatry, and to foster the general wickedness, which began loudly to call upon heaven for some purifying power to rid the earth of the monstrous wickedness under which it was groaning.

Thus it appears that in these lustful marriages was laid the foundation of that abounding evil which eventually brought the Deluge upon the earth.

It may be, however, that by the phrase “*sons of God*,” like other somewhat similar expressions, such as “*cedars of God*,”

“*mountains of the Lord*,” denoting very high trees, or lofty mountains, &c. (see 1 Sam. xxvi. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 16, xxxvi. 7, lxxx. 10, 11, civ. 16; Cant. viii. 6; and compare Nordheimer’s Hebrew Grammar, vol. i. pp. 60, 61), Moses intends to convey the idea of persons tall, large, and majestic in appearance. If this interpretation be admitted, we shall have here no account of the *origin* of these tall individuals; it would only seem, by inference, that such appeared among the descendants of Seth, the pious race.

Captivated by the beauty of the daughters of men—*i. e.* the thoroughly worldly, the descendants of Cain—they contracted marriages with them, the result of which was a race vigorous, daring, and distinguished alike for their achievements and their increasing wickedness.

Certain it is that this passage of holy writ has, in all ages, been understood to convey the idea that there existed, in antediluvian times, a considerable number of persons, if not an entire race or tribe of men, gigantic in size, and distinguished for their prowess. But it by no means authorizes the notion that the antediluvians were generally persons of gigantic stature. Nor is there any reason to believe that, even from the earliest ages, the general average of man’s size has undergone any considerable alteration. It is indeed true that many ancient authors speak of such giants in primitive times, *e. g.* Huetius, *Inquiries*, b. ii.; Augustine de Civ. Dei. vi. 15; Josephus, *Antiq.* b. i. c. v.; Pliny, vi. 1. (See Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarchs*, Essay ii.; Whiston’s *Orig. Records and Suppl.*; and also Harkwell’s *Apology*, vi. 3, &c. See Faber’s *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, vol. i. p. 217. See Jackson’s *Chronology*, pp. 59, 60.)

It is also true that, at various epochs, bones of immense size have been dug up, which at the time, and for many ages thereafter, were supposed to be human bones of vast size, the remains of ancient, and possibly of antediluvian giants. Thus it is stated by Taselius, and the statement is repeated by Claverinus, that near Panormum, in Sicily, the body of a giant eighteen cubits, or twenty-seven feet in height, was dug up A.D. 1547.

Another near Mazarene, in the same island, was found A.D. 1516, twenty cubits, or thirty feet tall. Again, in 1548, near Syracuse, was disinterred a skeleton of similar size. Near Entella,

in Sicily, was dug up a body twenty-two cubits, or thirty-three feet high, the skull of which was about ten feet in circumference. Another body of enormous magnitude is spoken of as having been found standing in a large cave near Drepanum, in Sicily, so early as A.D. 1342. The staff of this monster was, they tell us, like the mast of a ship, and the anterior part of his skull would contain several Sicilian bushels, each of which is about one-third of the English bushel. (See Whiston's Authentic Records and Supplement.)

Plato and Pliny both mention enormous bones found in a mountain of Crete, which, if human, must have appertained to a man standing forty-six cubits, or nearly sixty-nine feet tall. Another found in Mauritania, and mentioned by Strabo and Plutarch, was supposed to be the skeleton of Antæus. If really his, then Antæus must have stood sixty cubits, that is, nearly ninety feet high. A man of imposing presence certainly must this Antæus have been; and when he stooped to kiss his mother earth, it must have been an act of signal condescension.¹

Some old authors tell us of another skeleton, found A.D. 1171, in England, that appertained to a person fifty feet long.

It is hardly necessary to add that all such supposed gigantic human bones, when subjected to the test of scientific scrutiny, prove to be not human bones at all, but the bones, sometimes of whales, sometimes of the elephant, and sometimes of extinct monsters, such as the mastadon, or the isaurion. Sir Hans Sloane examined an immense vertebra, or joint of a backbone, dug up in Oxfordshire, England, which was fully believed by the vulgar to be the bone of a huge antediluvian giant. He found it to be, in truth, one of the vertebræ of a large whale. St Austin, in adducing proof of the existence of "*giants in those days on the earth before the flood,*" mentions an immense tooth that he himself had seen near Utica. It was doubtless the tooth of some elephant. In 1650 a large tooth disinterred near Tunis, in Africa, was sent for examination to the learned Pieresc. He identified it as in all respects similar to another tooth found in the same region; and

¹ Quære. May it not be that the discovery, in very early times, of such vast bones in Sicily, and some other places near the shores of the Mediterranean, and known to the ancients, had something to do in originating the traditionary fables of the giants of classical antiquity, especially the Cyclops and the Titans?

both were unquestionably the grinders of an elephant, or of elephants. (See Richardson's *Geology. Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 275.)

Some strange mistakes have, it is said, been made in the reputed relics of saints, exhibited in some popish churches. A few years ago, a large scapula, part of an elephant in reality, was exhibited in a church at Venice, as the shoulder-blade of St Christopher.

At Antwerp, also, a large tooth was shewn as a saintly relic, which had, at one time undoubtedly, aided in duly masticating the food of a good-sized elephant. (See Rees' *Cycloped. art. Giant*. See also Dr Beard's *Bib. Dict. for People*, art. Anak.)

It can hardly be denied, however, that human skeletons and human bones, and fragments of such bones of uncommon magnitude, have occasionally been found. A paper mentioning several such instances was read, some years since, by Mon. Le Cat. before the "*Academie des Sciences*," at Rouen. (*Idem*.) It is also unquestionable that occasionally there have been seen, in various countries and in all ages, living individuals of unusual, and sometimes even of enormous stature.

In our own day such monsters have been seen ; and exceptions, equally striking, occasionally present, of persons of very diminutive size ; as, *e. g.* the dwarf known as Tom Thumb, who is yet living, and has been exhibited in nearly every state in the Union, and in several countries of Europe also.

The skeleton of O'Brien is still in the British Museum, measuring seven feet eleven inches in height. The man, while living, must, therefore, have been about eight feet and one inch in height. Parsons, originally a blacksmith, and afterwards employed as a porter at the Court establishment of the English monarch, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, was seven feet and two inches high, and proportionably built in all respects.

Instances of similar excess beyond the average proportions of man are not unknown. Perhaps there are few who have not occasionally met with such.

A few years since, when travelling on the Mississippi, I saw a young man who came on board at Grand Gulf, apparently not above eighteen years of age. Judging by the degree in which he was compelled to stoop, as he moved about in the cabin of the steamer, he must have been considerably above seven feet in

height. At that time he was a well proportioned, though rather slender youth. If still living and in health, he is no doubt greatly increased in bulk, and might be appropriately designated a *giant*.

Some few years since, a person of yet larger proportions was exhibited at Philadelphia.

The Roman emperor Maximilian is said to have been no less than nine feet high.

Goliath, the Philistine, slain by David, is recorded to have been six cubits and a span : that is, if we rightly estimate the ancient Hebrew cubit, about nine and a-half feet.

Mention is undoubtedly made, in the Bible, of quite a number of men of gigantic size : but they are evidently spoken of as *lusus naturæ*, a singular phenomena, as rare exceptions to the general rule, and, *because exceptions*, therefore remarkable, and mentioned as such.

Now all history certifies the fact, that such rare examples of gigantic size, have occurred in all ages : and undoubted testimony, nay indeed our own observation assures us, persons of such gigantic size do still, occasionally, appear in society.

There is, therefore, no improbability in the account given in the Bible, of persons, and occasionally, of families, and perhaps of whole tribes of unusual, of even gigantic dimensions

In Gen. xiv. 5. mention is made of a race, termed Rephaim, who were settled beyond Jordan, in Ashteroth Kernaim : they were defeated by Chedorlaomer. Of this race, in the time of Moses, there remained alone Og, King of Bashan. (Deut. iii. 10.) The coffin of iron here spoken of (although this passage is, by some, supposed to be an interpolation by a later hand) was yet existing in the writer's time, and was preserved in Rabath, a city of the Ammonites. This coffin was nine cubits long and four broad. The person for whose corpse such a coffin was necessary, must have been of gigantic stature, upwards of thirteen feet high, and large in proportion.

Now we know that in the last century, Turner the naturalist reported that he saw, near the Rio de la Plata, in South America, a race of giants, from the interior, totally naked ; and one of whom, the tallest among them, was twelve feet high. (Rees. Cycl. art. *Giant*.)

The Patagonians, on the coast of South America to the north and north-west of Cape Horn, are universally admitted to be above the ordinary height, varying from six to seven feet, or a little more.

Humboldt tells us that the Guayaquilists measure six and a half feet, and that the Paraguas are equally tall : while the Caribbees of Cumana are distinguished, by their almost gigantic size, from all the other nations he had met within the New World. (See Pritchard's Researches, vol. v. p. 489)

By the earlier Spanish navigators, the Patagonians were stated to measure seven feet four inches. This account seems to be somewhat exaggerated. More recent travellers, such as Bougainville, Wallis, Carteret, and Falkner, tell us that the Patagonians usually measure from six to seven feet. (See Humboldt's Cosmos. See also Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. art. Giant.)

The Rephaim above spoken of, are mentioned in Job xxvi. 5, although the word rephaim is there rendered *dead things* : comp. Josh. xii. 4, and xiii. 12.

In Numbers xiii. 28, the Anakim are spoken of as a race of giants. The spies sent forth to explore and to ascertain the condition of the Canaanites and of their land reported, "*We saw there the giants, the sons of Anak, which came of the giants ; and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers ; and so we were in their sight,*" vers. 32, 33 : and compare Dent. ix. 2, and ii. 10 ; see also Josh. xi. 22.

In Asa, in Gath, and in Ashdod, persons of this gigantic race long continued. (Judges i. 20. Josh. xiv. 12.) Of this race Goliath was. (1 Sam. xvii. 4.)

The Zammoumim also (Deut. xxi. 20), who dwelt in the land of Ammon, are spoken of as a race of giants.

There can, then, be no doubt the Jewish Scriptures do teach, that in ancient times, at least from Moses to the time of David, men of gigantic stature, formidable exceptions to the general standard of human bulk and stature, were found occasionally in the land of Canaan ; and they were, generally, as wicked as they were gigantic.

That such gigantic stature is described among the antediluvians, is not quite so clear. The Hebrew word, translated in the text

giants, is *nephilim*, literally *fallen ones*, or persons falling on others.

Mon. Cahen introduces this chapter (Gen. vi.) with the heading, "*The Fourth Document: relative to the mixture (or confusion, melange) of the races.*"

In v. 2 he adopts the rendering of Onkelos, viz. for "*sons of God,*" sons of the great or the noble (*des grands*); "*daughters of men,*" he translates "*filles du peuple,*" young women of the common people: and he remarks, "The supposition of *two classes is probable.* The heroes of Greece were, for the most part, sons of her gods; and she attributes the same origin to the giants, the Cyclops—and surely different countries might have the same traditions."

M. Cahen, though a Jew, a learned Hebraist, and, I believe, a rabbin, is a French Philosopher; and he is, undoubtedly, a *very liberal* expositor of the Hebrew Scriptures.

On Gen. vi. 4: Giants were then on the earth, even after the sons of the great had intercourse with daughters of the people (*i. e.* peasant-girls, &c.) he remarks, in a note:—"Giants, *nephilim*: In those ages over which the flame of history could cast only a feeble (pale) light, every thing magnifies itself; the duration of human life, human dimensions, the bodily strength of men, like objects seen across an intervening obscurity. But, with the progress of reason, every thing resumes its proper proportions.

"This tradition is of very high antiquity. Moreover, the Hebrew word seems to denote *men fallen (des hommes dechus.)*"

Assuredly M. Cahen is a liberal and a rationalistic interpreter of the old Hebrew Scripture. The Jewish writer Aquila translates the term *nephilim*, "*men who attack,*" *i. e.* who fall with impetuosity on their enemies. Symmachus translates it, *violent men, cruel*, men whose only rule of action is *violence.*

Another term, translated by the Septuagint, *giant*, is *gibbor*, meaning strictly a strong man, a brave warrior. Such was Nimrod. (Gen. x. 8; see also Ps. xix. 5. Isa. iii. 2; xiii. 3; xlix. 24, 25. Ezek. xxxix. 18, 20.)

There is, therefore, nothing in this passage in Genesis (chap. vi.) which imperatively requires us to understand the term giants, in its ordinary sense, as denoting persons of unusual stature and

bulk. They may have been such. Persons of gigantic dimensions are spoken of in other parts of the Jewish Scriptures; ancient fables and traditions among nearly all nations mention such, as *e. g.* the Cyclops and the Titans of the ancient Greeks and Romans. History records instances of such uncommon stature in many countries, and in almost every age; and we know that even yet instances of the kind do occasionally present themselves. They are now extraordinary cases, and they excite wonder as such; and as such, they are mentioned in the Mosaic narrative.

There is, therefore, certainly nothing improbable or extravagant in the whole story; and, consequently, the objections urged against this portion of Genesis on the alleged ground of its fictitious character, are void of force. Moreover, the whole narrative furnishes an impressive illustration of the danger consequent on undervaluing a knowledge of the true God, and of the guilt of slighting the privileges attendant on access to the worship of the living God, with its several ordinances and sacred rites. Such neglect leads to carelessness of the highest duties, a thorough worldliness of spirit, open apostasy from God, and to every species of gross wickedness. It provokes, also, the displeasure of God; it wearies out his long-suffering; and eventually it calls down his heavy judgments, as in the Deluge, which destroyed the whole ungodly antediluvian world.

LECTURE IX.

THE DELUGE UNIVERSAL.

PART I.

GEN. vii. 23.—“And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heavens, and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.”

THE Bible was not given, most assuredly, to serve as a text-book of science, nor as mere food for curiosity, nor yet as a repository of materials for the gratification of a refined literary taste; and yet, in the events it records or alludes to, in the descriptions it furnishes, brief though they are, there is much to stimulate curiosity, much to gratify the most refined taste, and much which the deepest researches of science may be well employed to illustrate and to explain. And certainly no other of the teachings of the Bible is more remarkable than is that of a mighty deluge in the time of Noah.

Many centuries had elapsed since the creation of man upon the earth, and since his fall, by the transgression of the first human pair in Eden.

Population had greatly increased; and it seems to have spread extensively over the earth, for we read of cities, and the arts of life, and of civilization already cultivated. (Gen. iv. 17, 20, 21, 22.) But wickedness was everywhere prevalent, and impiety reigned. Gen. vii. 1, “*The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.*” Whereupon the Most High determined to destroy the whole race of man, and with him, all living creatures on the face of the earth, saving only Noah, with

his family, and a sufficient number of pairs of all living creatures, inhabitants of the dry land, that were to be preserved with Noah, in an ark, or large ship, constructed by Noah according to directions received from God. The materials and the dimensions of this ark are minutely described in the sacred narrative.

Nearly a century and a quarter, as it would seem, was Noah busied in preparing this huge vessel, to serve as a safe refuge for himself and his family during the fierce conflict of the elements attendant on the coming inundation; and to preserve alive seed of all living creatures, so that when the flood should subside, the earth might be again replenished with living occupants as before. (Gen. vi. 17-22.)

All this was done. The ark was constructed; due provision of appropriate food was made for all; man and beast, reptile and fowl, were all shut up in the ark; when, in the six hundredth year of Noah, and on the seventeenth day of the second month, the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. Copious torrents of rain descended day and night, for many weeks continuously, so that the waters increased and spread over the whole earth, covering the plains, the hills, and at length the loftiest mountain summits, under the whole heaven, several cubits deep. (Gen. vii. 10.)

For one hundred and fifty days, or about five months, the waters prevailed over the whole earth. After this they gradually subsided, and at length disappeared, leaving the earth bare as before, but utterly desolate and uninhabited; for "*every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.*"

From the whole narrative given in Genesis, it is, I think, plain that the writer designed his readers to understand, that the deluge he describes was not a mere local inundation, desolating only one large province of Asia, but that it was universal—strictly and literally universal—covering the entire surface of the habitable globe, and submerging all lands—just so far, at least, as animal life had then extended over the earth. Moreover, that this narrative is to be received as a true historical record, and

not an allegory, is plain from the manner in which the flood of Noah is mentioned and referred to in the New Testament. Thus our Lord says: "*In the days of Noah, they did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all.*" (Luke xvii. 27; compare Matt. xxiv. 37-39.)

The Apostle Peter mentions the Deluge in each of his epistles; thus, 2 Pet. ii. 5, "*God spared not the old world; but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness; bringing in the flood on the world of the ungodly.*" And again, 1 Pet. iii. 20; "*The long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved.*" And the writer to the Hebrews tells us (xi. 17), "*By faith Noah, being warned of God, prepared an ark, to the saving of his house.*"

By all, therefore, who believe in the inspiration of the Bible, the fact is held as certain, that a great deluge of waters took place in the days of Noah, by which all mankind, and all living creatures inhabiting the land, and incapable of continued existence in water, perished from the face of the earth; while eight persons only, viz. Noah and his family, together with the animals sheltered with him in the ark, alone survived and from the descendants of those so saved, the present living tenants of the globe, human and irrational, have sprung. *Against this account of a deluge* (interpret the record, and explain the facts as you may) *several imposing objections present themselves.*

That the Noachian deluge was universal, covering the entire surface of the globe, has been the generally received interpretation.

But to avoid the obvious difficulties attending this literal interpretation, some men, and those of no mean note, in both the scientific and the theological world, have resorted to the hypothesis of a partial deluge, extending only over the comparatively small portion of the earth's surface, which, as they suppose, could then have been occupied by man.

To support this hypothesis, they understand the strong language and the universal terms employed in the narrative, as applying merely to a portion of the earth. This portion they suppose to have been completely submerged, and its highest hills

covered. The entire race of mankind, saving only the eight persons in the ark, and all the animals inhabiting that extensive region, they admit, were destroyed: while they suppose there may have been entire continents not affected by this local inundation, and left still swarming with their appropriate animal occupants.

This interpretation they strengthen by adducing other passages of Scripture, in which *like universal terms are used* in a limited sense, as *e. g.* when (Gen. xli. 56) the *famine* in the days of Joseph is said to have prevailed in *all the earth*, while (as they tell us) a portion only of Asia Minor can be intended.¹ As also in Acts ii. 5, where it is said there were at Jerusalem, on the day of pentecost, devout men dwelling in *every nation under heaven*; and again in Deut. ii. 25, where it is declared that God will begin to put the dread of the Jews upon the nations *under the whole heaven*: which we know, with absolute certainty, never was fulfilled, if the promise be understood *literally*.

¹ If the Chinese annals are to be credited, a seven years' famine prevailed also over the entire country of China, also, at a period which seems to synchronise with that of the patriarch Joseph: and in that case, the terms used in Gen. xli. 56, could hardly be understood in a very restricted sense. (See Martin's China, vol. i. p. 196. M. Pauthier's *Chine*, l'Univers Pitt. pp. 65, 66. Du Halde's China, vol. i. p. 299. Lond. edit. 1736; and Gutzlaff's China Opened, vol. i. p. 307.)

On the credit to be attached to the Chinese histories, Mr Gutzlaff offers the following sensible remarks:—The history of all nations, except that of the people of God, commences with fables and mythological traditions, and it only assumes a more authentic shape when the nation has arrived at a certain stage of civilization. Before Confucius, China had no authors, much less an historian, so that his own annals were transmitted by tradition, through a course of 2000 years. Under such circumstances, what correctness can we expect even after the most laborious researches? On these annals, however, the antiquity of the Chinese empire is founded with as much claim to our belief, as might be accorded to an English writer of the present day, who should sit down to compose the history of the ancient Britons before the invasion of the Romans, and not only give the names of their kings, but also repeat the speeches they uttered in council, or the debates of their Druidical assemblies. We, therefore, consider the history previous to Yaou (2337 B.C.) as fabulous, from thence to Confucius (550 B.C.) as uncertain, from Confucius to the Sung dynasty (A.D. 960) it may be deemed as correct as that of Greece; and since that period it is fully authentic.

“We are aware that the calculation of eclipses has been brought forward to prove the high antiquity of the Chinese empire. If Europeans had not given themselves trouble to verify them, no Chinaman would ever have dreamed of bringing them forth as a proof: for it required much ingenuity even to find the eclipses in their classical works.” (China Opened, Gutzlaff, vol. i. p. 297. See also on this point the Edinburgh Cabinet Library, China, vol. i. pp. 40, 41.)

Were the mere universality of some of the terms employed in the Mosaic narrative the sole ground of objection to the hypothesis of a *local* inundation only in the days of Noah, that hypothesis might, perhaps, be deemed admissible. But there are other and more serious difficulties attending it, to be hereafter examined.

Moreover, the language employed in Gen. vii. derives its force as expressive of complete universality, not merely nor mainly from the meaning of the several individual terms, but from the structure of the whole. The complete covering of the entire earth's surface is asserted, and the submergence of the loftiest mountain summits, not merely on the earth, or the land, but under the *whole heaven*, is affirmed. Further still, the destruction of animal life, human and brute, is declared to have been complete; and then, as if to make assurance doubly sure, the saved are enumerated, Noah and those with him in the ark, and these are declared to have been the only living creatures preserved from destruction; "*and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.*" This closing declaration applies to the human race and to all creatures in which was the breath of life, not merely in any one land, or province, but *under the whole heaven*.

Whether his assertion be true or not, it would seem difficult to understand the language of Moses in this narrative, as conveying the idea of anything less than a deluge literally universal over the entire globe, just as it has been commonly understood.

If the language of Moses does not convey the idea of a universal deluge, it would be impossible to construct a paragraph that should unequivocally convey that idea. But however the account given by Moses of the Deluge be understood, as to the extent of surface covered by it, it will hardly be questioned that *as to mankind*, his doctrine is, the Noachian *deluge was universal*. Eight human beings only survived that calamity; and from those eight all the several families and nations of men now existing are descended.

Such an event as the Deluge must have made a deep impression upon the minds of the survivors; and the memory of that event may well be expected to shew itself prominently and strongly in the traditions handed down to their posterity; and conse-

quently the tradition of it may be looked for in the oldest legends of the several leading races or divisions of the human family, wherever found.

And such is the fact, and most strikingly so; and that, too, in nearly every country under heaven, even those most remote from the supposed site of the earliest settlements after the flood, and those most remote from each other.

The ceremonies of most of the nations of antiquity were full of idolatrous references to the preservation of man from the Deluge. "If we take the circuit of the globe (says a quaint old writer, Stackhouse), and inquire of the inhabitants of every climate, we shall find that '*the fame of the Deluge is gone through the earth,*' and that in every part of the known world, there are certain records, or traditions of it."

In almost all nations, from the remotest periods, there have prevailed certain mythological narratives, and legendary tales of the Deluge, or of similar catastrophes. Such narratives formed a part of the first rude belief of the Egyptians, Chaldæans, Greeks, Scythians, and of the Celtic tribes. They have also been discovered among the Peruvians and Mexicans, and the South Sea Islanders. (See Kitto, vol. i. p. 542. Dr J. Pye Smith, p. 74. Consult also Sir W. Drummond's *Origines*, vol. i. chap. vii. p. 57, &c. Faber's *Pagan Idolatry*, vol. ii. chap. iv. pp. 106-124.)

"Of this universal Deluge (says Dr Stillingfleet, in his erudite work, *Origines Sacræ*, vol. i. p. 146), we have most clear and concurring testimonies of most ancient nations of the world. For which purpose, Grotius and others have produced the testimony of Berosus the Chaldæan, and of Josephus, concerning the flood, and the ark in which Noah was preserved; that of Abydenus, out of Cyril and Eusebius, concerning Xisanthrus' or Noah's sending out of the birds to see if the flood was assuaged; and of Alexander Polyhistor, concerning the preservation of animals in the ark; of Plutarch, concerning the sending out of the dove; of Lucian, de *Deâ Syriâ*, concerning the whole story; and so of Molon and Nicolaus Damascenus. Besides, it is manifest by others, how among the Chaldæans the memory of Noah was preserved under the fable of Oannes, which had part of a fish and part of a man; as is evident from the fragments of Apollodorus Abydenos, and Alexander Polyhistor, preserved in Eusebius'

Greek Chronica. *Among the Chinese*, under the name of Punoceus, who, by them is said to have escaped alone with his family out of the universal Deluge; saith Isaac Vossius, who supposeth Pu, or Pi, to be only a prefix to the name, so that Punoceus, is the same with Νῶχος, *i. e.* Noah.

“Martinius tells us, ‘de diluvio multa est apud Sinicos scriptores mentio,’ that the ancient writers of Chinese history speak much of the flood (of a flood.) Johannes de Laet tells us out of Lescharbotus, how constant the tradition of the flood is among the Indians, both in New France, Peru, and other parts.” (Orig. Sacrae, vol. i. pp. 146, 147. Faber, vol. i. pp. 243-245.)

The early traditions of the Gentoos describe a deluge, and the escape of one family; and they detail many particulars strongly resembling the history of Noah as given in Genesis. The sending forth of a dove out of the great ship, by Xisanthrus, and its subsequent return, bearing a green leaf, are distinctly stated in these Gentoos traditions. Baron Humboldt (the most extensively travelled, the most acutely observant, and the most profoundly learned of all travellers) tells us, that of the different nations who inhabit Mexico, paintings representing the deluge of Coxco, are found among the Aztecs, the Miztecs, the Zapotecs, the Tlaltaltecs, and the Mechouacans. The Noah, Xisuthrus or Menou of these nations, is called Coxcox, Teocipaetli, or Tezpi. He saved himself and his wife Xochiquetzel in a bark, or according to other traditions, on a raft of Ala-huete (the Cupressus disticha), but according to the Mechouacans, he embarked in a spacious Acalli, with his wife, his children, several animals, and grain, the preservation of which was important to mankind. When the Great Spirit, Tezcallipoca, ordered the waters to withdraw, Tezpi sent out from the ship a vulture, the Zopilote. This bird, which feeds on dead flesh, did not return, on account of the great number of carcasses left on the ground by the retiring waters. Tezpi then sent out other birds, one of which, the humming-bird, alone returned, holding in its beak a branch covered with leaves. Tezpi seeing thus that fresh verdure began to clothe the soil, left his bark, near the mountain of Colluacan.” (Humboldt’s Resarches, p. 65.)

In this Mexican tradition, the Mosaic narrative is given almost entire, only the vulture here figures in place of the raven; and

instead of the dove, the humming-bird, better known to the Mexicans, is introduced. In another part of the same country, a similar story is handed down by tradition; but it goes farther, and makes mention of giants, and of the building of an artificial hill, in shape like a mound, a memorial of the mountain on which the ship rested. This hill was designed to rise above the clouds, but the gods, in anger at the impious attempt, hurled fire on the pyramid, killed many of the workmen, and scattered the rest.

This curious tradition not only strangely corroborates the narrative of Moses, but it may serve to throw light on the origin and design of the mounds, so numerous in the West, and possibly, also, on the origin and primary design of the numerous Pyramids of Egypt. Resting-places for the dead,—in their form commemorating the first resting-place after the furious storms of the Deluge, to the one sole family of man that survived the catastrophe.

“The Crees,” also a tribe of Arctic Indians, “all spoke of a universal Deluge, from which one family alone escaped, with all kinds of birds and beasts, on a huge raft.” So says Dr Richardson, the companion of Franklin in his polar expedition.

Humboldt mentions also similar traditions among the various tribes of South American Indians, inhabiting the high inland regions on the banks of the Orinoko.

Even Indians of the Choctaw tribe, some miserable remnants of which still lurk around the suburbs of our city (Mobile), had, it is well known, when they first came into contact with the whites, traditions handed down from their remotest ancestors, of a mighty deluge, from which a small number of persons only escaped on a raft. In these North American Indian traditions, a musk-rat figures as the substitute of Noah's dove.

Now all these traditions (and similar ones have been found lingering in the heart of Africa), so widely spread, so ancient, so carefully preserved, so varying in non-essentials, so identical in all the main circumstances, and all pointing to the one same great event, must have had a common origin, and an origin in truth. They could not be the result of chance, they could not have originated in fancy or in falsehood; and in this case, collusion is altogether out of the question.

These traditions do, then, confirm the narrative in Genesis, and

go far to prove it true. They do not, indeed, prove that the Deluge was *geographically universal*; but they do prove that it was universal ethnographically. (See Harcourt's *Doctrine of the Deluge*, vol. i. pp. 29-35.)

These several traditions,¹ so harmonious, furnish at least strong ground to believe, either that there have been, at a very remote period, as many great deluges as there have been primitive abodes of man, in all these several countries; that these deluges destroyed the entire population of all these several countries, with all the animals then existing therein, excepting only and always, in each one of these several cases, one family of each of these primitive tribes, saved by the same means,— a vessel, an ark, a raft, or a big canoe; and saved with the accompaniment of animals, and of

¹ The sketch of antediluvian history given by Moses, in which we find many dark passages, is followed by the narrative of a deluge which destroyed the whole race of men, except four pairs; an historical fact admitted as true by every nation, to whose literature we have access, and particularly by the ancient Hindus, who have allotted an entire Purana to the detail of that event, which they relate, as usual, in symbols or allegories. (Sir Wm. Jones's *Asiatic Researches*, vol. iii. p. 425.)

Mr Mitford in his learned work, "The History of Greece," thus expresses himself: "The tradition of all nations, and appearances in every country, bear witness scarcely less explicit than the writings of Moses, to that general flood which nearly destroyed the whole human race; and those ablest Greek authors who have attempted to trace the history of mankind to its source, all refer to such an event for the beginning of the present system of things on earth." (Mitford's *Greece*, vol. i. sec. i. p. 3: Plato's 3d Dialogue on Legislation.)

The Iroquois, a tribe of American Indians, are said to have preserved a curious tradition of the primeval history. "They believe that the first woman was seduced from her obedience to God; and that in consequence of it she was banished from heaven. She afterwards bore two sons. One of these having armed himself with an offensive weapon, attacked and slew the other, who was unable to resist his superior force. More children afterwards sprang from the same woman, who were the ancestors of all mankind." (*Mœurs des Sauvages*, tom. i. p. 43, as quoted by Faber, *Orig. Pag. Idol.* vol. ii. p. 38.)

In the learned work of Mr Bryant on Mythology, he thus reasons: "If the Deluge really happened at the time recorded by Moses, those nations whose monuments are preserved, or whose writings are accessible, must have retained memorials of an event so stupendous and comparatively so recent; but, in fact, they have retained such memorials." This reasoning (remarks Sir Wm. Jones) seems just, and the *fact* is true beyond controversy. (See *Asist. Resear.* vol. iii. p. 429.)

For further accounts of traditions respecting the Deluge, consult Harcourt's *Doctrine of the Deluge*, vol. i. p. 29, &c. Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, vol. i. pp. 206, 218; vol. ii. chap. iv. pp. 106-129. Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ*, chap. iv. Sumner on the Records of Creation, 6th Lond. ed. 1850. Tomkins' *Hulsean Prize Essay*, 1849.

food appropriate to them,—all which is exceedingly improbable, we might almost say impossible; or else these numerous accordant traditions prove *one such great deluge*, from which *one family alone was preserved*, and that of that one family the descendants have been scattered abroad into all these several countries, each colony bearing with it a distinct tradition of that memorable event, a tradition that has been everywhere preserved with wonderful truthfulness and accuracy, and hence the strong resemblance and almost identity of all these several traditions.

Sir C. Lyell, the great English geologist, distinguished not less for his erudition, his classic style and his candour, than for his science, suggests that, since floods and volcanic eruptions are the chief instruments of devastation on our globe, and are, indeed, so peculiarly calculated to inspire a lasting terror, and are so often fatal in their consequences to great multitudes of people, it scarcely requires the passion for the marvellous, so characteristic of rude and half-civilized nations, still less the exuberant imagination of Eastern writers, to augment them into general cataclysms and conflagrations.

He then instances the great flood of the Chinese, under the emperor Ya-ou (see the book called Chou-King, chap. Yao-Tien: and see Pauthier's China, p. 12), B.C. 2300, which some have supposed to be identical with Noah's deluge.

This Chinese cataclysm is described as *having covered the low hills, and bathed the foot of the highest mountains, threatening to drown the heavens, &c.* Lyell adopts the idea of Mr. Davis (who visited China with several British embassies), viz. that this was an ancient but local derangement of the waters of the Yellow River, one of the largest in the world, and which might, by a great overflowing, easily inundate the finest portion of China. Lyell adds, "The tradition of a deluge among the Araucanian Indians, in South America, may be explained by reference to great earthquake waves, which have repeatedly rolled over part of Chili: since the first recorded flood of 1590. The legend, also, of the ancient Peruvians of an inundation, long before the reign of the Incas, in which six persons only were saved on a float, relates to a region which has been, more than once, overwhelmed by inroads of the ocean, even since the days of Pizarro.

“The submergence, so lately as 1819, of a wide area of country in Cutch, in British India, is well known, when a single tower only of the fort of Sindree was left visible above the waste of waters. All this may serve to prove (adds this distinguished geologist) how easily the catastrophes of modern times might give rise to traditional narratives, among a rude people, of *floods of boundless extent.*”

Nations without written records, and who are indebted for all their knowledge of past events exclusively to oral tradition, are in the habit of confounding in one legend, a series of occurrences and incidents, which have happened at various epochs. They mingle these legends in their superstitions, and consecrate the idea in their religious rites, as *e. g.* Humboldt tells us, that after a terrible earthquake in Cumana, in 1766, which destroyed a large part of its inhabitants, the ensuing season, rendered (as is common in such cases) unusually fertile by the abundant rains which accompanied the subterranean convulsions, was celebrated by the Indians with feasts and dances, after the ideas of an antique superstition, as celebrating the destruction of the world and the approaching epoch of its regeneration. (Humboldt and Voy. Relat. Hist. vol. i. p. 30.)

These rites are singularly in accordance with the ancient traditions of the Brahmins, and of the ancient Egyptians.

“Nor,” says Lyell, “must we forget that the superstitions of a savage tribe are transmitted through all the progressive stages of society, till they exert a powerful influence on the mind even of the philosopher.” (Princ. Geol. 1850, pp. 8-10.)

This theory of the great geologist is ingenious in itself, and is strongly presented: and were such ancient legends found only in two or three countries, this theory might be admitted as satisfactory.

But the tradition of an ancient, a vast, and a totally destructive deluge, destructive to all the race of man, save one family only, and that family saved, as the tradition uniformly represents, in one and the same way, by means of an ark or floating vessel, is too remarkable, too minutely particular in all the points of its identity, and too strongly resembling the Mosaic narrative, to be accounted for by a vast series of local inundations, in vastly numerous countries, far separated by space, and by time too, yet all

wrought up in one almost identical legendary tale. These numerous traditions, found everywhere in countries so wide apart, and all agreeing so wonderfully in the circumstances of one calamity, could have originated only in the same catastrophe, experienced by the remote ancestors of all these now widely separated nations; a catastrophe, the memory of which was preserved and handed down by tradition, and kept alive by religious commemorative rites; and which, on the occasional occurrence of local inundations, in the different countries where the colonies of descendants had settled, would be recalled with fresh interest, and be celebrated with renewed vivacity,—each such recurring calamity adding some new feature to the legend, or to the rite, or to both.

The universal tradition of a deluge, shews that the ancestors of all nations once experienced the irruption of a mighty deluge of waters over the country of their abode, from which one family alone of those ancestors escaped, together with such animals as they had secured with them in the vessel which bore them in safety until the waters subsided. But this tradition is a faithful echo of the history Moses has given us of Noah's flood, in Gen. vii.¹

¹ Dr Redford thus expresses himself on these traditions:—

“Traditions of a general deluge have been found among all nations of the ancient world, and disseminated among modern nations in the most distant and opposite parts of the earth, and in all their different degrees of civilization. Wherever there is any attempt to account for the existence of the present population, it begins with the preservation of one pair of human beings, or a single family, by some floating vessel. This is usually connected with a previously existing race,—with the anger of the Supreme Being against their sins,—and with the desolation of the earth and the race of men by a general inundation.

“There are no conflicting traditions. The harmony among all nations is such as could have arisen only from the fact itself. We find Chaldeans, Phœnicians, Assyrians, Persians, Chinese, Hindoos, Mexicans, Peruvians, North Americans, islanders of Oceanica, all preserving in their mythologies or their histories, the principal facts recorded by Moses. They all embody but one story.” (Holy Scrip. Verified, pp. 112, 113.)

“Baron Cuvier thus reasons:—Is it possible that mere accident should afford so striking a result, as to unite the traditional origin of the Assyrian, Indian, and Chinese monarchies to the same epocha of about 4000 years from the present time? Could the ideas of nations, who possessed almost no natural affinities, whose language, religion, and laws, had nothing in common,—could they conspire to one point, did not truth bring them together?” (Id. 113.)

And yet Bolingbroke has had the hardihood to assert, that the tradition of Noah's deluge is vouchsafed by no other authority than that of Moses, and that the memory of that catastrophe was known only to *one people*, and preserved in *one corner* of the earth. (See his Philosophical Works, vol. iii. p. 224. See also Sumner's Records of Creation, p. 21.)

But in addition to the corroboration of the Mosaic history, found in these wide-spread traditions of a mighty deluge, preserved among nearly all nations, it was long thought that the appearances left on the surface of the earth itself, yielded evidence, clear and conclusive, of the truth of the Mosaic account of the flood.

Even among the ancients, several of the philosophers, particularly Strabo, had noticed ancient shells and other fossils, in elevated positions; and had suggested the idea of successive upheavals and depressions of the earth's surface, by earthquakes, &c. In after ages these topics seem to have been overlooked and forgotten.

About the period of the Reformation, and for some time thereafter, other branches of knowledge absorbed the attention of scholars. Leibnitz, a man of universal genius, a contemporary and a rival of the immortal Newton, seemed intuitively to catch a glimpse at the truth on this subject; and he actually indicated the line of research which has since led to the wonderful results embraced in modern geological science.

The most cursory examination of the earth's surface, shews bones, shells, and other remains of animals and plants both, presenting themselves in every possible variety of location—in the deep valley, and on the high hill. For a long time these were all ascribed directly to the deluge of Noah; and the earth itself was thus supposed to present everywhere upon its very surface, evidence of that great scriptural cataclysm, corroborative of the text of Genesis.

A little attentive examination, however, soon shewed that these remains were deposited in regular successive beds, or *strata*, one above the other. About a century and a half ago, Dr J. Woodward, of the Cambridge University, England, suggested the theory (already noticed in the preceding lecture on Creation in Six Days), viz. that all the rocks that contained minerals, were deposited by the waters of Noah's deluge, as a common solvent, and in the order of their specific gravity.¹ (*Essay towards a Nat. Hist. of the Earth, 1695.*)

But long-continued research, conducted in widely separated lo-

¹ This is substantially the theory advocated in the recent work of Dr Lord, entitled, "*Epoch of Creation*," chap. ix. p. 228, &c.

calities, shewed at length that such a cause was inadequate to explain all the conditions under which these remains and rocks occur. For instance, though the Deluge might have strewn them over the surface, it could not have buried them in the strata of mountains, or entombed them deep in the earth itself.

Again, it was observed that marine shells were associated in one spot, while the fresh-water kinds were collected in another; and that similar genera and species were in like manner separated and arranged; although it is obvious that the flood here contemplated must have heaped all kinds promiscuously together.

And when at length more extensive observation shewed that *the same locality exhibited alternations of marine and fresh-water deposits*,—in other terms, that the same locality had evidently been the site of sea and land alternately, over and over again, it was felt and admitted, that *no one single event* was adequate to produce such varied effects; and hence arose those more extended views of the operations of nature which constitute the principles of geology at the present day. (See Richardson's *Geology*, pp. 80, 81.)

The several fossiliferous rocks, no less than the deeper primitive, are therefore now most generally assigned to ages long anterior to Noah's deluge; and anterior even to the renovation of the earth from chaos, for its reception of man. Still, all this notwithstanding, the idea prevailed in the minds of many, that the rising, the prevalence, and especially the subsidence of so great an inundation of waters as the deluge of Noah, could not be (as Sir C. Lyell contends that it was comparatively) *a tranquil event*; even though it might not tear up *all* the soil, nor utterly destroy all vegetation, as may be inferred from the return of the dove to Noah with an olive-leaf, so soon after the deluge had subsided. The olive-tree whence that leaf was plucked, must certainly, it would thus seem, have remained rooted and living, during the entire period of the inundation. But though here and there a detached spot might have been but little altered by the flood, it was still believed that, during both the increase and the subsidence of the deluge, a considerable action, from the rushing of the water among various obstacles, would be inevitable. Ancient lakes and beds of rivers would be filled up, and new ones scooped out. Deep gorges would be worn among mountain ranges; extensive depo-

sits of sand and gravel, and fragments of rock, would be left in various positions; and in some places, where large bodies of water had rolled off in long and powerful currents, detached fragments of mountain cliffs, or rocky boulders, might be looked for, left in masses, or left separately, at intervals, along the course taken by those mighty streams.

All this seems rational enough. When, then, careful examination over extensive districts in Europe, in some parts of Asia, and even in North America, discovered such masses—of sand in some places, of gravel in others, and of both combined in other places: when, further, large blocks of rock, or boulders, were found lying in such circumstances, as clearly implied their having been brought together from a great distance by some vast inundation or current of water; it was supposed that thus, over a very extensive portion of the earth's surface, this *drift*, as it was called, or *diluvium*, furnished demonstrable proof of the action of Noah's deluge, vastly extensive, and at a comparatively recent date; much later, at least, than the latest of all the strata of fossil-bearing rock, cropping out from beneath the earth's surface.

It was under the influence of these facts, then but newly discovered, that the great Cuvier wrote that passage, so often quoted, in which he speaks of the traces left by the action of Noah's deluge, as visible now on the earth's surface: "*If there be a fact well ascertained in geology, it is this, that the surface of our globe has suffered a great and sudden revolution, the period of which cannot be dated further back than 5 or 6,000 years.*" And he adds, "It is from the epoch of that revolution, that the small number of individuals which it spared, have spread themselves and multiplied over the newly dried ground; and consequently, it is from that epoch alone that human societies have resumed their progressive improvements." (*Discours sur les Révolutions de la surface du Globe, &c.* 3d edit. Paris, 1836, p. 133.)

Later still, speaking of the mud, gravel, and bones of the Kirkdale caves, Cuvier says: "Most carefully described by Professor Buckland, under the name of *diluvium*, and exceedingly different from those other beds of similarly rolled materials, which are now constantly deposited by torrents and rivers, and containing only bones of animals existing in the country, and to which

Mr B. gives the name *alluvion*, they now form, in the eyes of all geologists, the fullest proof to the senses of that immense inundation (viz. Noah's deluge), which came last in the catastrophes of our globe. (Discours, &c. p. 141.)

In his work entitled *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, published in 1823, and which contains his observations on the *drift*, Dr Buckland thus expressed himself:—"An agent thus gigantic appears to have operated universally on the surface of our planet at the period of the Deluge. The spaces then laid bare by the sweeping away of the solid materials that had before filled them, are called valleys of denudation, and the effects we see produced by water, in the minor cases I have just mentioned, by presenting us an example, within tangible limits, prepare us to comprehend the mighty and stupendous magnitude of those forces, by which whole strata were swept away, and valleys laid open, and gorges excavated in the more solid portion of the substance of the earth, bearing the same proportion to the overwhelming ocean by which they were produced, that modern ravines on the sides of mountains bear to the torrents which, since the retreat of the Deluge, have created, and continue to enlarge them." (*Reliq. Diluv.* p. 237, 1823.)

The facts presented in these passages are striking, and the reasoning upon those facts is forcible. And yet, since the publication of the work containing these passages, a still more extended examination of these drifts, in different countries, has brought to light new and important facts which have altered entirely the opinions of geologists, and of Dr Buckland himself, as to the age and the origin of these drift deposits.

The views expressed in the preceding quotations, were, until recently, my own. But the force of the evidence adduced compels me to abandon this theory so plausible and so pleasing; and in thus yielding to the power of clear evidence, as Buckland, Sedgwick, Conybeare, Chalmers, and Pyc Smith, have done before me, I see no cause to blush. Sufficient evidence once seen must bring conviction: and to avow conviction, candour is always ready.

The general term *diluvium*, now abandoned, was used by Buckland to describe superficial accumulations, whether of soil, sand, gravël, or loose aggregations of larger blocks, which are found to

prevail over large tracts of the earth's surface, and are manifestly superinduced over the deposits of different ages, with which they have no connection.

An examination of the contents of this drift soon shewed the diversified nature of the fragments of which it is composed in different localities. Investigations were made by comparing the transported fragments with the nearest rocks from which they could have been derived. Hence was inferred the *direction* of the current which transported them, and the degree of force necessary for such transport, according to their size and nature, and the character of the intervening ground.

Hence the conclusion became inevitable, that many such currents, in different directions, and acting with different degrees of force, must have occurred to produce the observed results.

It was very soon found also, from indications not to be mistaken, that these instances of diluvial action were of *very different ages*, and none of more than local extent; although some must have acted over considerable tracts of country. In some instances the most palpable evidence of this has been furnished, in one stratum crossing and overlying another. Thus Professor Hitchcock, speaking of the abundant drift of Massachusetts, declares, "A transient deluge, like that described in Scripture, could not have accumulated it. It has obviously been the result of different agencies, and of different epochs: the result of causes, sometimes operating feebly and slowly, and at other times, violently and powerfully. But the conclusion to which I have been irresistibly forced, by an examination of this stratum in Massachusetts, is, that all the diluvium which had been previously accumulated by various agencies, has been modified by a powerful deluge, sweeping from the north and north-west, over every part of the state, not excepting its highest mountains: and since that deluge, none but alluvial agencies have been operating to change the surface." (Hitchcock's *Geology of Massachusetts*, 1835, p. 148.)

One might almost imagine that in the diluvium left by this powerful north-west deluge, sweeping over Massachusetts, we have at length found evidence of the action of Noah's flood.

But, no! The one unanswerable argument against this conclusion is, that neither in this north-westerly diluvium of Massachu-

setts, nor in any other diluvium hitherto examined, have any traces been found of *man* or of his works.

In other instances (perhaps in the greater number) there is equal evidence of the operation having gone on at the bottom of deep water, as it does at present, by currents, eddies, tides, &c.

Again, in some instances, masses of what had once formed a diluvium, have themselves been cleared off by some new current, and heaped up, leaving the substratum bare. In a word, with reference to cases of this kind, the most recent researches simply point to a continuation of the same great series of long-sustained natural action, in the deposition of detritus, and the gradual elevation of coasts, covered with the ordinary accumulations of mud, sand, and shingle, which have been referred to as the analogous causes of the earlier formations. (See Kitto's *Bib. Cyc.* and Dr J. P. Smith, pp. 89-91.)

Moreover (remarks Dr Pye Smith), in many countries drifts have been formed, shewing where large bodies of water have moved with great force in contrary directions. In other places, vast rocks, or boulders, have, as it is supposed, been drifted in icebergs, and dropped where they now lie. Others are attributed to the action of glaciers. In some instances, since the time when boulders were transported from the parent mountain, upheavals or subsidences have taken place. For instance: on the sides of the Jura Mountains, lying on the borders of France and Switzerland, boulders are now lying which must have been brought thither from the Alps. But, directly in the track which alone they could have taken, now lies Lake Geneva. Had that lake existed when those boulders were moving, they must have sunk and remained in the bed of the lake. Lake Geneva, must then, itself, have been formed *since* the time when those boulders were transported.

But the vast Alps themselves are, comparatively, a modern formation. Lofty and grand though now they tower amid eternal snows, many of the deposits and the chalk-cliffs of Britain had long been upheaved at a time when, where the Alps with their glittering snow-capped summits now stand, was spread only a champaign country, or one vast morass. (See Dr J. P. Smith, p. 94.)

Little, then, as we might have expected such a result, it now

appears that the so-called diluvium drift, cannot be attributed to Noah's deluge.

Innumerable traces may be found of changes effected, and of deposits made, on the earth's surface; of successive upheavals and depressions in the same locality; sometimes sinking beneath the waters of the sea, then again emerging; then serving as the bed of a fresh-water lake, &c. &c.; and all, as it would seem, before the time of Noah's deluge. Changes have also been effected, and deposits have been made, since that period; and such deposits are now being made, as in river deltas, &c. The temple of Jupiter Scrapis, at Puzzuoli, near Naples, directly on the shores of that beautiful bay, has twice sunk and twice risen, nearly twenty feet each time, since the Christian era, and it is again slowly sinking, as I myself can testify (and as I did testify to Sir C. Lyell in Nov. 1846: see his *Princ. Geol.* London, 1850, p. 497), while the whole coast of Sweden is at this moment, and has long been gradually rising. (See Lyell, *Id.* pp. 497, 502. See also Richardson, pp. 422, 423.)

Still, amid all these evidences of change—past and now in progress, no marks of change, no deposit of drift, or of fossils, can be pointed out, of which we can say with absolute certainty, "*these are the effects of Noah's deluge, these are the proofs of its occurrence.*"

How is this? The answer I shall attempt in my next Lecture.

To adopt, then, the language of Dr Buckland, when frankly avowing his abandonment of the *diluvian theory*: "Though we have not yet found the certain traces of any great diluvian catastrophe, which we can affirm to be within the human period, we have at least shewn, that paroxysms of internal energy, accompanied by the elevation of mountain chains, and followed by mighty waters desolating whole regions of the earth, were a part of the mechanism of nature. Now what has happened again and again, from the most ancient up to the most modern periods in the natural history of the earth, may have happened once during the few thousand years that man has been living on its surface. We have therefore taken away all anterior improbability from the fact of a deluge, such, *e.g.* as that of Noah." (See *Proceedings of the Brit. Geol. Soc.* for 1831, pp. 312-314.)

Without endorsing unconditionally every sentiment contained

therein, I will conclude this Lecture with the words of an eminent and orthodox Scotch divine (Rev. Dr Fleming). "There is reason to believe, from the writings of Moses, that the ark had not drifted far from the spot where it was lifted up, and that it grounded at no great distance from the same spot. I have formed my notions of the Noachian deluge, not from Ovid, but from the Bible. There the simple narrative of Moses permits me to believe, that the waters rose upon the earth by degrees; that means were adopted by the author of the calamity to preserve pairs of the land animals; that the flood exhibited no violent impetuosity, displacing neither the soil nor the vegetable tribes which it supported, nor rendering the ground unfit for the cultivation of the vine. With this description in my mind, I am not prepared to witness *in nature* any remaining marks of the catastrophe; and I find my respect for the authority of revelation heightened when I see, on the present surface, no memorials of the event." (Jameson's Philos. Journal. See also Dr J. P. Smith, p. 81.)

LECTURE X.

THE DELUGE UNIVERSAL.

PART II.

GEN vii. 23.—“And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things and the fowl of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.”

THE very terms of this record of the deluge in the days of Noah, seem then to convey the idea of universality over the entire surface of the whole globe. The Deluge covered the highest mountains under the whole heavens, and every living creature, man and beast, that were exposed to it perished. The only survivors were Noah, and those sheltered with him in the ark. As might be expected, traditions of a universal deluge, from which one family only escaped, with certain animals sheltered with them in a floating vessel, are found among all nations, on every continent and in almost every island on the globe, nations of all languages and of every grade of civilization: traditions wonderfully agreeing as to all the main facts in the case, and strongly corroborating the Mosaic narrative of a universal deluge, in which every human being on the face of the earth perished, excepting only one family, whose posterity have since spread over the whole globe.

But, though evidence abundant is presented on the earth's surface now, of vast bodies of water having swept over the surface of the earth, at different times and in different directions, nowhere can we discover deposits or drifts, or marks which we can with certainty assign to the action of Noah's deluge. Nor in the accumulations of these ancient drifts, nor in any deposits older than these beds of alluvion which are even now forming, have any re-

mains of man or of his works been found, such as *must* have been covered up in deposits left by Noah's flood, in all countries then inhabited by man.

This absence of human remains in all the deposits laid open to our research, I propose to account for in this Lecture.

The result of these geological researches renders one thing very plain, viz. that if we can find no undeniable marks of the action of the deluge of Noah upon the earth, yet all improbability that may have been supposed to attach to the idea of such a deluge at that epoch, is effectually removed, so that we are prepared to receive the evidence of its occurrence, whenever that evidence shall be presented to us, let it spring from what source it may.

The narrative found in Genesis teaches, as believers in revelation have generally thought, and as I cannot but think, that the Deluge in the time of Noah was literally universal, covering the whole earth, and destroying all living creatures, man and beast, excepting only those sheltered in the ark.

Against the universality of the Deluge, several grave objections are urged.

As, 1st. On *scientific grounds*, objections are brought. The quantity of water required to effect such a universal deluge would have been such, as that there is no accounting for the production of so large a body of water, or for the disposal of it afterwards, without a series of miracles utterly incredible, and not even hinted at in the Bible. Gen. vii. 19, 20: "*The waters prevailed exceedingly on the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered; fifteen cubits upwards did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered.*"

Now, as there are mountains rising to the height of five miles above the sea-level, in order to produce a deluge such as the literal understanding of this passage implies, the body of water on the surface of the globe must have been so increased, as to produce a universal ocean over the whole globe, to the depth of five miles at least, above and over the present ocean. Two means of bringing the waters over the land are mentioned by Moses, viz. *a heavy rain* for forty days and forty nights, and the "*breaking up of the fountains of the great deep.*"

The rain that ordinarily falls, is, we know, first drawn by evaporation from the sea, and other bodies of water on the surface

of the earth ; it is held in suspense by the atmosphere, again falling to the earth when condensed.¹

Now the height of the atmosphere so far as it has density sufficient to sustain vapour, is not very great : its capacity to contain or suspend vapour is limited ; and although heavy rains of even a few hours' continuance may speedily inundate a whole province or a country, especially a country abounding in valleys and plains lying amongst or surrounded by or bordering upon hills and mountain ranges ; yet still, were the entire atmosphere surcharged with vapour to its utmost capacity, and then caused to discharge it at once on the earth, it could not possibly cover the surface of the entire globe, more than to the depth of a few inches, which, towards the production of a deluge five miles deep, is as nothing.

Besides, inasmuch as all rain is drawn from the water of the sea, &c. a rain that should fall for days, or for months continuously, would only amount to a return to the earth, in the form of rain, of the very water as constantly rising from it by evaporation. Such continuous rains might inundate and desolate whole provinces, and even empires, but they would not increase by one drop, the sum total of water actually existing in the ocean, lakes, &c. on the earth at the moment when these rains commenced.

Nor could the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep do very much towards increasing the quantity of water on the surface of the globe : unless we admit the idea once entertained, that large bodies of water are lodged in cavities in the earth, and that the *breaking up of the fountains of the great deep*, implies that vent was given to these subterranean waters, so that they rushed forth, and overspread the land. This may be so, nor does this idea, to me, at least, seem either absurd or improbable. But still we know enough of the structure of this earth, to satisfy us that no subterranean oceans of water now exist in the interior of the earth, equal to an emergency such as that of inundating the entire surface of the globe to a depth of five miles above the present level of the sea.

The only hypothesis left us is, that the vast amount of water necessary to flood the globe, and cover its highest mountains to a

¹ "The windows of heaven were opened," Gen. vii. 11, seems to be but another mode of expressing the idea of heavy rains falling in unusual quantities, and for a period of unprecedented duration.

depth of fifteen cubits, was miraculously created by God for the occasion, and then, when the grand purpose of its introduction upon the earth was accomplished, it was as miraculously annihilated or removed.

But we are told, that by this hypothesis we are calling in the aid of miracle after miracle, when the Bible attributes the whole to ordinary, natural causes: for the expression, "*the windows of heaven were opened,*" merely denotes the long-continued fall of heavy rain (Gen. vii. 11): and the declaration, "*all the fountains of the great deep were broken up,*" simply teaches, that an *irruption of the waters of the sea upon the dry land* then took place. But we know with certainty, that neither of these events, nor yet both combined, could do more than produce a local flood—a partial inundation: because they could not possibly increase to any great extent the sum total of water on the globe. But without an increase of water to the amount of seven or eight times the quantity of all the water contained in all the seas and oceans now on the globe, the earth could not have been covered with water that should rise several feet higher than the highest mountains, as Moses positively avers that the waters of Noah's deluge did.

Other difficulties still attend this idea of a universal deluge: for it is argued that such an accumulation of water on the earth's surface, covering it to the depth of five miles above the present sea-level, would very considerably increase the diameter of the earth, vastly augment its bulk, its weight, and must, therefore, inevitably alter the path of its orbit, and produce a disturbing effect throughout the whole solar system: nay, its disturbing influence would be certainly felt through the whole extent of the material universe, and, very possibly, to the detriment, if not the destruction, of many myriads of sentient beings, in other and far distant worlds.

A deluge of this character, it has been said, "would require a series of stupendous and immensely multiplied miracles, in comparison with which, the great decisive miracle of Christianity, the resurrection of Jesus Christ, sinks as insignificant." (Dr J. Pye Smith, *Scripture and Geology*, pp. 113, 116.)

True, these are formidable objections. But if the Mosaic narrative required us to admit such vast increase of waters, in order to account for the universality of the Deluge, I would still bow to

the authority, and implicitly believe in the truth of this divinely inspired document, notwithstanding all these difficulties ; and that too, in view of other and scarcely less formidable difficulties yet to be noticed. For if I read in a document clearly proved to be inspired of God, as the books of Moses are, that *the Deluge was universal*, I know assuredly that God's power was equal to the emergency. He who made all things, and impressed upon them the laws of their existence, and of their mutual influence one upon another, can suspend, or alter, or modify these laws, at his pleasure, just as He sees the emergency of the case may require. How, indeed, can we tell but that occasional *apparent exceptions*, or *seeming deviations*, may be involved in the very nature of those laws ? If the Deluge which, for the wickedness of mankind, God had sworn to bring on this earth, required the creation of oceans of water, He could create it, and cause it to spread just where He chose ;¹ His hand could guide the earth reeling under the super-added weight, and so guide it as to neutralize its otherwise disturbing power on the other orbs and other systems in the universe, over which man's apostasy was not permitted to diffuse evil.

I know full well that this idea of miracle upon miracle will be sneered at by the so-called philosopher, and deprecated by some good men, and perhaps even by able theologians too. But if the alternative be, admit the supposition of a series of even unprecedented miracles, or suffer the Mosaic record to be brought into discredit, I, for one, am for adhering to the record. A preternatural catastrophe the Deluge was—so Moses represents it—and therefore we cannot judge of it by the ordinary laws of nature merely. I would as soon undertake to account for the resurrection of the body by the laws of nature only, as to account fully for the flood in Noah's day, by those laws exclusively.

If revelation records the stupendous event, that record is ~~not~~

¹ God always acts according to law. There is a law of miracles as well as common events : even when God introduces a miracle, perhaps by a counteraction of ordinary laws, he may still act by some rule : so that, were precisely the same circumstances to occur again, the same miracle would be repeated. The laws regulating miracles and special providences, are as fixed and certain as those of ordinary events : and those laws must have formed a part of the plan of creation originally existing in the divine mind. (See Hitchcock's Religion of Geology, pp. 358, 359. See also Babbage, 9th Bridgewater Treatise.)

to be brought into discredit by our inability to explain the mode in which the event was accomplished, or to account for all its possible effects.

But such miraculous increase of water is not necessary to account for a universal deluge. When "*all the fountains of the great deep were broken up*" (Gen. vii. 11), a great change on the earth's surface seems to be intimated. The hidden waters accumulated in subterranean caverns might then have gushed forth, and whole continents might then have sunk, and remained permanently submerged; just as now it occasionally happens that a tract of land sinks down, and a lake appears where before smiling meadows had spread. But, without the supposition of such ancient subterranean oceans as is intended by the "*fountains of the great deep*" (see Dr J. P. Smith, pp. 111, 112), *the simultaneous sinking of all the antediluvian continents beneath the surface of the sea, and the upheaval of the bed of the ancient ocean, and the continuance of that upheaved ocean-bed, as the present dry land of the postdiluvian earth, is a supposition not improbable in itself, and it will account for all the facts which Moses details as attendant on Noah's flood covering the highest mountains.* It will also fully account for the fact, that no human relics, no work of art from the antediluvian races of man, have, as yet, been brought to light. These antediluvian relics all lie fathoms deep beneath the beds of the present oceans and seas.

We know that even at this day some countries are slowly rising above the sea; others are as gradually sinking beneath it. (Richardson, p. 422. Lyell, p. 502.) Lyell does, indeed, maintain that the laws of nature are uniform; that changes have for innumerable ages been going on slowly, as now they do, and that we must not imagine the occurrence of any great and sudden convulsions to effect the changes of which we find evidence. (Lyell, Princ. Geol. pp. 63, 64, 175.)

But now this theory of uniformity in the modes and rates of change, the great English geologist pushes too far. There is ample evidence to shew, that it is *a part of the uniformity of nature's laws, that a rigid uniformity shall occasionally be interrupted by sudden convulsions.* The series of geologic strata furnish proof to shew that the present land has, at several different periods in the ages past, been covered with water, as the

bed of an ocean; then, upheaved, it has been dry land: then, perhaps, covered with fresh water, as the bed of a lake; then left dry again, &c.,—many times in succession. Sometimes, also, through these several deposits overlying one another, there have been forced up, by some deep subterranean power (perhaps volcanic action), masses of crystalline rock, formed ages ago, deep in the bowels of the earth: and sometimes the rocks, now seen breaking through these overlying strata, were evidently forced upwards while in a fluid state, from the effect of intense heat, deep in the bowels of the earth.

Every earthquake, every mountain wave that has been rolled up from the vast depths of ocean, devastating whole provinces in a few hours (Lycell, pp. 9, 342), every volcanic eruption and sudden upheaval of hills, as *e. g.* of Monte Nuovo, thrown up to the height of five hundred feet in one night (Sept. 29, 1538), a few miles from Naples, shew that *an unbroken uniformity is not the law of nature's action*; but that elevations and subsidences of land, sometimes extensive and sudden, are even now taking place.

It is, therefore, very far from incredible, that, at the time of Noah's flood, such subsidence of all the dry land, and simultaneous elevation of ocean's bed, might have been effected. Such extensive alterations in the level of continents and ocean beds, must necessarily have produced a deluge over all earth's surface, that might have lasted several months; and it could not fail to alter completely the aspect of the whole world.

The chief if not the only serious objection to this supposition, arises from the fact that it involves the permanent submergence of the garden of Eden, and implies that that once favoured spot now forms a part of ocean's bed; whereas Moses so describes the region where it stood, as that one can hardly avoid the conclusion, that Moses meant his readers to understand that the locality of Eden might, in his day at least (which was many ages posterior to the flood), have been ascertained without much difficulty. He even mentions by name the Euphrates, as one of the streams that watered Eden.

Moreover, if all the antediluvian land was sunk, and remains sunk, forming the bed of the present sea, and if the land on which Noah planted his foot when leaving the ark, was the old ocean's

bed then recently laid bare and dry, where was found the olive-tree from which the dove brought a green leaf to the ark (Gen. viii. 11) ? and whence did Noah derive the vines that he planted to form a vineyard ? (Gen. ix. 20.)

These are difficulties, I admit ; but they are not so formidable as are those which encumber even the most plausible of all other theories yet advanced to account for the Deluge.

As to the locality of the garden of Eden, the description of it as given by Moses is so general and so vague, that all attempts to identify the spot have proved abortive. The only fixed point in relation to it is the name of a river, *Euphrates*. The other names Moses gives, and the description in which those names occur, are to this day inexplicable even by the most learned. May we not be permitted to conjecture that "*the garden planted by Jehovah eastward in Eden,*" in which he placed the first human pair, and from which, after the first sin, man was effectually excluded, was a district larger than has generally been supposed, comprising perhaps Persia, and a large part of Western Asia to the shores of the Mediterranean ? May we not further suppose that this entire region, uninhabited by man, sank last of all beneath the invading waters, and that this, the sole region of all antediluvian countries that was re-elevated, was first left dry before the beds of antediluvian oceans were lifted up ! All other lands that man had trodden sank, and remain to this day sunk beneath the deep sea. This comparatively small region, submerged for but a few weeks, might have again emerged with but little alteration of its natural scenery. It might still shew its ancient mountain peaks, its original river channels and valleys, and its antediluvian volcanic craters and even cones. This hypothesis, viz. the subsidence of all lands then inhabited, and the elevation of ocean-beds, fully accounts for the absence from the present surface of the earth of all traces left by the Deluge, and of all the remains of antediluvian man and his works.

This I believe to be the true explanation of the facts recorded in Genesis as to the Deluge. The ancient lands gradually but rapidly sank, burying the whole human race, with all the monuments of their industry and skill, deep under the waves of ocean ; while the bed of the antediluvian ocean emerged and became the present dry land : possibly also the uninhabited district desig-

nated as "*a garden planted in Eden,*" may have again emerged also. Such elevation or subsidence of large tracts of land we know to be usually attended by great agitation of the elements, and by copious rains. (See Lyell, Princ. Geol pp. 9, 342.) This theory well agrees with all the particulars given in the Mosaic record. "*The windows of heaven were opened, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up. The waters prevailed exceedingly on the earth, and the mountains were covered.*" (Gen vii. 19.) Nor can I see in this record anything to forbid the idea that the mountains now on the continents then upheaved, are greatly higher than any that "*were under the whole heavens*" before the flood.

In regard to *the rapid appearance of vegetation* on the newly dried surface of earth, so long and so recently the bed of ocean, as indicated by the *olive leaf* brought by the dove to Noah while he was yet shut up in the ark; and again, in respect of the subsequent planting of a vineyard by Noah, a moment's reflection will furnish a very natural solution of the difficulties.

We might, indeed, satisfactorily account for this rapid vegetation by a reference to that law ordained by God, on the third day of the creation in six days, Gen. i. 11: "*God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself;*" a law which we know does to this day operate everywhere over the surface of our globe; a law which operates on all newly formed lands; gradually, and sometimes rapidly, covering with appropriate vegetation such districts as, by emergence from the sea or by the action of volcanic forces, are heaved to light and exposed to the rays of the sun and to the action of the elements; a law, the operation of which with unusual celerity would be necessary after the Deluge as truly as after the third day's creative work, in order to furnish appropriate food to man and to the animals that must issue from the ark soon after the waters of the Deluge should have subsided. But not to insist too strenuously on this point, it is yet quite natural to suppose that, as the ancient lands sank beneath the waters, immense quantities of fertile soil would be washed away by those waters, and would be held in solution therein; and also that seeds in great variety and in vast quantities, and fruits of all sorts, would be lifted up and would remain floating about; and that as the new lands were rising,

great quantities of this soil would be deposited thereon in the form of mud, and seeds of all sorts, still capable of germinating, would be lodged on various localities on the emerging lands, many of them mixed with and covered up in the mud so deposited, and which, after a very short time of favourable weather in that genial climate, would present, in suitable situations, thousands of patches of thriving vegetation, much as now, every year, is observed in Egypt on the retiring of the waters of the Nile. Among these patches of verdure the rapidly shooting scions of seedling trees and vines and shrubs in countless variety might appear. The presentation by the dove of a green olive leaf to Noah, who was still in the ark, and the planting of a vineyard by Noah, when he had again a settled habitation on the earth, are easily accounted for. Moses does not affirm that the dove bore to Noah an olive-branch, nor yet the twig of an olive-tree, but simply a green olive-leaf. The leaf of a seedling olive plant, some few days old, would have answered every purpose to indicate the ground left dry by the retiring waters and the commencing of vegetation. Nor does Moses tell us how soon it was after Noah had left the ark that he planted a vineyard. It might have been several years afterwards, affording ample time for the seedling vines, growing rapidly in the virgin soil, to attract the attention of Noah by the excellence and abundance of their fruits. Possibly the vine may have been unknown in the regions wherein Noah and his family had resided before the flood. These circumstances do, then, present no serious objection against the theory I have proposed.

But against the universality of the Deluge, in itself considered, and independently of the mode in which it may have been effected, other and very weighty objections lie.

The ark, it is said, had not sufficient capacity to accommodate the immense number of living animals that must have perished if left to battle with the waters of the flood.

The dimensions of the ark are given by Moses with great minuteness of particularity. Biblical interpreters, about a century ago, made sundry calculations to shew that the ark was sufficiently capacious to contain pairs of all terrestrial animals, and septuples of those counted clean, and also of birds and reptiles, with sufficient space for their accommodation, for air, and for the storage of provisions and water. These calculations are undoubt-

edly based on far too low an estimate of the number of living animals.

By one writer it was computed that the entire number of animals requiring shelter would not exceed the equivalent of five hundred horses, a number which, he has shewn by careful calculation, could be readily accommodated, fed, and attended in a vessel of dimensions such as Moses ascribes to the ark.

A late writer reminds us that, in 1778, Linnæus estimated the entire number of known animals at 6000 species (Dr Beard's Bible Dictionary).

Since his time the number has been greatly increased. Even in 1842, ten years ago, the number of mammalia known (*i. e.* of animals that suckle their young) was 1000; of birds 6000; of reptiles and amphibious animals 1500. The bounds of zoological knowledge are still constantly extending.

But it must not be forgotten that of all these the vastly greater proportion are small, and numbers of them could be placed together in the same compartment of the ark. Many animals also are torpid during the winter, and would probably lie dormant during the long wintry storm of the Deluge, while for all of them much less than the usual amount of food would suffice in consequence of their inactivity during the whole period of their confinement in a floating vessel.

Notwithstanding all the ridicule that has been employed to bring into contempt the idea of preserving alive in the ark specimens of all animals sufficient to perpetuate all the several species on the subsiding of the Deluge, I have as yet seen nothing to shake my confidence in the credibility of the Mosaic story of the ark. The same God who promised to Noah that pairs of all living creatures should *come to him* to be kept alive in the ark (Gen. vi. 20), could and would so arrange all circumstances and all events as that the preservation of all these animals should be secured. The Mosaic narrative does, as it seems to me, represent this whole affair as out of the ordinary course of nature. God himself did directly interfere.

But it is confidently alleged that *so many animals, from climates the most varied and opposite, even if brought together, could not possibly exist for so long a period as the Deluge lasted.* Of this objection every travelling menagerie furnishes the refuta-

tion. The white bear from the Arctic Ocean, the lion from the burning deserts of Africa, the tiger from the jungles of Bengal, the elephant from Ceylon, the llama from South America, the ourang-outang from Borneo, and even the kangaroo from New Holland, with the armadillo of Central America and the bear of the Rocky Mountains, have been known to exist for many months, and even years, side by side in the same menagerie.

During the continuance of the Deluge the temperature of the atmosphere would probably be a medium between the intense cold of the arctic and the fiery heats of the tropics—a temperature in which *all* animals could exist for a considerable length of time.

It has, moreover, been asserted that if the ark was raised by the flood above the highest mountains, the height is so great, and the atmosphere is so rare and so cold at that height (as the experience of all explorers among the summit crags of lofty mountains shews), that if the very surface of the water was not all frozen, yet the tropical animals must have inevitably perished, and all, save the arctic animals, must have suffered severely.

But on the hypothesis I have advanced, viz. that the ancient continents all sank, and the primeval ocean-bed was upheaved, this extreme elevation would not have been reached by the ark. And even if it were, just so far as the water rose the air would rise with it and above it, air being a lighter fluid than water; so that the atmosphere on the surface of the water, where the ark always remained, would retain its ordinary density, and very nearly also its usual temperature.

Another difficulty meets us when we seek to account for the spread of the animals saved in the ark, each to its appropriate climate and locality.

On the surface of our globe are found many regions or districts, each having its own animal as well as vegetable occupants—a region wherein the animals peculiar to it live and flourish, and nowhere else so well. True, we do find such zoological provinces to which their animal occupants seem fitted by the Creator. They flourish best there, as *e. g.* the elephant in India, the kangaroo in New Holland, the chamois among the highest Alps, the crocodile in the Nile of Nubia. But under extraordinary circumstances they can, we know, exist for a considerable length of time in other localities, and they can subsist too on other than their ordinary

food. The Deluge did present extraordinary circumstances, and He who formed all animals, and endowed them with their several peculiar instincts, could guide them step by step, by their instincts, through all intervening regions, until they reached each one his proper locality.

To restrict the extension of animal life from one common centre over all the three continents of the Old World no formidable impediments occur.

This continent was probably tenanted at a later period by way of the points nearest to the Asiatic coasts; while even New Holland may have been formerly connected, with but slight intervening gaps, with the southern peninsula of Asia. In the isles of the great Pacific but very few animals were found by the first European discoverers. These island animals were small, and such as might very easily have been transported in the canoes and other frail vessels in which the first human tenants were driven by storms or borne by ocean-currents to those isles; but little difficulty can be felt in accounting for their animal tenantry.

But were the difficulty attending this subject tenfold greater, and seemingly beyond all satisfactory explanation (as may possibly be esteemed the zoology of New Holland), if I find it recorded in the book of revelation that in the Deluge "*every living thing in which is the breath of life perished, and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark,*" I could still believe it implicitly, satisfied that the difficulty of explanation springs solely from the imperfection of human knowledge, and not from any limitation in the power or the wisdom of God, nor yet from any lack of trustworthiness in the document given to us as a revelation from God—a document given to man by the hands of Moses, the learned, accomplished, and eminently devout Jewish legislator.

Again, it is objected that, even of aquatic animals, many live only in fresh water, and would perish in the salt waters of the ocean; others exist only in salt water, and could not possibly live several weeks in fresh; and others again are so organized, that they can inhabit only brackish waters, such as that found in the estuaries of rivers like Mobile Bay, or like the waters of the Hudson river opposite to Jersey city and Hoboken, and like the waters of the Mississippi below New Orleans, and near the Balize. A

universal deluge must, therefore, have annihilated the whole race of fresh-water animals and moluscs over the entire surface of the globe.

True, such distinction of fresh and of salt water moluscs and fishes, does exist. But who has tested with sufficient accuracy the capability of these fresh-water animals for the endurance of a salter element, to decide positively that they could not have lived through the period of the universal overflow?

Suppose, however, that all the living tenants of fresh water actually perished, may not the spawn of these several varieties have been floating uninjured in the waters, or have lain protected beneath and around stones and rocks in secluded places, on the newly upheaved lands, which finally settled, where but little current could disturb the precious deposit that was spread abundantly where the rivers of the new continents would begin gently to flow, and the lakes to embosom themselves? In this way ample means may have been provided for continuing the races of fresh-water fishes and moluscs, which multiply, as we know, with astonishing rapidity in ordinary circumstances.

May it not even be true that the germs of animal life lie imbedded at this very moment beneath the stratum forming the bed of the ocean, and that they are so guarded by surrounding mud, and the immense pressure of ocean's waters, from all action of the atmosphere, and from all escape of vital moisture and gas, that vitality still exists there—so that when, ages hence, the present ocean-bed shall be upheaved, it shall bring with it to the sun and air the seeds of appropriate animal no less than vegetable life, in countless myriads? And why may it not have been thus with lands upheaved at the Deluge? We know that seeds which had been lying for many centuries entombed with Egyptian mummies, have, with proper care, been found capable of germinating. And it is said that insects, which had for years been enclosed in liquors kept in closely sealed bottles, have, on exposure to air and light, revived to perfect vigour and activity. (Dr J. P. Smith, p. 116; Humboldt's *Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 345, note.) 'To one instance of the kind, at least, I can myself testify. The preservation of fresh-water animals does, then, present no serious objection against the universality of the Deluge.

Again. *Trees sometimes attain to great longevity; and by*

observing the rings successively formed each year beneath the bark, in the growth of the tree, a reasonable certainty as to its age may be attained. Now, in some parts of Africa, and even in Mexico, trees are now standing which, judged by this test, must, it is asserted, be pronounced three, four, and some even five thousand years old or more. But if this be true, then some of these trees must have been growing one thousand years before the date of Noah's deluge, as ordinarily computed. (Dr J. P. Smith, p. 117, and Supplement Note I. See also Lyell, Princ. p. 405. Humboldt's Aspects of Nature, p. 287.) Such trees could not possibly live submerged for several months under water. Hence, it is confidently maintained, we have proof that the countries where these trees are growing could not have been covered by the waters of Noah's deluge. (Aspects of Nature, Humboldt, p. 287.)

In answer to this objection, I would observe, it is obvious that very great uncertainty must always attend even the most careful attempts to compute the age of extremely old trees by counting the rings in the wood.

It is generally admitted that every time a new set of leaves is produced by a tree, a new ring is formed in the trunk. We know that sometimes, in tropical countries at least, from the effects of drought, or of the ravages of insects, trees shed and renew their leaves twice, or even three times, in the course of a single year. In each of such years, two or three rings would be formed in the trunk.

Besides, for the purpose of ascertaining the age of these majestic trees, the tree is not cut down; it is merely bored, and a plug is extracted.

The causes of error are therefore too numerous, and too palpable, to allow us to rely with confidence on the results of such calculations.

Four thousand years, at the very least, have elapsed since the flood; a period long enough, one would suppose, to account for the growth of any tree now on earth, however gigantic.

But another, and a far more serious objection to the universality of the Deluge, is found in the appearance of various volcanic regions in different countries: as e. g. Mount Ætna in Sicily; also the province of Auvergne in the south of France, and

a region in Asia Minor. In the south of France, in a district about forty miles long by twenty broad, are found many cones, craters, and other marks of ancient volcanic action; shewing that once there must have stood there a great number of contiguous burning mountains, some of them nearly equal in size to Vesuvius. Similar cones and craters are found in Asia Minor. The period when these craters were in action must far antedate the earliest historic records of those countries: since no notice of volcanoes in action there, nor allusions to them, nor traces of tradition respecting these volcanoes in action, appear in any ancient writings known to us.

In the country around some of these craters and cones (which are themselves but vast heaps of cinders and scorix, thrown out by the volcano whose mouth they surround, just as we now see the cone continually enlarging around the volcanic mouth of Vesuvius), are still to be seen vast beds of lava, once fluid, but now rock of the hardest kind, that flowed over a surface many miles in extent. In some places rivers have worn their way through these masses of rock lava, in a channel a hundred and more feet deep.¹ In other places in the same region are to be seen beds of lava alternating with vegetable mould, or with mineral deposits, and with strata containing fossil remains, many of them of *extinct species*. All which circumstances serve to attest the vast antiquity of this region, and of the volcanoes, once active, that ejected these beds of lava and scorix.

Further; on the sides of Mount *Ætna* similar extinct craters and cinder cones are found, some of them so long extinct that they have become covered with a thick growth of forest.

A careful examination of these volcanic districts, these extinct craters, and these cones, by competent observers, shews, it is said, no mark or trace of the action of water. Had the waters of Noah's deluge overflowed the regions where these cones stand, the cinders of which they are composed being light, like pumice-stone, they must have been washed away almost entirely.

Plain it is, then, we are told, these countries were not submerg-

¹ For a very interesting account of this volcanic region of Auvergne, see Richardson's *Geology for Beginners*, pp. 433-438: and see also *The Course of Creation*, by Dr Anderson of Scotland, pp. 280-283.

ed beneath the waters of the Deluge. That deluge could not, therefore, have been universal: it must have been a mere local inundation: confined to those regions in the interior of Asia, over which alone the antediluvian race of man had spread.

The difficulty just stated is, it must be frankly admitted, a grave one. Of all the objections urged against the universality of the Noachian deluge, this drawn from appearances presented in certain volcanic regions, strikes me as by far the most serious. It is very plausible, and on a first view it seems almost insuperable; because although for the mere production and the subsequent disposal of the water, for the safe keeping and sustenance of all in the ark, for the subsequent dispersion of man and of the animals to their appropriate localities over the face of the entire earth, the direct intervention of the Creator may be reasonably appealed to, yet we cannot bring ourselves to suppose that that intervention would have been employed for preventing the usual effects produced by such a body of water as that of the Deluge being left visible in every region where it had spread, nor yet for obliterating the marks of its action that would be left after the waters had subsided.

If these volcanic craters and cones be as old as geologists conjecture, then they must have withstood the washing and surging of the overflowing waters of the Deluge; on the popular view of that event; or else they must have emerged from the sea, as they now are, on the upheaval of the region where they stand, according to the hypothesis I have advanced. The total absence of all traces left by the action of water upon these cinder cones, seems peremptorily to forbid either of these alternatives. Hence the inference presented in the objection: these volcanic regions could not have been overflowed by the waters of the Deluge; that deluge must, therefore, have been a local inundation only.

But the plain language of Moses, and all the circumstances he details, and the uniform representations of that event, and the allusions to it, found in various passages of Scripture, compel us to believe that the Deluge was *literally universal*, covering the entire surface of our globe, so that these volcanic regions could not have escaped. Whatever be the difficulties attending this view of that event, it is the only view the language of the Bible will authorize.

If we cannot trust our interpretation of the Mosaic account of the Deluge, all certainty of interpretation seems hopeless.

The Deluge was universal. That is certain, if unequivocal language used by a man inspired of God can make any position certain. In conformity with that one *fixed fact*, all the appearances presented in our planet must, by a Christian philosopher, be interpreted. And happily in this case, formidable though the objections drawn from these volcanic regions appear at first, a little patient attention will shew they are not fatal to the truth of the Mosaic doctrine, nor inconsistent with it.

We may cheerfully concede that the wearing away of hard rock, such as lava, by the action of water alone, is a very slow process; and that for a river to wear, in such hard lava rock, a channel "*a hundred or more feet deep*," would require a long succession of ages.

Thus we know that the basaltic rocks, volcanic in their origin, which constitute and surround the Giant's Causeway in the north of Ireland, and Fingal's Cave in the isle of Staffa,¹ near the western coast of Scotland, exhibit but little evidence of wear, after many centuries of exposure to the action of the heavy tides, and the furious storms of the Atlantic Ocean. So that if these deep channels in the lava beds of Auvergne have been worn *solely* by the ordinary action of water steadily flowing, it may have required perhaps many thousands of years longer than can be supposed to have intervened between the days of Noah and our time.

But who will undertake to prove that these channels have been worn by the ordinary action of water alone? Who shall say that the rock itself is not composed of such materials that, though to the observer seemingly homogeneous, even when tried by all known chemical tests, it is in some places more yielding to the action of water than in others? Or who will prove that the mountain torrents do not at times come charged with such ingredients held in solution, as that, when commingled in one stream in the river, their chemical action is such as to effect, in the lava rock over which they fall, a solution² of feet and yards in one single season, where,

¹ Richardson, p. 238. Course of Creation, p. 166.

² It was with no ordinary interest that, since the above remarks were written, and were published in the Southern Presbyterian, I found, in Lyell's Principles of Geology, pp. 250 and 251, the following statements in relation to these volcanic rocks in

under other circumstances, the wear would be hardly perceptible in half a century? Are all the agencies of nature known to us?

A thousand years constitute a very long period, and in that period many times may recur those extraordinary events, such as storms, tornadoes, water-spouts, and other phenomena, the effects of which on the hardest mountain cliffs are great, wide-spread, and absolutely inconceivable to one who has not witnessed them. The writer of this noticed among the Highlands of Scotland the effects of one winter's storms, such as ages of ordinary wear could not have produced. Deep gorges were worn in the sides of solid mountains. Again, in passing, in Switzerland, from Lucerne to the Brunig Pass, the effects of a recent tornado and water-spout were seen.¹ Vast rocks had been hurled from the loftiest moun-

Auvergne, which verify as *fact* the supposition above given as a theory, for the solution of the difficulty. "*Carbonate springs, Lucerne* (Carbonic acid gas is very plentifully disengaged from springs in almost all countries, but particularly near active or extinct volcanoes. This elastic fluid has the property of decomposing many of the hardest rocks with which it comes in contact, particularly that numerous class in whose composition felspar is an ingredient. It renders the oxide of iron soluble in water, and contributes, as was before stated, to the solution of calcareous matter. In volcanic districts, these gaseous emanations are not confined to springs, but rise up in the state of pure gas from the soil in various places. Prodigious quantities of this gas are now annually disengaged from every part of the Limagne d Auvergne, where it appears to have been developed in equal quantity from time immemorial.

"In the environs of Pont Gibaud, not far from Clermont, a rock belonging to the gneiss formation, in which lead mines are worked, has been found to be quite saturated with carbonic acid gas, which is constantly disengaged. The carbonates of lime, of iron, and manganese, are so dissolved that the rock is rendered soft, and the quartz alone remains unattacked. Not far off is the small volcanic cone of Chaluzet, which once broke up through the gneiss, and sent forth a lava stream." (Lyell, Princ. Geol. p. 250)

The same indefatigable investigator of nature has a paragraph on the very next page, in relation to the granite rock underlying these lava beds in Auvergne. (See Richardson, p. 436) "*Disintegration of Granite in Auvergne* Disintegrating effects of carbonic acid. The disintegration of granite is a striking feature of large districts in Auvergne, especially in the neighbourhood of Clermont. (N.B.—The district which is the site of the volcanic cones, and of the beds of lava and of granite here spoken of, is called *La Limagne d'Auvergne*, remarkable for its fertility, as is the case with all soils formed of volcanic detritus. See Richardson's Geology, p. 436, Lyell, p. 250.) This decay was called by Dolomieu, '*la maladie du granite*,' and the rock may with propriety be said to *have the rot, for it crumbles to pieces in the hand*. The phenomenon may, without doubt, be ascribed to the continual disengagement of carbonic acid gas from numerous fissures." (Lyell, Princ. Geol. p. 251)

¹ The power of mountain torrents in wearing away solid crags and hard rocks, is vividly illustrated among the Andes in South America. See also the description given

tain peaks, and had been poured in one continuous stream of gigantic fragments, all down the mountain's side, and far over a lovely valley. Centuries of ordinary wear could not have so changed the face of the country.

But we need not recur to this hypothesis, so probable in itself, and so accordant to the settled irregularity of the course of nature, of occasional convulsions and extraordinary phenomena, that must have occurred in the vast period of four thousand years that have elapsed since the upheaval of these volcanic regions, to wear, in the lava rock of Auvergne, the deep channels in which the streams of that volcanic region now flow. We can satisfactorily account for all the phenomena now found there without this supposition.

We may readily admit the vast antiquity of this whole region, and of the volcanic craters there found. When upheaved from the depths of ocean in the days of Noah, these lava beds may have been already formed, and the water channels now seen therein may have been already deeply worn. For the presence of alternate beds of lava, and of vegetable soil, and the existence there of strata presenting fossil remains of *extinct* animals, shew clearly this region has, like many others on our globe, been several times upheaved and submerged, and again upheaved. Those now ex-

by Darwin, of what he calls "*streams of stones*" (Voyage of a Naturalist, vol. i. pp. 253, 255), the effect of some great convulsion. "I have seen in the Cordilleras of the Andes (says Mr Darwin) the evident marks where stupendous mountains have been broken into pieces, like so much thin crust, and the strata thrown on their vertical edges; but never did any scene like these '*streams of stones*' so forcibly convey to my mind the idea of a convulsion, of which, in historical records, we might in vain seek for any counterpart" (vol. i. p. 255).

"The *power of running water* to erode the solid rocks (says Richardson, p. 442, speaking of this very district of Auvergne), and to produce valleys by their currents, is strikingly exemplified throughout the whole of this remarkable district. It is to be observed that *the erosive power of water has been aided by the proneness of the volcanic rocks to decompose*. In some instances beds of lava have been corroded by waters which have worn through a mass of rock one hundred and fifty feet in height, and have formed a channel, *even in the granite beneath*, since the lava first flowed into the valley. . .

"In another spot a bed of basalt one hundred and sixty feet high, has been cut through by a mountain stream" (p. 442.)

The same writer remarks, that "on the Rhine, every castellated summit throughout the entire region, from Bonn to Mayence, are so many piles of volcanic rock, the decomposition of which constitutes a rich and luxuriant soil, forming a very hot-bed for the cultivation of the grape." (Id. p. 443.)

tinct volcanoes may have been in action in a former period of upheaval, and active even when submerged, as we know does sometimes happen. We know, too, that whole regions are upheaved, and sink again so steadily, that every hill and rock, nay, even buildings erected by men, retain their position, both positively and relatively. Thus the temple of Jupiter Scapis, on the shores of the bay of Naples, has been twice elevated, and has twice sunk, to the extent of at least twenty feet each time, since the Christian era; and yet many of the marble columns of the temple, which shew unmistakeable proofs of this alteration of level, are still standing perfectly upright to the present day, as I can personally testify. (See Richardson, p. 422.) So, also, these volcanic regions, after having bared their lava rocks to the action of the elements and the streams for ages before Adam was, may have sunk beneath the waters, and emerging again steadily in the days of Noah, the same water-worn lava rocks may have presented their well-worn channels for the passage of the stream again flowing in the ancient beds, as their most natural course.

If on this last emergence of this ancient volcanic region, the old craters again burst forth into action, the long interval between the Deluge and the historic age in these regions in the south of Europe, will yield ample time for the formation of the cones of cinders and scoriæ now observed. Volcanic action having now ceased for many centuries, and no fresh accumulation of cinders and of scoriæ taking place, these apparently unsuitable materials are converted into, or they become covered with, a productive soil in a much shorter time than many geologists seem to suppose, as has been shewn more than once in answer to the objections against the Mosaic era of the Deluge, drawn from the alternate strata of lava and vegetable mould passed through in the digging of a well in Sicily, as mentioned by the traveller Brydone. When his observations were first published, it was confidently maintained that two thousand years were requisite to convert hard lava into vegetable mould; and that as seven of these alternating strata were passed through, the lowest bed of lava must have there overflowed at least fourteen thousand years since; consequently the Mosaic story of a universal deluge four or five thousand years ago could not be true. But more extended and careful research has furnished evidence to shew that a few centuries will sometimes suffice to ac-

compleish this change. Even the materials overlying Herculaneum, and the sides of Vesuvius, where lava has so frequently overflowed, and where the freshly reduced volcanic soil is so speedily covered again with vineyards and houses, afford ample evidence of this. The mere fact, on which so much stress has been laid, that many of these old volcanic cones, especially on the sides of Mount *Ætna*, are now covered with large forest trees, shows indeed that these cones surround crater-mouths which have been inactive for a long time, for many centuries probably. But, with all deference to the accomplished Lyell be it said, this fact furnishes no shadow of a proof that these cones have been standing as they now are, since the time of Noah, and before it.

The four thousand (perhaps we may say five thousand) years or more that have elapsed since the Deluge, comprise a great many centuries, and afford ample time for the accomplishment of changes far more extraordinary than the extinguishing of all these once active craters, the conversion of the materials of numbers of them into productive soil, and the clothing of these volcanic cones with a dense forest of huge trees.

Many a man in these Western States can point to rugged spots, once bare of all vegetation, save only a scanty herbage, but now shaded by large trees several feet in girth, and all within the memory of the settlers. The hardest rock, when exposed to the elements, speedily shews a coating of vegetation: and when masses of rock are fissured and fractured, vegetation once begun progresses rapidly. Lichens, mosses, grasses, weeds, and a stunted shrubbery, gradually succeed each other; and this stage once reached, soil rapidly accumulates by the deposition of vegetable matter, and by the disintegration of the rock itself, so that the shrubbery thickens, sapling trees appear here and there, and before many centuries are gone, the once naked fragments of rock wave with a rank vegetation, beneath the shelter of towering forest-trees in countless numbers.

If hard rock shows this change in a few centuries, how much more readily must it take place upon heaps of cinders, porous, friable, easily reduced to powder, and often consisting of vegetable and animal substance but half calcined. (See Humboldt, *Aspects of Nature*, pp. 230, 231. Darwin's *Voy. of a Nat.* vol. ii. pp. 85, 86, 296, 297.)

Monte Nuovo, near Naples, was heaved up by volcanic power five hundred feet in one night, September 29th, 1538, only a few centuries ago. It is already clothed, partially at least, with vegetation; and if nature be there left to take its course, but a few more generations will pass ere Monte Nuovo, a mere volcanic protrusion, shall be clothed with large trees also. Geologists are too ready to deal in large numbers, and to ascribe an antiquity of thousands of years, where a few centuries would be nearer the truth. Were the date of the upheaval of this new mountain in the bay of Naples, September 29th, 1538,¹ not perfectly well known, geologists would not have been wanting, who, before this time, would have pronounced Monte Nuovo of vast antiquity, far antedating the æra of the flood. When soberly considered, therefore, the cones on the sides of Mount Ætna, and the lava-beds and the extinct craters and volcanic cones of the south of France, and of Western Asia, present no insurmountable objection to the absolute literal universality of Noah's flood. They may all be accounted for in a manner perfectly consistent with that universality.

Another objection against the Mosaic narrative of the Deluge has been thus represented :

The ark, as Moses tells us (Gen. viii. 4), grounded on Mount Ararat, and from that mountain Noah and the animals emerging from the ark descended to the plains below. Now, it is said, the summit of Ararat is a lofty granite peak, or a series of peaks, covered with glaciers, and nearly inaccessible to man. If denuded of their icy covering (as they must have been by the washing of the waters for many weeks in continuance), those granite peaks would present a series of exceedingly high and nearly perpendicular masses of rock, down which, although not without great difficulty and even danger, *man might* have descended, but down which such animals as the ox, the horse, and the elephant, could not possibly have moved in safety.

Hence it is inferred the story of Genesis cannot be true, if understood literally.

To this objection the answer is easy.

If the Mount Ararat mentioned in Genesis be the same mountain that now bears that name, it does not follow that the very

¹ Lyell, p. 348.

highest summit is intended. Drawn by eddies into a basin of waters, sheltered by a range of the loftier peaks after they were already bared above the waste of waters, the ark might have remained nearly stationary for some time, and finally have grounded on a much less elevated point, whence the descent would be easy. Transfer the case, in idea, to the region of the Alleghanies, or of the White Mountains, and we can easily discern how a vessel might ground upon one of the ridges of such mountains, from which the descent would be unattended with any difficulty. Or suppose such complete inundation in Switzerland that should cover the very loftiest Alps. A vessel that had been floating on the waters of such inundation, might ground on the summit of the Wengern Alp, where now stands a chalet for the entertainment of travellers. Lying there, it could with perfect truth be said to rest *on the Alps*, or on the summit of the Alps, as much as if it had been arrested on the highest pinnacles of the Yung-frau. From this latter, a safe descent would be impossible: from the former it would be entirely practicable.

One more objection, and one only, will here be noticed, *archæological* in its character, and exciting at the present moment general attention in the literary world.

It is confidently asserted, *the Deluge could not have been universal, covering the whole earth, because the records and the monuments of several oriental nations shew clearly a series of proofs running back, up to, and even far beyond the era of Noah's deluge, demonstrating that civilization of a high grade, and also a very dense population, existed in Egypt certainly, and probably in China also, at the very time when a deluge in the days of Noah, had it been universal, must have placed Egypt miles deep under water.*

Thus Monsieur Ampère, the accomplished French traveller in Egypt, so late as 1848-9, reiterates the assertion, based on the published discoveries of the Baron Lepsius, that monuments do still exist in Egypt, the dates of which have been identified step by step through their hieroglyphic inscriptions, back to a period so early as 2500 years before Abraham: *i. e.* upwards of 4300 years before Christ, and therefore several hundreds of years antecedent to the date of the creation of Adam, as computed by Usher,

B.C. 4004. (See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 1847, p. 1035.)
Idem. No. III. *Les Pyramides*, p. 637.

In the early Chinese history also, dates are found of extreme antiquity, as far back, even among the less extravagant of their annals, as B.C. 2300, and B.C. 2637, and to B.C. 3400. (See in this work the *Lecture on Creation in Six Days*.)

Without here entering minutely into the great question of scriptural chronology, which is reserved for future discussion, it may be remarked that no judicious writer now ventures to regard as authoritative any of the annals of the East, whether Chinese, Hindoo, or Chaldean, that extend beyond about the twelfth or thirteenth century before Christ. The Chinese historians give an account of reigns, of dynasties, and of remarkable events, up to a fabulous antiquity, and that also with great minuteness. But we know that Confucius, about B.C. 500, gave these works to his countrymen, *professing*, indeed, to have compiled them from authentic ancient archives: but of the genuineness, nay even of the existence of these ancient documents, no evidence is before the public. Nor is there either in India or in China *monumental* evidence existing to sustain this claim to high antiquity. (See Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, &c. vol. i pp. 241, 242. See Lepsius, *Chronologie der Egypter*, vol. i. pp. 3-8. See *Cosmos*, vol. i. pp. 114, 115, and note. Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. i. pp. 93-231.)

In Egypt the case is different. Monuments do there exist in great numbers, and of extreme antiquity, undoubtedly. The vast Pyramids, it is asserted with great confidence by those deemed competent to judge in the case, were erected before the time of Abraham. If this could be proved, then certainly the interval between Abraham and Noah must have been much longer than we have been accustomed to suppose: for, on the common computation, there was not sufficient time for the multiplication of mankind, the growth of distinct nations, and the advance of the Egyptians in numbers, wealth, civilization, and skill in the ~~fine~~ arts, to a degree such as must have been indispensable in a people who could build the pyramids of Gizeh.

To settle the chronology of the flood is the only difficulty in the case: for certain it is that the pyramids could not have withstood the surging waters of the Deluge. Much less could the

temples and the vast halls of the royal palaces, or the chambers of their excavated tombs, covered with hieroglyphic inscriptions, and with paintings presenting the most delicate lines and the richest tints of colouring, have remained as they still are in all their freshness, brilliant as if executed but yesterday, had the waters of Noah's deluge rolled over the valley of the Nile since these wonderful works were executed.

So near as Egypt is to what we must suppose to have been the primitive seat of man's abode, even a partial deluge arising from the subsidence of that primitive land, must have sent a vast wave of waters sweeping temporarily over Egypt, that would have been fatal to the whole series of monumental paintings and inscriptions. (Lyell, Princ. 342; Darwin's Voy. ii. p. 133.) The probability is great that somewhere, as yet not fully detected, lies an error, either in the mode of interpreting the hieroglyphic records in Egypt, or in the method of computing the several reigns and dynasties of its monarchs.

Already several errors are detected in the interpretation given to some of the hieroglyphics by men of high renown. Moreover, it is well known that on very many of the monuments themselves, the names now standing have been executed over previous inscriptions, effaced for the purpose of making room for them. Who shall say how far these alterations have been made, where now detection is difficult? And who can fail to perceive how the fact of these substitutions tends to throw discredit on the whole series of monumental inscriptions, and to involve their historical value in uncertainty? Once ascertained, as it now is beyond dispute, that the Pharaohs allowed themselves thus, from a petty vanity, to tamper with and to alter the noblest monuments¹ of their predecessors, the very records of the nation, what guarantee can we find for the genuineness of even those tables of royal names, those lists of dynasties, or those chronological marks upon which our modern Egyptologists found their most plausible arguments for the vast antiquity of the Pharaonic empire?

Besides there is, in the very nature of things, an inherent improbability in this claim to antiquity for Egypt.

It would present an anomaly among nations. One solitary

¹ This has been done at Medinet Habou (See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Dec. 1847, p. 1028), at Luxor (id. p. 1010), and in many other places. (Id. Jan. 1849, p. 93.)

nation, existing for thousands of years, with the most stupendous works of art ever wrought by the skill and industry of man (works which to this day have never been surpassed), scattered profusely over their whole territory, while all the rest of the world, without exception, was occupied by scattered tribes of barbarians, totally uncivilized. It is utterly incredible.

A radical error in the Egyptian chronology, as presented to the public in all the splendid works on Egypt that are now bursting on the astonished world, has from the first been suspected. Somewhere this error *must* be, and I hope yet to see the day when the source of that error shall be detected, exposed, and acknowledged.

Happy am I to be able to add, that the means of doing this seem to be now brought within our reach chiefly through the skilful and laborious researches of Mr R. S. Poole, a gentleman of talents and learning, who was brought up on the banks of the Nile, who has spent many years in the study of the monuments, and who has adduced proofs from the monuments themselves that several of the dynasties were really contemporaneous, just as the learned have for ages past supposed would prove to be the case. Mr Poole has discovered on the monuments a variety of astronomical signs and records, the interpretation of which he has ascertained,—and his calculations, based on those astronomical records, confirm the conclusions he deduces from other sources,—all going to shew, that the whole of Egyptian chronology, when understood and reduced to order, is entirely consistent with the chronology of the Bible.

As an instance, on several monuments Mr Poole found, under the well known names of some of the old Pharaohs, records of this kind: “On such a day, of such a month, in such a year of the reign of King ——, son of the Sun, beloved of Amoun, lord of the two worlds, &c. such a star being in such a position in the heavens (here all the points are distinctly laid down) happened such an event, a great assembly,” &c. &c.¹

Now the time when the star thus named occupied the position thus designated, is easily calculated: and the result of all these several dates, when fixed by calculation, falls in with, and is cor-

¹ See Poole's *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, p. 73; also his Preface, p. 8; his Introduction, p. 22; and Champollion's *Monumens*, plate 116.

roborated by, the evidence adduced, in various ways, from a great number of the monuments. But, in order to remove all grounds of doubt, Mr Poole submitted the data collected from the monuments, and on which he had founded his calculations, to Mr Airy, the Astronomer Royal at Greenwich, England. By him the calculations were made anew, and subsequently revised again and again, with great care, and they were found to agree, within a few minutes, with the result of Mr Poole's original calculations.¹

But so complete and satisfactory is the train of evidence adduced by Mr Poole, that Sir J. G. Wilkinson, one of the most learned of living men in all that relates to Egyptian archæology, has openly published his entire concurrence in the views of Mr Poole on Egyptian chronology, and his conviction of the satisfactory character of the evidence that gentleman has drawn from the monuments. (See his *Architecture of Egypt*.)

That question may now be regarded as virtually settled. *Egypt, with all her splendid monuments, is found a witness to the truth of the Bible, and to the correctness of the Mosaic chronology.*

After a thorough and patient examination of the whole subject, in all its most important bearings, we find no reason from any thing advanced, either on the ground of alleged absurdities in the narrative itself, nor yet in difficulties raised on scientific grounds, nor yet from the claims advanced by certain oriental nations to an antiquity inconsistent with the universality, if not also with the very fact, of a deluge in the days of Noah, to doubt the perfect truth of the Mosaic record on that point, and its accuracy in every particular.² This venerable record teaches us that the Deluge was literally universal, covering the entire surface of the globe, so far, at least, as animal life had then spread.

This fearful catastrophe was produced, as I cannot but suppose, by an elevation of the bed of the antediluvian oceans, which ele-

¹ See Poole's *Horæ*, Preface, p. 8; Introduction, p. 22; *Egyptiacæ*, p. 73; and Champollion's *Monumens*, plate 11. The accuracy of these results will probably be called in question by Mr Gliddon, and those who are already strongly committed in the support of the high antiquity advocated by Lepsius and Bunsen.

² The learned Adrien Balbo says: "No monument, either historical or astronomical, has yet been able to prove the books of Moses false; but with them, on the contrary, agree, in the most remarkable manner, the results obtained by the most learned philologues, and the profoundest geometricians." (*Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*. Mappemonde, Eth. 1.)

vated beds constitute what is now land on our globe, and by the simultaneous sinking¹ of the primeval continents, which then became, and still continue to be, the bed of the sea. Hence it is that no remains of antediluvian man, or of his works, have yet been discovered among geological strata.

The argument adduced to shew that man was not a denizen of the earth in the period when the older strata were deposited, because no remains of man or of his works are found among the fossils of those strata, is equally in point to shew that the present continents could not have been the seat of man's abode, when, in Noah's day, the Deluge covered the whole earth.

"Our bones," says an eloquent writer (Richardson, pp. 90, 91), "composed of the same materials as those of the animal tribes, are equally capable of being kept from destruction. The same battle-field has preserved the remains of the horse and his rider."

But had the present lands been the seat of man's abode when the Deluge swept over the globe, "his skeleton, or the mere fragments of his osseous structure, would have constituted the least of those relics which he would have bequeathed to the soil of which he was an inhabitant. We should have discovered his mighty and majestic works, which so far transcend in duration his own ephemeral existence. We should have found his cities and his structures overwhelmed in the waters of the Deluge; his majestic pyramids sunk in the bed of ancient rivers; his mountain temples hewn in the solid rock;" his bridges of stone, or the tombs he had erected over his loved ones. We should have found (for even a century ago Bishop Berkeley expressed a similar thought) "his weapons of war, his implements of agriculture, his coins, his medals, his cameos, intaglios, and vases."

The fact, therefore, that nothing of all this has been found in the vast multitude of aqueous deposits brought to light, seems to show conclusively we tread not the soil trodden by antediluvian man; that soil lies now, in all probability, deeply submerged beneath the rolling billows of the ocean.

It may, however, yet happen, and that, too, possibly at no very distant day, that a renewed alteration in the relative position of land and sea, even to a limited extent, shall heave up the site of

¹ On the subsidence of continents, see Darwin's *Voyage of a Naturalist*, vol. ii. pp. 262, 263.

antediluvian cities; or volcanic throes may yet protrude some battle field of Nimrod; force up to the light some vast idol-temple of the wicked "*sons of men*," some cemetery of the "*giants that were on the earth in those days*," and present to the amazed geologist of the future, the warrior clad in mail, the priest in his sacerdotal garb, censer in hand, the huge skeleton of some antediluvian chieftain-giant, in his rocky sarcophagus, covered with mysterious inscriptions, with the jewelled tiara yet encircling his skull, and the gem-studded breast-plate still overlying the arched ribs, proclaiming the mighty man, one of those "*which were of old, men of renown* (Gen. vi. 4.) Or these future upheavals may yet lay bare to the gaze of the indefatigable votaries of science among the sons of our sons' sons, the virgin in her bridal attire, the shepherd surrounded by his flocks, the mother still clasping her fossil babe, the husbandman, plough in hand behind his oxen, just as they were imbedded in the mass of mountain fragments, swept over their sinking lands by the advancing ocean-floods, when the "*fountains of the great deep were broken up*;" a whole gallery of antediluvian human fossils, demonstrating to the most sceptical among the scientific of future ages, the truth of the wonderful old record:—"*Every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowls of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only was left alive, and they that were with him in the ark.*" Amen.

By the same mail which brought for correction the proof-sheets of the Lectures on the Deluge, came also the April number of the Theological and Literary Journal, containing a very able and ingenious paper by the editor of the Journal, David N. Lord, on the Age of the Earth. That article the author of these pages has twice read with great care and with deep interest. The editor takes bold ground, and he sustains it with great fluency. He recognises unhesitatingly the great facts presented in geological science, but shews clearly that the doctrines thereon founded by geologists are *not demonstrated truths*, but merely and simply inferences, based in reality on an unwarranted assumption, employed in their mode of reasoning. Whatever the probability of the deductions drawn from geological facts, they cannot, the editor contends, be counted on as *ascertained truths*, before which the teachings of Moses must give way. This point the editor presents in a strong light.

To all his positions the writer of these pages cannot subscribe: in the interpretation of the several stages in the six days' creation, as laid down by the editor, he cannot

fully agree. These, however, are minor points. The article in question fairly shews that however a knowledge of the *facts* of geology may modify our views of the import of the Mosaic record in some particulars, the teachers of geologic science have no *demonstrated* system of cosmogony which can, by the remotest possibility, compete in value with the teachings of Moses.

There is a noble passage in that article (see pages 543, 544) illustrative of the position laid down p. 514: "*The whole Bible, as a revelation, stands or falls with the first chapter of Genesis.*" That passage will be found in the Appendix to this work.

LECTURE XI.

DEATH AMONG THE WORKS OF GOD—ITS ORIGIN AND ITS EXTENT.

GEN. iii. 19.—“Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

THE deed was done, the sin was wrought, the fall of man, in the first human pair, was accomplished. Adam, our common progenitor, had trampled under foot his Maker's command; he had plucked and eaten of the forbidden fruit, and by that one act, he involved his entire posterity in moral degradation and ruin, and placed them in imminent peril; for this fatal act it was that “*brought death into the world and all our woe.*”

The favour of heaven was now lost, and ere long the voice of God himself pronounced the doom: “*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*”

The origin and extent of death among the works of God on earth may then well claim our attention.

The *origin of death* is in the Bible distinctly and repeatedly ascribed to *the sin of man*. “*By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin*” (Rom. v. 12); “*The wages of sin is death*” (Rom. vi. 23.)

Whatever might have been included in the original commination uttered to deter Adam from transgression, “*In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,*” certain it is that, the act of transgression being accomplished, there was pronounced on sinning man the doom which constitutes the theme of this discourse: “*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*”

It is, then, clearly the doctrine of the Bible, that to man death is the fruit of sin.

Had man remained sinless, he would not only have continued

to maintain uninterrupted communion with the pure Spirit, his glorious Creator, but his very body would have been exempt from decay and death.

What special arrangement would have been needed to secure this end, we cannot pretend to decide; but that so it would have been, is beyond question.

All things necessary to secure such results, *could* and *would* have been provided by the almighty Creator; and probably after a suitable period passed by each individual of the race in probation on earth, each one without death (and in a mode somewhat analogous to that supernatural transformation which, as the apostle tells us, will hereafter, at the sound of the last trumpet, be effected in the twinkling of an eye, on the bodies of Christ's believing people who may be living when He comes to judgment, see 1 Cor. xv. 52) would have been prepared for removal to a higher state of existence, and to larger enjoyments in another and a brighter world. We must suppose such probationary term, and subsequent removal to another world, or another scene of action, because, else, the natural increase of the human family would, in time, have filled the earth to overflowing; sustenance must then have failed; and hence there would seem to have arisen a necessity for death, where, by the very terms of the supposition, death were impossible.

But all speculation as to what *might* have been the condition of man had he not sinned, is now fruitless. Sin he did, and on him fell the curse, one of whose results is the cessation of his animal life, and the return of his body to its original constituent elements: "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"

This sentence of mortality to man we see continually carried into execution. Every day we live the spectacle is presented of death entering the abodes of men, and selecting his victims from among the rich and the poor, the young and the old, the ~~band~~ and the free.

The active and the vigorous sometimes suddenly fall before the destroyer; and sometimes insidious disease slowly, unsuspected, yet certainly saps the strength, wastes the energies, and ends the life that had given promise of long and happy duration. One day the old man full of years, calmly sinks to his long rest; another, the little infant, after a few days of precarious life, or after a few

months of bright promise, sickens, droops, and dies. Another day the meridian of life is suddenly overcast, and the sun of existence sets at noonday. Nor varied possessions, nor weighty business, nor the pressing claims of a rising family, can delay the hour, nor avert the blow. It has been seen, too, that the young bride in her loveliness, grows suddenly pale amid her bright smiles, and sinks in the very arms of her enamoured husband, who finds, to his dismay, that what he had loved so fondly was but a lump of breathing clay. At another time we see the mother, gazing with speechless agony on the surrounding group of her little ones, for she knows that she must leave them to the care of others; she feels that she is dying; and her fast dimming eyes strain in their lingering gaze at the loved ones, dearer to her than life. Oh! how deep, how far-reaching, and how varied are the influences flowing from that one dread sentence, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"

The young man, who has nobly struggled with a thousand difficulties, to fit himself for action in life, to store his mind with knowledge, and to discipline and train his powers for the hard contest with competitors for honour, and usefulness, and distinction, and who was just beginning to feel his task almost done, and to gain confidence in his resources, and in his ability to use them with effect, finds, alas! that the task of *preparation for life* has exhausted the very energies of his life, and has planted deep within his breast the seeds of early death: and now the burning thirst, and the hacking cough, and the hectic glow, and the wasting flesh, and the exhausting night-sweats, forbid the hope of honour, of distinction, of wealth, and of his promised bride, and of the calm joys of domestic life, and bid him *prepare to lie down in the grave*, and make his bed with worms; for all remind him, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"

It is an affecting thought for each of us to contemplate,—go *where* we may, do *what* we may, and struggle and toil and labour *as* we may, we are moving ever *onwards* to the grave. To us the *hour* may be near, or it may be distant, but its approach is constant, its coming certain and inevitable. Like the crew of a foundering ship in mid-ocean, swept from her decks by the surging billows: some struggle a longer, some a shorter time upon the surface, but all, eventually, sink in the deep.

But if this arrangement of God's providence has its dark side, in the disappointment of hopes, the blasting of bright prospects, in the pains and sorrows of a sick-bed, and in the deep anxieties attending the prospect of leaving, and leaving, perhaps, unprovided for, those who are unutterably dear to us, it has also its redeeming influences.

If the hour of death is uncertain, and if its blow falls often suddenly as well as unexpectedly, this fact is known, and it peals its impressive warning to all and to each, *Be ready to meet the summons.*

God might have planted an instinct in man's bosom like that in many species of animals, which enables them to discern the tokens of coming death, and leads them to retire and hide away in some obscure retreat, there to die unseen and unnoticed.¹ Instead of that, God has made death and its preliminaries in man the means of calling into action some of the deepest and tenderest sympathies of our nature. The tokens of declining health awaken these sympathies in the breasts of friends and kindred, and the result is, that the kind services and loving attentions of those around the sufferer, often soothe the agonies of dissolution, cheer the approach to the grave, and almost strip death itself of its terrors: while to those sympathizing friends themselves, the emotions thus awakened, and the reflections thereby aroused, are always salutary, and sometimes they prove big with blessings which eternity alone can estimate. By such means, many a one has been led to profound reflection and to true piety. Moreover, *on the aspect of society*, this arrangement produces a decided effect. By the operation of this law of mortality, society is constantly changing and constantly becoming renewed.

Instead of one unvarying mass of individuals, to whom every object has been long familiar, and with whom every enjoyment has long since waned and almost expired, society is now receiving constant accessions of young life, and of vigorous capacity for happiness such as the world has to furnish. Human society is thus ever youthful, ever joyous.

Nor can it be doubted that, so far as mere animal enjoyment is concerned, the operation of this law of death, making room for

¹ See Mr Darwin's account of the curious habits of the guanaco or wild llama of Patagonia. (*Voyage of a Naturalist*, vol. i. pp. 212, 213.)

constant accessions of young life, occasions a far greater amount of enjoyment in the world than there could be were death not busy.

And yet all this death is the fruit of sin. It was *sin* that called forth the declaration, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"

Another illustration this of the grand truth, that the all-embracing benevolence of God *brings good out of evil*. But there is another point that here demands attention, *viz. the extent to which this doom applies.*

All men, the entire human family without exception, are subjected to this doom of death, and a return of dust to dust, as the fruit of sin: those without revelation as well as those having it. Infants no less than adults die. They are from the first breath of life drawn, members of the family of man, and as such they die. This is the fruit of the first sin of Adam, irrespective of personal guilt. Facts prove this; for little infants that never sinned *do yet die*. Death does still reign over them that have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

But further still, *death reigns over the brutes, and over the whole of the irrational animal creation*: and the inquiry forces itself upon us, *Is this death, in the irrational animal kingdom, the result also of Adam's sin?*

Not many years since, and few divines could have been found who would not have answered unhesitatingly in the affirmative. And in proof of their opinion, they would have quoted such passages of Scripture as these, "*By man came death.*" "*By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;*" and again, "*The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly (i. e. not of themselves), but by reason of him that hath subjected the same.*" (Rom. viii.) Now is this really so? Does death prevail among irrational animals, as well as among men, only because Adam sinned? Let us examine this point.

If such is indeed the case, then *before Adam fell*, death must have been unknown, and if so, then lions, tigers, and all other carnivorous animals must have lived on other food, not on flesh.

But no other materials does our globe furnish that could serve as food to the brute creation without destruction to animal life. The grass that springs thickly on the soil, the foliage that adorns

the trees of the forest—aye, every drop of water with which the panting heart quenches her thirst—teems with living occupants ; so that neither can vegetable food be taken, nor the pure water be quaffed from the broad river, or at the mountain streamlet, without the death of myriads of living creatures at every meal and at every draught. The ox grazing in the meadows, the timid sheep nibbling the short sweet herbage clothing the hill-side, the wild chamois cropping the stunted shrubs that cling to the loftiest summits of the mountain crags, the bright songsters of the grove slaking their thirst from the morning dew, yea the very humming-bird sipping the nectar treasured in the fragrant flower-cup—all, in their simplest meal, and in their purest draught, inflict a thousand death-pangs, where the tiger, for his bloodiest meal, destroys one life.

Constituted as things now are, millions of deaths must occur upon this globe every day and every hour, even were every animal now carnivorous confined to vegetable food exclusively.

But further still : *the anatomical structure of each animal determines the nature of its food*, and the habits of its life. In vegetable-eating animals the stomach must be adapted to receive and to digest vegetable substances. The length of the neck, the size and position of the muscles of the neck, the chest, and the legs, must be adapted to grazing on the ground, browsing among the bushes, or reaching up among the tender twigs of the loftiest shrubbery and trees. The form of the mouth, the lips, the tongue, must be adapted to lay hold of and to crop ; and the structure of the teeth must be such as to furnish the means of duly masticating this herbage or mass of twigs, to prepare it for reception in the stomach and digestion there. Such structure will answer for a vegetable-eating animal and for none other.

A carnivorous animal must have a stomach adapted to digest fresh flesh. It must have claws to seize, a sight quick to detect, instincts inciting it to pursue or to surprise by stealth its living prey. Moreover, the muscles of the jaw, the head, the neck, the chest, must be such as to give strength and agility for the pursuit, the capture, the slaying, and rending of the victim-prey : whilst the teeth must be adapted to tear and to masticate the flesh, and often the bones, too, of its victim, for subsequent digestion in the stomach.

A carnivorous animal could not live on herbage, nor an herbivorous animal on flesh. Some few animals (*e. g.* man) are omnivorous, and can live on vegetable or on an animal diet, although designed (as the structure of the teeth proves) to subsist on food consisting of a mixture of both. Occasionally, it is true, some carnivorous animals have by artificial means been brought to subsist for a time on vegetable food only. But these exceptions, few in number, and unnatural in their nature, invalidate not the rule. Beasts and birds of prey could not subsist, even for a few days, without feeding on the bodies of fresh slain animals.

Are we, then, to suppose, that before Adam sinned, lions, tigers, eagles, and vultures, fed like oxen, sheep, and sparrows, on herbage, fruits, and seeds? It is utterly incredible—it was not possible. Was then their anatomical structure different before man fell? Where is the evidence of it? Of any such alteration in the structure and in the animal functions of the brute creation, consequent on the fall, as this supposition implies, there is not a particle of evidence, nor indeed the slightest probability.

Were such change of structure in the brute creation admitted, transforming into carnivorous the birds, and beasts, and reptiles, and fishes that are *now* such, although their previous and original organization was that of herbivorous animals, it would be equivalent to maintaining that creation was not completed when God pronounced *it all very good*. For, in that case, the sin of Adam was needed to render the animal creation complete, on a plan that should endure: and till that sin was committed, a great number of creatures of peculiar organization, which now constitute a large proportion of the animal creation, were not produced, and they could not be produced with their proper organization perfected until man had sinned. The very idea is absurd.

Moreover, the end aimed at in such a supposition, viz. the deferring of death among God's creatures until it should be brought in as the consequence of Adam's sin, could not by it be gained; because every meal made by the ox in the meadow, and by the birds among the fruits, must necessarily entail death on myriads of insects and animalculæ; unless you suppose Adam to have sinned, and the penalty of death to have been pronounced and inflicted as its consequence, instantaneously after man was

created, and before either man or any other living creature had had time to take, or had felt the need of taking any nourishment by food. But this supposition is hardly less absurd than the former. It implies, moreover, this further absurdity, that whole classes of animals made to live on animal food, and on none other, must wait for their first meal till man had sinned. And yet man was forbidden to sin, under the heaviest conceivable penalty. If man did not sin, the brute creation could not eat; but without food they could not live; neither could they die, for no death could enter this world, until Adam had disobeyed his Maker's command, and sinned. To such absurdities are we driven by interpreting literally, and as of universal application, the doctrine that *death* could not enter this world but as a part of the penalty of Adam's sin, and that no death took place, even in the inferior animal creation, until after the fall of Adam by sin.¹

But *we have not only cogent reasoning, we have also the incontrovertible evidence of facts to shew that death did take place on this earth, not only before Adam sinned, but countless ages also before man was created, and before this globe was fitted to receive man as its occupant.*

It is well known to all that, among all competent judges, the doctrine is now universally admitted as true, that the material substance of our globe was brought into existence *in the beginning*, which beginning may have been countless ages before the earth exhibited that appearance of a chaotic mass over which the Spirit of God brooded, reducing it to order and beauty for the reception of man, then about to be created; that during this immense interval the surface of our earth was subjected to many and great changes; that it was successively occupied by many different systems of animal and vegetable races that were made to live on its surface, and were successively destroyed by great convulsions of the crust of the earth, such as the submersion of lands, the upheaval of beds of seas again and again; by which means the remains of those former animal tribes and vegetable races were imbedded in the soil, and became frequently indurated in the solid rock, lying now in successive

¹ Dr Hitchcock has well observed, "It would require an entirely different system in nature from the present, in order to exclude death from the world. To the existing system death is as essential as gravitation, and apparently just as much a law of nature." (Relig. of Geol. pp. 77, 78.)

strata or layers one above another. In many countries other and later convulsions of nature have upheaved these several layers of rock, that inclose in their very substance the distinct forms, the actual remains of these several successive races of animals and plants—quadrupeds, reptiles, fishes, birds, insects, flowers, ferns and trees, seeds and fruits. Such, moreover, are the circumstances of the case, that we can, by evidence perfectly conclusive, not only ascertain that these several races *were* successive, one race existing after the other had ceased to exist, but we can also determine, with absolute precision, the very order of succession, and consequently the relative age of these several successive races of now extinct animals and plants.

In some of these rocky strata, which present the remains of animals that lived and perished unquestionably many ages before man was created on earth, have been found the skeletons of gigantic animals formed somewhat like lizards; and under the ribs of these monstrous reptiles their stomachs are still found, and found yet containing the more solid relics of the food on which they had lived, and among these relics of food are the bones and the scales of fishes, and these relics shew, in some instances, marks left by the action of the teeth of the reptile that had devoured them. Here, then, the existence of these *skeletons*, and of other animal-remains innumerable, is itself proof that death was busy at his appropriate work on the occupants of this earth long before man sinned or had a being. These relics also, and the circumstances in which they are found, shew further that, long, long ere the fall of Adam, animals roaming over this earth obtained their food by preying upon and devouring one another. Untold thousands of years before the adjustment of this earth for the human race may that gigantic saurian have made his meal by devouring the fish whose relics we can, even now, see in his stomach, disinterred from the rocky stratum wherein at his death he was deposited.

Further still—such animal remains are not only found imbedded in hard rocks, but they often constitute the chief substance of those rocks. You may often see vast masses of such fossil-bearing rock in the very places where the convulsion of nature which destroyed the entire animal system, of which the creatures they now inclose constituted a part, originally left them. And you may see specimens of such rock filled with the remains of extinct

animals, in every cabinet collected by the curious. The limestone of Alabama and its prairies abounds with such fossil remains.

If my recollection of observations made there during a hasty visit in May 1832 be correct, at Trenton Falls, on Canada Creek, near Utica, N. Y., the rock over which the water dashes is little else than a beautiful conglomerate of animal remains.

At Louisville, Kentucky, on the Ohio, and in the rock of the hills stretching like an amphitheatre around the beautiful town of Huntsville, in North Alabama, abundant fossil remains may be observed entering largely into the composition of the rock.

In fact, every fossiliferous stratum yet brought to light by geologists has its own characteristic animal remains existing in that peculiar stratum and no others; while again other fossil remains occur in more than one of these strata.

Moreover, each such stratum, wherever found, holds always the same relative position to the other strata, more ancient or more recent. But as a late writer has well observed (see Dr J. P. Smith's Scripture and Geology, Supplement, Note A. pp. 255, 256), geology furnishes cases of animal life extinguished upon a scale immensely large by other processes than that of being devoted to furnish nutriment to other living bodies.

The polishing stone called *tripoli* is now ascertained to be, not composed, as once was thought, merely of sand and clay combined (siliceo-argillaceous), but a congeries, a vast mass of microscopic, many-chambered shells; and there are immense rocks of nummulite limestone, and vast heaps of the shell (*milliola*) compressed into solid masses.

It has also been discovered (by Mr Lonsdale) that common chalk contains, nay it may be said to consist of, innumerable minute shells. In all these cases the densely associated and countless millions of once living beings which inhabited these shells must have died by the upheaving out of the sea of the compact masses consisting of them, and being thus left dry—a death more protracted, and therefore more painful, than if they had been devoured by larger cephalopods.

Some approach to an idea of the countless myriads of animals thus rendered the prey of death may be made, if we remember that a cube of this *tripoli* rock or polishing stone of but one-tenth of an inch is found to contain five hundred millions of these minute shells

or *shields* as they have been called. Each one of these little shells constitutes an exquisitely formed dwelling, comprising several cells, most beautiful in material, and in general structure resembling the beautiful shell called *nautilus*. A cubic inch of this polishing stone weighs but about two hundred and twenty grains, *i. e.* less than half an ounce, and yet it contains forty-one thousand millions of these shells.

In Bohemia there is said to be a large deposit of this stone, occupying a surface of great extent, which was probably the bed of an ancient lake. This stone is there found, forming slaty layers of fourteen inches in thickness. (See *Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 46, note.)

Again, there is a kind of mountain limestone found in the hills of Yorkshire and Derbyshire in England, and in innumerable other places, many miles in extent, and hundreds of feet in thickness. Even without a microscope this limestone may be seen to consist of scarcely anything else than the skeletons of the many-fingered crinoideal families, and the occasional beds of bivalve and some univalve shells, lying together in all ages and degrees of growth.

Similar beds of a not very dissimilar limestone are found occupying large districts in this state (Alabama); and there is an immense bed of limestone underlying apparently the whole region of country from Reading, in Pennsylvania, embracing Hummelstown, Harrisburg, Carlisle, Chambersburg, and Gettysburg, Pa, and the whole extent of the valley of Virginia as far as Staunton, at the eastern base of the Alleghany Mountains.

On a similar mass of limestone rock stands Cincinnati in Ohio, and St Louis in Missouri.

The number and the rapid multiplication of the minute animalculæ that enter into the substance of many rocks, and the fossil remains of which constitute immense mountain masses, are almost inconceivable.

Those little animals called infusoriæ, for instance, are of diversified form, many of them are of brilliant hues—some green, others yellow, blue, crimson, and often perfectly transparent, so that not only the mouth, ciliary fringes, and numerous organs of prehension and of progress are seen, but also the stomach and appendages, and canals with their inosculation. The celebrated Ehrenberg has discovered in them muscles, intestines, teeth, different

kinds of glands, eyes, nerves, and organs of reproduction. He has discovered that some are born alive, others produced by eggs, and some multiplied by spontaneous division of their bodies into two or several distinct individuals. So prolific are they that a single individual can, in a few hours, procreate many millions of beings like itself.

In their collective volume it is supposed they exceed all other animated beings. (Dr J. Pye Smith, p. 331.)

By means of their silicious coverings or shells these animalculæ form earthy masses, stones, and rocks in immense quantities. They are found in nearly all substances, and in every fluid. They exist also in the bodies of men and other animals. Conglomerations of them, accumulated during the progress of long rolling ages, are ascertained to compose immense banks on the shores and at the bottoms of seas; and these, when upheaved by geological causes, have been solidified into *mountains*. (See Dr J. P. Smith, Script. and Geol. p. 332.)

Some of these masses of rocks are hundreds and even thousands of feet thick. Of the Egyptian Pyramids, some are built of the nummulite limestone, which is itself entirely composed of chambered shells, of very small size, and of exquisitely beautiful construction. (Id. p. 70.)

Indeed there is ample ground for the opinion that all chalk, and indeed all other calcareous masses, are nothing but the corpses and the habitations of these infinitely minute creatures.

Moreover, the *mud* of which the deltas of rivers—such as the Mississippi and the Nile—are composed, and which constitutes the alluvial lands, the richest soil in the world, is found to be composed in great part of the remains of such minute animalculæ and of their shelly habitations; those native to fresh water being unable to live in salt water, while those native to the sea cannot inhabit fresh water. The mixing of fresh water and of salt at the mouths of rivers kills these little creatures by myriads of myriads every hour, and occasions a constantly increasing mass of deposits in all such estuaries at the mouths of large rivers, in addition to the mud brought down from the lands on the head waters, which is held in solution, and finally deposited in these deltas and at the bottom of the sea.

This circumstance, we may remark, discovers to us one of the

latent and often unsuspected sources of error in computing the age of river deltas; for no care can detect, and no skill can compute with any approximation to accuracy the countless myriads of these minute animals which are thus killed in the brackish water of these estuaries—are daily and hourly mingling with the subsiding sediment to form the deltas of rivers, and the alluvial lands ever rising near the mouths of rivers.

Several curious facts have been observed in different countries, which shew the almost incredible numbers of these infusoriæ and minute animalculæ in the waters of lakes and rivers and in the seas. At Punta Gordo, in the Banda Oriental, South America, Mr Darwin found in the soil of the pampas, and even constituting that soil, an estuary deposit, with limestone containing extinct shells. Low down in this deposit, close to the skeletons of the mastodon, he found some of the red earth which is the rich soil of the pampas. This red earth, examined by Ehrenberg under a powerful microscope, was found to contain many infusoriæ, partly salt water and partly fresh water, with the latter preponderating.

These immense pampas of South America must therefore once have been the beds of estuaries or perhaps of fresh water lakes, gradually encroached on by the sea and made brackish, and then elevated and left dry. (See Darwin's *Voyage of a Naturalist*, vol. i. p. 165. Also Darwin's *Geological Observations on South America*, pp. 87, 88.)

Again, in Patagonia, the same distinguished naturalist found—superimposed upon a great deposit, extending five hundred miles along the coast, and including many tertiary shells, chiefly a sort of gigantic oyster, nearly all of them extinct—a peculiar soft white stone, including much gypsum, and resembling chalk, but really of a pumiceous nature. Strange to say, this stone is composed, to at least one-tenth of its bulk, of infusoriæ. Professor Ehrenberg has discovered in it thirty oceanic forms. At Port St Julian this bed of infusorial pumice is five hundred feet thick. (Id. vol. i. p. 209.)

In like manner, the black, white, and red mud with which the savages of Terra del Fuego bedaub their naked bodies, proved, when examined by Ehrenberg, to consist mainly of minute shells, pronounced by him, from inspection merely, to be inhabitants of

fresh water. And such proves to be the fact: for Jemmy Button, a native of the country, who had been for some years in England, and was then returning with the crew of the *Beagle*, assured Darwin that this mud paint is always collected in the beds of brooks flowing from the mountains. (Id. pp. 284, 285, note.)

It has been found also, that clouds of dust, exceedingly fine, blown far out to sea, and falling on the rigging and decks of ships, in some instances many hundreds of miles distant from land, was nothing else than immense quantities of extremely minute shells, the habitations of millions of animalcules, some living and some dead, and thus transported to vast distances.

The very country where these minute shells originated, has been determined by the skill of science. It is said that at times this dust falls in such quantities as to darken the atmosphere; and that ships have occasionally been lost in consequence of the obscurity. (Lyell's *Princ. Geol.* p. 446. Darwin's *Voyage of a Naturalist*, vol. i. pp. 6, 7.)

The phosphorescence of the ocean also is attributed to the presence of innumerable myriads of minute animalculæ—animated gelatine. (Id. vol. i. p. 209.)

On one occasion Darwin tells us the ship, which drew thirteen feet of water, passed over many circular and oval patches of brightly phosphorescent water, near the mouth of the Plata, without disturbing the patches: so that some of these minute animals were congregated together at a greater depth than the bottom of the vessel. (P. 214.)

Nay, what is more extraordinary still, in masses which have been ejected by volcanoes, in the form probably of mud, or in showers of what at the time might have seemed to be ashes, shells and animalculæ have been detected.

Thus in the Isle of Ascension, in the Atlantic, there is a singular hill, formed of the older series of volcanic rocks, and which has been erroneously considered as the crater of a volcano. This hill is remarkable for a broad, slightly hollowed, and circular summit, which has been filled up with many successive layers of ashes and fine scoriæ. These saucer-shaped layers crop out on the margin, forming perfect rings of many different colours, which give to the summit a most fantastic appearance. One of these rings is white and broad, and resembles a course, around which

horses have been exercised; hence the hill has been called, "*The Devil's Riding-School.*"

Of one of these tufaceous layers, of a pinkish colour, Mr Darwin brought away several specimens; and singular as it may seem, Ehrenberg found, on microscopic examination, that these specimens were composed of matter which has been organized. In it he detected some silicious shielded fresh-water infusoria; and no less than twenty-five different kinds of the silicious tissue of plants, chiefly of grasses. From the total absence of all carbonaceous matter, this distinguished student of nature, Ehrenberg, believes that these organic bodies have passed through the volcanic fires, and were erupted in the state in which we now see them. (Darwin, *Voy.* vol. ii. p. 296, also Darwin, *So. Amer.* pp. 108, 110, 118, 119.) Singularly corroborative of this opinion avowed by Prof. Ehrenberg, are the facts presented in the following passage from the last (the 10th) edition of Sir C. Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (London, 1850), under the heading, "*Infusorial beds covering Pompeii:*" —

"A most singular and unexpected discovery has been recently made (1841-5) by Professor Ehrenberg, respecting the layers of ashes and pumice enveloping Pompeii. They are, he says, of organic and fresh-water origin, consisting of the silicious cases of fresh-water infusoria."¹

But what is still more extraordinary, this fact proves to be by no means an isolated or solitary example of intimate relations subsisting between organic life and the results of volcanic activity.

On the Rhine, several beds of tuff and pumiceous conglomerate, resembling the mass incumbent upon Pompeii, and closely connected with extinct volcanoes, are now ascertained to be made up, to a great extent, of the silicious cases of infusoria, invisible to the naked eye, and often half fused. No less than ninety-four distinct species have been already detected in one mass of this

¹ Of this substance, the fragments of pumice and scoria, under showers of which from Vesuvius, Pompeii was buried A.D. 79, I brought away several specimens from Pompeii in October 1846, and they are still in my possession. Little did I think when gathering them that they had already been demonstrated to be composed of fresh water shells.

kind, more than one hundred and fifty feet thick, at Hochsimmer, on the left bank of the Rhine near the Lancher-see.

Some of these Rhenish infusoria appear to have fallen in showers, others to have been poured out of lake-craters, in the form of mud, as in the Brohl-valley. In Mexico, Peru, the Isle of France, and several other volcanic regions, analogous phenomena have been observed; and everywhere the species of infusoria belong to fresh-water and terrestrial genera, except in the case of Patagonian pumiceous tuffs, specimens of which, brought away by Mr Darwin, are found to contain marine animalcules.

In various kinds of pumice ejected by volcanoes, the microscope has revealed the silicious cases of infusoria, often half obliterated by the action of heat.

And the fine dust thrown out into the air by volcanic eruptions is sometimes referable to these minute organic substances, brought up from considerable depths, and sometimes mingled with small particles of vegetable matter. (Princ. Geol. pp. 372, 373.)

What a field is here opened for reflection. From time immemorial, perhaps myriads of ages before man was, this earth was peopled by innumerable races of animated beings, race succeeding race, but all the prey of death, long before Adam sinned, or Adam lived.

And consequently all those passages in the Bible which speak of *death* as the *fruit of man's sin* must be understood as restricted, in their application to man exclusively. The entire animal creation was from the first subjected to death. The spectacles of *animals dying* might have been early familiar to man. The threat, "*in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,*" might therefore in part have been quite intelligible to him. This threat itself involved a pledge from God, that if he sinned not, he should not die. So long as man retained his integrity, man might thus, in his exemption from death, no less than in intellect and in his moral powers, have been strikingly superior to the brutes.

Sin would therefore entail a curse, which he would the more keenly feel, in that it would strip him of this striking superiority over the brute creation, and degrade him to a level with the beasts, in rendering his *body* mortal, and subject to decay like theirs.

If obedient, the threat itself did virtually assure him he would be kept, by the special power of God, from death and from decay, until, his term of probation completed, he would probably have been transferred to a higher degree of happiness and purity, and in another world.

It must, however, have been by *the special power of God*, exerted for this very purpose, that man, had he not sinned, would have been preserved from death; because (as has been well remarked by another, see Dr J. P. Smith, p. 68) "all organized matter, everything that has life, vegetable or animal (as now existing, at least), is formed upon a plan which renders *death* necessary, or something equivalent to death."

"The law of organization, from the embryo formation to the maturity of the animal, is carried on in the way of a continual separation of particles, and their replacement by new ones, which the nutritive process incessantly furnishes" (p. 206)

Vegetables derive a part of their nutriment from inorganic masses (the earths, gases, &c. that never had life). But in animals it is not so. *Animals cannot be supported by any substances except such as have had life*, vegetable or animal. In the present constitution of this world, "*the mysterious principle of animal life is universally maintained by the agency of death*. Death is then the universal, the indispensable feeder of life. From dead organic matter the living structure derives its necessary support; but these supplies do not bring a *perpetuity* of existence. Their very nature and operation imply the contrary. The processes of nutrition, assimilation, growth, exhaustion, and reparation, hold on their irresistible course to decay and dissolution, *i. e.* to death." (Id. p. 69.)

To this process of progression, decay, and reparation (observes the same judicious writer, pp. 206, 207), *impassable limits are set*, by the most certain laws of the Creator's ordinance, *viz. those of gravity and of chemical action*.

To suppose that these laws should be annulled, or perpetually suspended, involves a contradiction: it would be appointing laws which were only to be suspended. When a certain point is reached in an organized body, these fixed laws of God's appointment insure the separation, changed combination, and dissolution of the

molecules. But this is the very rudiment of death—its sure fore-runner.”

It seems therefore certain, that, inasmuch as *to man* the mortality of his body is one of the results of *sin*, the exemption which appertained to man’s bodily constitution in the state of his pristine purity, from the operation of this law of progress towards dissolution, that applied to all the inferior animals, must have resulted from causes to us now unknown. The human frame must have been maintained in this distinguished peculiarity so long as man was sinless, by some special means employed by God for this specific purpose.

It seems, therefore, highly probable, as some able writers have maintained, that *the tree of life* planted in the midst of Eden, was not only a *symbol of undying life*, but the *means to insure it*: that it was the antidote to decay, the elixir of animal life in man; a natural means appointed by the God of nature himself to counteract all tendencies to decay in the human body, and maintain it in youthful vigour and health unfailing, until, in the natural course of things, the whole man, physical, mental, and moral, would be fitted for removal to another and a brighter abode, where even the last remaining liability to imperfection would disappear.

This remedial efficacy against death and decay, as inherent in the tree of life, seems more than intimated in the sacred record itself; for, after the transgression of the first pair in Eden, we read: “*The Lord God said, And now, lest man put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and eat, and live for ever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden.*” (Gen. iii. 22, 23.) This passage *seems* certainly to imply the existence of such efficacy in the tree of life, that if, even after the fall, man had eaten thereof, his body would have been exempt from death.¹

Had man retained his integrity, he would probably, at the close of a limited period of personal probation, have passed through a transforming process without dying, and have then been transferred to some other scene of action, and a higher state of existence. But, transgress he did. On him the curse actually fell. Those spe-

¹ See also Hitchcock’s “Religion of Geology,” p. 34.

cial conservative influences against death were withdrawn ; the tree of life, the sovereign and only antidote against decay, was effectually barred against his approach. The human body became, thenceforth, subject to the same law that applies to all other organized bodies, that of progression and decay ; and the utterance of the awful words, by the voice of God, "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return," made known the fact of man's *degradation to mortality*, just as are the beasts of the field.

What an affecting view does the subject just discussed present of the nature of the world we live in, and of the condition of man !

This beautiful world is, after all, one vast cemetery!¹ We ourselves dwell among the dead ; we feed upon the dead ; the very air we breathe is but the oft-used breath of the dead ; and the gay clothing we wear has been rifled from the dead ; yea, even the material particles of which our bodies are composed, are the pillaged spoils of the dead who have preceded us.

The marble that adorns your halls of state is but the mausolea of myriads of the dead entombed therein. The ground we tread on, the rocks employed in our buildings, are but compact masses of the corpses or the ashes of the dead. The water we drink teems with the living and the dead innumerable. The food spread upon our tables, the luscious fruits that tempt our taste, the rich odours of the flowers that adorn our apartments, all derive their flavour from the remains of the dead therein contained, and variously combined.

The very blood that circulates in our veins has reached us from sources exuding from the dead. The rich glow of the youthful cheek wells up from the graves of the dead ; and the lips, on the

¹ "Limestone has been chiefly elaborated by the organs of animals, many of them microscopic littleness. Yet lofty ranges of mountains and immense deposits in the intervening valleys, have been the result. Nearly one seventh part of the crust of the globe, it has been said, is thus constituted of the works or remains of animals." (Hitchcock, *Relig. of Geol.* p. 212.)

Dr. Pritchard has remarked : "It is hardly conceivable that, within the narrow space of a grain of mustard seed, 8,000,000 of living, active creatures can exist, all richly endowed with the organs and faculties of animal life. Such, however, is the fact." (*History of Infusoria*, p. 2. *Relig. of Geol.* p. 455.)

Indeed some philosophers have asserted, that it is probable every particle of matter forming the crust of our globe has, at some period, entered into the composition of organized living beings.

pressure of which affection lingers so fondly, are formed of materials that have passed, times innumerable, through the process of corruption, decay, and death. What a lesson is this for human pride, "*I ust thou art!*"

What a lesson for the noon-tide of manly vigour, for the blushingmorn of woman's beauty, *Dust thou art!* And oh! how it should endear to us the hope of obtaining admission to that nobler land, where there is no more sickness nor sorrow, neither do they die any more; and especially and pre-eminently how it should endear to us that *divine Saviour*, who yielded his own sacred person to *death* that he might give us life.

Jesus' blood here spilt, has consecrated this earth anew a second Eden! His cross is to us the "*Tree of Life.*" He that participates of the fruit borne by that tree *shall live for ever.* Amen.

LECTURE XII.

MAN ONE FAMILY.

GEN. xi. 1.—“ And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.”

THIS assertion of the sacred record, in relation to men at a period not much later than the Deluge, and before the commencement of the abortive effort which has rendered Babel so memorable, reveals a fact precisely such as we might look for if the Deluge was literally universal, and if “*Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark,*” Gen. vii. 23. For plainly in that case all the growing population subsequent to that catastrophe must have sprung from Noah and his three sons; they must have been of one and the same stock, and they must, therefore, all have been originally *of one language and of one speech.*

This passage in Genesis must refer to the entire population of the globe at that time. It cannot be restricted to any one particular land or country, and to some one tribe or nation occupying that one specified district. All the circumstances of the case forbid such restriction. This declaration stands as introductory to the record of the building of the tower of Babel, the confounding of the language of those so employed, and their consequent separation into several branches or communities, each speaking its own peculiar language unintelligible to the others, and of the after settlements of these several bands of colonists in different countries; by all which the ultimate peopling of the whole earth was secured. This separation of the earth's population, or this *dividing of the earth*, as the sacred penman calls it, took place in

the days of Peleg, whose birth is recorded Gen. x. 25. It has, therefore, been concluded, that the confounding of man's language at Babel, which led to the dispersion, took place not very long after the Deluge, and at a time when the post-diluvian population might readily have numbered several thousands.

This oneness of the primitive language spoken by the entire post-diluvian population of the earth, up to the days of Peleg, is one of the proofs going to shew that to this day it is true, *Man is one Family*.

Notwithstanding all the diversities marking what are called the several races of mankind, the entire population of our globe even now is sprung from the same stock. All men of all nations and countries, whatever be the shade of their complexion, the difference in their features, their anatomical structure, their habits of life, and their intellectual capacity—the Caucasian, the Negro, the Mongol, the Malay, the Papuan—are each and all the descendants of the one original human pair, Adam and Eve, in the line of Noah and his three sons, who, with their wives, were the sole survivors of the Deluge. They all constitute *One Family*; they are all sprung from *Eve, i. e. Life*, so named on that very account that she was to be *the mother of all living* (Gen. iii. 20), just as it is declared in the book of Acts (xvii. 26), "*God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.*"

Such is the view the Bible presents: such is the view we hold and shall maintain. All the various races of men now inhabiting our globe are derived from one common stock—they are all descended from one original pair—they still *constitute but one family*.

Against this doctrine numerous grave objections are urged; and these objections are backed by name of celebrity and weight. The conclusion to be drawn from facts exhibited in natural history do, in the opinion of some, present invincible difficulties in the way of receiving as true the doctrine that all the now differing races of men are sprung from one original pair. *

*The negro at least (we are told) is a distinct race, and must have had a separate origin. Negroes cannot have sprung from the same stock as the white man.*¹

¹ Two Lectures on the Connection between the Biblical and Physical History of Man by Dr J. C. Nott, 1849, p. 33, p. 67.

The celebrated Professor Agassiz says that, "as a question of natural history, the investigation of the human race leads to the idea of diversity in their origin, rather than to the supposition that they have *originated from a common stock*. (See Christian Examiner, July 1850, pp. 138, 139.)

Again, Professor A. remarks: "Men were primitively located in the various parts of the world they inhabit, and they arose everywhere in those harmonic proportions with other living beings, which would at once secure their preservation, and contribute to their welfare. To suppose that all men originated from Adam and Eve, is to assume that the order of creation has been changed in the course of historical time, and to *give to the Mosaic record a meaning that it never was intended to have.*" Prof. A. insists that "Genesis must be considered as relating chiefly to the history of the *white race*, with special reference to the history of the Jews." (Id. pp. 137, 138.)

On a question of mere science, in relation to any *mere animal*, it were presumption in almost any man, and especially in an obscure theologian, to dispute a position assumed by one so eminent in his department of natural history as the justly celebrated Prof. Agassiz. But when Agassiz peremptorily declares that such and such is the teaching of Genesis, in direct contradiction to the opinion held by the great body of learned expositors of holy writ, he leaves his own province, and exposes himself to rebuke—as incompetent.

And when Prof. A. treats man as a mere brute animal in the mode of his pursuing his investigations—the dignity of his own nature as a man, a reasoning, improvable, and responsible being, possessed of powers that render man what no other animal is, or can be made to be, a *cosmopolite*,¹ capable of existing and of flourishing in all climates, and in all countries—most assuredly rebukes him.

Again writes Prof. A.: "We challenge those who maintain that *man* kind originated from a single pair, to produce a single passage from the whole Scripture, pointing at those physical differences which we notice between the white race and the Chinese, the New Hollanders, the Malays, the American Indians, and the negroes, as having been introduced in the course of time among

¹ See Principles of Zoology, by Agassiz and Gould, chap. xiii. sec. 1, p. 154.

the children of Adam and Eve." (Id. pp. 134, 135.) Again he says: "This assertion of the common descent of all races of men from a common stock, is a mere human construction, entitled to no more credit, and no more confidence, and no more respect, than any other conclusion arising from philosophical investigations of this subject, from a scientific point of view," (p. 135.)

These are startling assertions, and they are very confidently made. If true, then the ablest, the most learned, and the most industrious expositors of holy writ, in all ages of the world, have misunderstood the teachings of the Bible on this point. For it is unquestionable, that the general opinion of biblical scholars has been, and is, that the Bible distinctly teaches this very doctrine, *of the common descent of all mankind, of all the varying races, from one original stock, from Adam and Eve, and again from the three sons of Noah.*

Whether this doctrine be true or false, is another and a different question: but that the Bible does teach this doctrine, has been the general belief of both Jews and Christians, and that in all ages.

The truth of this doctrine is now boldly denied, and a separate origin is claimed for each of the several races of man. The argument for this diversity of origin for the human races, and more especially for the negro¹ as a distinct race, may be thus presented.

Throughout all the works of God we mark progressive advance, from the simpler to the more complex forms, in both vegetable and animal life; from the lichen or the moss, to the rose, the lilac, the beautiful flowering peach, the splendid magnolia, or orange, or to the magnificent oak; from the animalcule floating invisible, up through almost countless series of animated forms, moluscs, fishes, reptiles, birds and beasts, to man. Moreover, each genus has its distinct species, and its subordinate varieties. Why should man be the only exception?

But among men also, we do find diversities of colour, ^xform, general appearance, and habit; diversities as great and as striking as among the several varieties of any class of animals: as great as those which mark the several divisions of the feline spe-

¹ On the anatomical peculiarities of the negro, see Dr J. C. Nott's *Two Lectures*, published in Mobile, 1814, pp. 23-25. On the negro's cuticular structure, see id. p. 27.

cies ; as those which separate the lion, the panther, the tiger, and the cat, from one another.

The white, or Caucasian race, is the perfect form of man. The negro is, perhaps, the lowest : and the negro is distinguished by his anatomical structure, the peculiarities of his skull, and his nervous system ;¹ the relative size of his limbs, and of several important muscles, as well as by the blackness of his skin. This black colour, it is said, results from a peculiar secretion in the reticular membrane, lying beneath the outer cuticle : this secretion is found in the negro only. He is also distinguished by an inferior intellect.

So great, striking, and permanent are these peculiarities, as to stamp the negro a distinct race from the white man. Neither climate, difference of food, nor peculiarity of social condition, nor all these combined, can ever change a white man into a negro, or a negro into a white man. Such changes have never been known to take place : for, up to the remotest antiquity of which we have any knowledge, negroes existed, and the difference between the negro and the white man was just the same in the days of the earlier Pharaohs² that it is now. This is manifest from the paintings and hieroglyphic delineations found on the older Egyptian monuments. It is shewn also by the skulls of individuals of the different races, taken from the oldest catacombs of Egypt. Indeed, in his concluding remarks on Egyptian Ethnography, Dr Morton observes : “The physical or organic characters which distinguish the several races of men, are as old as the oldest records of our species.” (See *Crania Egyptiaca*, p. 66, Obs. 15.)

To those who thus reason, to establish a diversity of origin for the several races of man, it is in vain that you point to the sacred record, “*God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.*” (Acts xvii. 26.)

Professor Agassiz tells us (see *Christian Examiner* for July

¹ See a curious and interesting account of the distinctive peculiarities of the negro in De Bow's Commercial Review, July 1851, p. 68.

² The Plates in Champollion's *Monumens de l'Egypte*, &c. shew negroes, perfect as now, in the reign of Thotmes IV. about B.C. 1700, and in the times of Ramses II., Ramses III. at Thebes, at Ipsamboul, &c. (See Tom. i. Plate cx. Plate 71, 72, &c. also Rosellini, *Mon. M. R. Tav. 75*, B.C. 1570.) But Lepsius claims to have found negroes mentioned at Sakkara in the name Kush, on monuments of the sixth dynasty, B.C. 3000. (See Mr Gliddon, in *Lond. Ethnol. Journal*, No. vii. p. 310.)

1850, p. 135), "What is essential for men in a moral point of view in their intercourse one with another, that is taught in the the Bible, and nothing more. This most important information is the fact, that all men are men equally endowed with the *same superior nature, and made of one blood*, inasmuch as, *this figurative expression* applies to the higher unity of mankind, and *not to their supposed genital connection by natural descent*. This higher nature,—the closest, the most intimate unity, which exists without a common descent, without that relationship, denoted by the expression '*lies of blood*'" (see id. p. 118), Professor Agassiz declares to be "such community of physical constitution, such a unity of type, such an essential difference from the character of even the highest animals. together with those most prominent, more elevating, more dignifying distinctions, which belong to man as an intellectual and moral being, and which are so eminently developed in civilised society, but which *equally exist* in the natural dispositions of *all human races*, constituting the higher union among men, making them all equal before God," &c. &c. "Such (adds the eloquent Professor) is the foundation of a unity between men, truly worthy of their nature : such is the foundation of those sympathies which will enable them to bestow upon each other, in all parts of the world, the name of brethren, as they are brethren in God, brethren in humanity, though their origin, to say the least, is lost in the darkness of the beginning of the world." (Christ. Exam., July 1850, p. 120.)

Few persons entertain a higher respect for the talents and the attainments of Professor Agassiz than does the writer of these pages. In any department of mere science, the opinions of Agassiz are entitled to profound deference. But, as an expounder of the sacred records of our faith, Agassiz stands before us shorn of his strength.

To sustain a theory, he would arbitrarily impose a novel and an unnatural interpretation on several passages of the Bible, which present a very natural and a totally different meanings. "*Made of one blood*," has, according to him, no relation at all to affinity by blood, or to natural descent.

It will be long before this interpretation shall be received by sober-minded expositors of the Bible as just and sound.

Moreover, Professor A. assures us the Bible teaches *only what*

is important for men, as men; what is essential, in a moral point of view, in their intercourse one with another. But he has failed to shew that it may not be important, for the proper intercourse of man with man, that men should know there is a still closer bond of unity among all men than this "higher unity" of which he speaks; even a unity in the ties of blood: a unity consisting in a common origin, a common descent from the same primitive human pair, the progenitors of all mankind.

The knowledge of this one fact may possibly have some connection with the highest truths of religion, with some of the gravest duties required of man, in the acceptance and in the propagation of religion. All these points Professor Agassiz has, in his zeal for a novel theory, wholly overlooked. Yet these points are worthy of note; and they will, as we think, be found important in their bearings. Certain it is that Genesis records the giving of a name—*Eve*, or *Life*—to the first woman, because she was to become "the mother of all living," which must certainly mean the mother of the entire population of the globe.

But here again Professor Agassiz steps in with his peculiar theory, and assures us "Genesis relates chiefly to the history of the white race," (p. 138.) Again, on p. 111, "We have no statements (in the records of Genesis) relating to the origin of the inhabitants now found in those parts of the world which were unknown to the ancients." In a note on the same page, he remarks: "In the history in Genesis, the branches of the white race only are alluded to, and nowhere the coloured races as such."

This assertion is gratuitous, and wholly unsupported: moreover, to us it seems contradictory of the whole spirit of the sacred record, and inconsistent with the scriptural doctrines respecting salvation through a Redeemer, the Saviour of the whole world, as will presently be shewn.

It is in vain that the friends of the "unity of the human races" appeal to the results of a careful comparison of languages, by which it is shewn that "all languages throughout the whole world, present so close an analogy the one to the other, and exhibit so many points of resemblance, notwithstanding the vast diversity among them, that the ablest investigators of the subject have concluded all languages must have been originally united in one, whence they draw the common elements essential to them all:

and the separation between them could not have been caused by any gradual departure, or individual development; but it must have been brought about by some violent, unusual, active force, sufficient alone to reconcile these conflicting appearances, and to account, at once, for the resemblances and the differences." Such an event, in short, as the confusion of tongues at Babel implies: that event recorded in Gen. xi. immediately after the declaration, "*The whole earth was of one language and of one speech.*"

To this argument the advocates for a diversity of races stoutly object. Thus Professor Agassiz says: "We doubt the possibility of deriving from such sources (ethnology and philology) evidence capable of deciding the question either one way or the other" (p. 139).

Again: "Why should not the different races of men have originally spoken distinct languages, as they do at present, differing in the same proportion, as their organs of speech are variously modified? And why should not these modifications, in their turn, be indicative of primitive differences among them?" (p. 140.)

The advocates for a diversity of the races do, most usually, esteem but lightly the arguments derived from philology. Thus Dr Nott (Two Lectures, Mobile, 1844, p. 39) observes: "Volumes have been written on the affinity of languages and religion, to prove the common origin of races; but to my mind, nothing can be more fallacious. The faintest resemblances in grammatical construction, or in particular words, have been seized with avidity, and confidently put forth as evidence of a common origin. Is it not more reasonable to believe that, in ancient times, as in the present, the nations who were most civilized stamped their characters, both in religion and in languages, upon the inferior tribes with which they held communication?"

Again, Dr N. remarks: "If a great physical or moral revolution should again occur in the world, like many which have occurred, it might (many ages hence) be assumed that the negro colonists in Liberia are descended from the English, because their language and religion are the same."

In these remarks, both these writers fail to do justice to the subject. Such men as Sir William Jones, W. Von Humboldt, Schlegel, Klaproth, Adelung, Johns, Pritchard, and other distinguished philologists, are not likely to be so easily misled.

The evidence of a colonial, or a foreign origin, in some particular district, is often readily detected, from the language of that district presenting points of resemblance to, or of difference from, the prevailing language of the surrounding region. Thus, even without the corroborative facts exhibited in the craniology of those *races*, certain tribes in California, and on other parts of the north-west coast of America, are shewn even by their language to be of foreign origin (Agassiz says Mongolians, see *Christ. Exam.* July 1850, p. 126, note. Pickering calls them Malays, "On the Races," pp. 100, 103). Probably they were adventurers out to sea, stranded on that coast, ages ago.

As to the argument of Agassiz on the subject of language, certainly we may admit, that if the several races of men be of different origins, indigenous in their several localities, we might reasonably expect that "*they would, originally, have spoken distinct languages as they do at present.*" The fact, then, that notwithstanding the prevailing diversity of languages, there are so many points of resemblance among all known languages, resemblances which present themselves the more numerous and the more striking the further philologists extend their researches, does, to one who duly reflects on the nature of language, and appreciates the philosophical character of the structure of language, present a strong case in evidence of a common origin¹ for them all; and with it a powerful argument for the common origin of all the now widely differing races of men.

The advocates for the unity of the races of men are accustomed to point also to the changes effected by climate, diet, and other influences, operating through a long course of time, on colonies planted in tropical countries, as, for instance, in the black Jews of India.²

Analogous changes in domestic animals, effected by climate,

¹ On this subject, see Pritchard's *Researches*, vol. iv. pp. 12-47. See Wiseman's *Lectures*. Smith's *Patriarchal Age*, pp. 339, &c. Faber's *Pagan Idolatry*, *passim*. Sir W. Drummond's *Origines*. Pritchard's *Egyptian Mythology*. *Early Oriental History*, Introduction, and also p. 308. Smythe on the *Unity of Races*, chap. xiv. and xv. and Redford's *Holy Scripture Verified*, pp. 156-174.

² These black Jews of India are not a pure race: they are proselytes from the native Hindoos. See Buchanan's *Researches in India*; also Dr J. C. Nott's "Physical History of the Jewish Race," in the *Southern Quarterly Review*—an able and interesting article.

mode of treatment, &c. as seen in the several varieties of the dog, the sheep, horned cattle, horses, the domestic fowls, &c. &c. are also appealed to.

Granted, is the reply; great changes are certainly effected in many of the inferior animals, and what may be termed new varieties are produced. But these facts do not prove, and cannot prove, that man is so changed by these causes.¹

The difference of anatomical structure in the different races, and especially in whites and negroes, is too great to be so accounted for. Moreover, no instance can be found on record of a white man changed into a negro, or the reverse.

If, then, we refer to the grand characteristics of *man* impressed on each and on all of the several races alike, on the negro no less than on the white man—his general configuration, his upright position, the faculty of reason, the power of speech, the capacity for improvement, and above all, his moral susceptibilities, and his sense of accountability. “True (is the reply), they are all men. The *negro is one of the varieties of the human family, he is one species of the genus homo.*” But this does not necessarily involve the consequence that the negro has sprung from the same parent stock as the white man. These characteristics are the mark of that “*higher unity which may exist without a common origin. A common character by no means proves common descent or parentage, in the least degree, as appears by comparing the different species of that so large genus the cats, in which the wild-cat, the panther, the leopard, tiger, lion, and all the numerous species of this group, having such similar habits, such similar natural dispositions, with the same structure, were yet constituted as so many distinct species, unconnected in their genealogy.*” (See Christ. Exam. p. 118.)

Now in this reasoning, the learned Professor certainly loses sight of man's higher nature as a rational and moral being; else he would hardly represent the several races of men as being united in nearly the same sense in which the several species of the large genus, the cats, are one. Human nature is not a unit in the same sense merely in which the feline tribes constitute one genus in natural history. There are the further characteristics of reason,

¹ On analogous changes in the lower animals, see Pritchard, vol. i. book ii. chap. i.—viii.

of speech, of moral susceptibilities, and of an improvable nature, making a wide gap between man and any order of the lower tribes. And who shall say that this further evidence of a higher unity has nothing to do with genealogy?

Moreover, these several species of the feline genus do not intermingle; no mixed breeds occur among them. But among the several races of the human family such intermixtures do frequently and freely occur, insomuch that, says one writer, "*There is probably no perfectly pure race of men now on earth.*" (Two Lect. 1849, p. 35) So also says the author of "*Outlines of Ethnology,*" in the London Eth. Journal, No. III. p. 129: "The primitive races no longer exist, rigorously speaking. *All, or nearly all, the inhabitants of the earth are of mixed blood.*"

Professor Agassiz does himself, in another place (p. 119), very forcibly present the points of difference between man and the monkey family. From all the inferior animals man is widely distinguished. It cannot, therefore, be safe or philosophical to reason in regard to the *origin of man* as we may in reference to the origin of brute animals.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that man's rational powers and his moral nature may occasion, or may indicate a wide difference between him and the brutes, *as to the mode of his origination.*

That such difference has really been made by the Creator, the Bible seems to us, at least, very clearly to teach—as that, whether or not the several races of animals may have all originated in a common central point, man, assuredly, and all the varieties of man, have sprung from one parent stock, and have all radiated from one central point. Still the advocates of distinct races adhere to their argument from natural history.

"As a question of natural history (says Agassiz, p. 138), the investigation of the human race leads to the idea of a diversity of their origin, rather than to the supposition that they have originated from a common stock."

In respect of the negro especially, the advocates of diversity of origin for the human races maintain, that "as subjects of the naturalist's investigation, the negro must be pronounced a race separate and distinct from the white man, just as truly as the ass or

the zebra is distinct from the horse; or as the leopard is distinct from the lion, or the cat from the tiger.

“The distinctive characteristics of their race have been propagated by hereditary descent, through all past generations from time immemorial. We find them a distinct race now. The records of the past, far back as we can go, shew that negroes were then distinct as now, and that they were the same, in all their distinctive peculiarities, then as they now are. They *are* distinct. No known causes are adequate to effect the change from the white man to the negro. No one solitary instance of such change from the white man to the negro, or from the negro to the white man, has ever been produced, or known. No such case is on record. They *must*, then, *have been created* a distinct race, designed to occupy a region of the earth adapted to them, and not to the white man.

“Reason, analogy, and history, all combine to shew, that the distinction is an *essential* and a *permanent one*; it is, indeed, *specific*. It demands a distinct and separate origin to be assigned to the negro and to the white man, just as to the horse and the ass, to the lion and to the leopard. The advocates of identity of origin for all the several races of men, as sprung from one only primitive pair, have no argument to urge in support of that position, but simply a *vulgar prejudice, based on some few obscure passages of the Bible, which may, after all, be capable of a different interpretation*”

Such is the line of argument pursued by the advocates of diversity of races; and certainly they make out a *strong case*.

Besides all this, it is urged that the white race alone have recognised marriage, in the union for life of one man and one woman. Among the dark races, polygamy has everywhere and always prevailed. This furnishes another and a decisive difference between the dark races and the white, bespeaking a difference in the physical organisation, and indicating clearly diversity of origin. (See Democratic Review, July 1850.)

But this fails to furnish a distinct mark of diversity. Had polygamy prevailed *uniformly among the dark races everywhere, and never among the white*, the argument would have been valid. But among the white race as truly as among the dark, polygamy has been practised. The Hebrews and the Arabs are con-

fessedly of the white race; yet polygamy long prevailed among them.

Revelation discountenances polygamy. Among the several branches of the white race, polygamy has been checked by the teachings of revelation; and among the dark races too, just so far as revelation has been introduced, polygamy disappears, and the law of marriage prevails. No specific distinction can, therefore, be established on this ground between the dark races and the white.

Another argument for a diversity of races among men, and for a diversity of origin to those races, is thus presented by Professor Agassiz: "The question, with reference to the races of men is this, Have the differences which we notice among the different races, as they now exist, been produced in the course of the multiplication and diffusion of men upon the earth, or are these differences primitive, independent of physical causes? Have they been introduced into the human race by the Creator himself, or has nature influenced men so much as to produce this diversity, under the influence of those causes which act in the physical world?" (p. 134.) Again: "We maintain that, in the Mosaic record, there is not a single passage asserting that these differences, we mean the physical differences existing among men, have been derived from changes introduced in a primitively more uniform stock of men."

"The circumstance (continues Agassiz), that wherever we find a human race naturally circumscribed, it is connected in its limitation with what we call in natural history, a zoological and botanical province, that is to say, *with the natural limitation of a particular association of animals and plants*, shews most unequivocally the intimate relation subsisting between mankind and the animal kingdom in their adaptation to the physical world. The arctic race of men, covering the treeless region near the arctics, in Europe, Asia, and America, is circumscribed in the three continents, within limits very similar to those occupied by that particular combination of animals which are peculiar to the same tract of land and sea. The region inhabited by the Mongolian race is also a natural zoological province, covered by a combination of animals naturally circumscribed within the same regions. The Malay race covers also a natural zoological province.

“ New Holland, again, constitutes a very peculiar zoological province, in which we have another particular race of men. And it is further remarkable, in this connection, that the plants and animals now living on the continent of Africa, south of the Atlas, within the same range within which the negroes are naturally circumscribed, have a character differing widely from that of the plants and animals of the northern shores of Africa, and the valley of Egypt; while the Cape of Good Hope, within the limits inhabited by Hottentots, is characterized by a vegetation and a fauna equally peculiar, and differing in its features from that over which the African race is spread.

“ Such identical circumscription between the limits of *two series of organised beings*, so widely differing as man and animals and plants, and so entirely unconnected in point of descent, *would to the mind of a naturalist, amount to a demonstration that they originated together*, within the districts which they now inhabit. We say such an accumulation of evidence *would amount to a demonstration*; for how could it, on the contrary, be supposed that man alone would assume new peculiarities, and features so different from his primitive characteristics, whilst the animals and plants, circumscribed within the same limits, would continue to preserve their natural relations to the fauna and flora of other parts of the world?

“ If the creator of one set of these living beings had not been also the creator of the other, and if we did not trace the same general laws throughout nature, there might be room left for the supposition, that, while men inhabiting different parts of the world, originated from a common centre, the plants and animals now associated with them in the same countries originated on the spot. *But such inconsistencies do not occur in the laws of nature.*

“ *The coincidence of the geographical distribution of the human races with that of animals,—the disconnection of the climatic conditions when we have similar races,—and the connection of climatic conditions when we have different human races, shew further, that the adaptation of different races of men to different parts of the world must be intentional, as well as that of other beings; that men were primitively located in the various parts of the world they inhabit, and that they arose everywhere in those harmonious numeric proportions with other living beings,*

which would at once secure their preservation, and contribute to their welfare.¹

“To suppose that all men originated from Adam and Eve, is to assume that the order of creation has been changed in the course of historical times and to give to the Mosaic record a meaning that it never was intended to have.” (Christ. Exam. July 1850, pp. 135-148.)

In another part of the same Essay, Agassiz says: “We maintain that, like all other organised beings, mankind cannot have originated in single individuals, but must have been created in that numeric harmony which is characteristic of each species; *men must have originated in nations, as the bees have originated in swarms.*” (Id. p. 128.)

This is certainly explicit enough.

But, against this theory of the origin of the different races of men, as thus put forth by Agassiz, and against the arguments he here adduces to sustain it, several weighty objections present themselves.

In the first place, *this theory rests wholly on assumption.*

Professor Agassiz first states the facts. These are admitted by all. Different varieties² of men exist; and these different

¹ That is in those regions where wild animals sprang forth abundantly for game, men appeared as spontaneous products of the soil, in proportionate numbers, to pursue and prey on them.

² It may be proper here to remind the reader that different writers advocate different systems, as to the number of races into which men should be divided. The great Linnæus divided men into five varieties—the American, European, Asiatic, African, and those of preternatural confirmation, Albinoes for instance. Buffon contended for six varieties; these he afterwards reduced to five. The scientific Blumenbach held to five varieties—a classification now, perhaps, most generally adopted. Cuvier reduced the races to three, leaving, however, several varieties unclassified. Malte-Brun, the geographer, proposes sixteen varieties. The scientific and industrious Dr Morton of Philadelphia, whose recent death is lamented by all the lovers of independent research, embraced substantially the classification of Blumenbach, reckoning five races. (1,) The Mongolian, in Asia and the extreme northern America; (2,) the Caucasian, covering Europe, North Africa, together with Arabia, Persia, Asia Minor, and Hindostan in Asia; (3,) the Malay, in Malacca, Sumatra, Borneo, and a few other islands in the Southern Ocean; (4,) the American race, covering the whole continent south of about 66° of north latitude; (5,) the Ethiopian race, covering all Africa, south of about 20° north latitude, together with New Holland, New Guinea, and some few of the isles of the great Southern Ocean. (Morton's Cran. Amer. pp. 3-7, and map.) This five-fold division Professor Agassiz seems mainly to recognise, although he makes the Cape of Good Hope and New Holland each the seat of a separate race.

varieties are found existing (most generally, but *not always*, as will be shewn directly) *each in its own zoological province* (p. 136.) Thus the Arctic races of man inhabit the treeless region near the Arctics. in all the three great northern continents, a region having animals and plants peculiar to itself, and found nowhere else. The negro in Central Africa occupies another zoological province; its fauna and its flora are peculiar, and are not found elsewhere. The Hottentots in South Africa are another distinct race, surrounded by a fauna and a flora found in that region alone. So also in New Holland is found a distinct race, and the animals and the plants around that race are peculiar to the region they occupy.

Now, says Professor Agassiz, "*As these plants and animals originated where they are found, and did not reach these several regions by radiating from some other centre till they came there, why should not these several races of men have originated in the regions they severally occupy, and to which, and to the fauna and the flora thereof, they are severally adapted? If man alone originated in one common centre, and thence radiated over the earth, while other animals originated where they now exist, this would be an inconsistency in the laws of nature.*" (Christ. Exam. p. 137.)

Here it is first *assumed* that the fauna (*i. e.* the animals, the living creatures) of the several zoological provinces, originated there, as truly as did the flora, *i. e.* the plants.

But now, of this origination of all the animals on the ground they now occupy, *this creation* of animals in the several different localities where they now exist, the Professor gives no proof—he can give none. However probable such creation of all animals in their several native localities may appear in the eyes of a naturalist, it is probability at the most. Certain, it is not—*proved, it cannot be.*

But this creation, which at the best is but *a probable supposition*, the Professor here *assumes* as a certain truth, a kind of *axiom*.

Dr Pickering of the United States' Exploring Expedition, says, on the contrary, "I have seen in all eleven varieties of men; though I am hardly prepared to fix a positive limit to their number." (Pickering on Races, p. 303) "There is, I conceive, no middle ground between the admission of eleven distinct species in the human family, and the reduction to one." (p. 306.)

And yet the Bible seems, at least, to teach otherwise, so far as *the fauna of all earth's regions* is concerned: else why were pairs and septuples of all living creatures sheltered with Noah in the ark, for the declared purpose "to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth" (Gen. vii. 3), till after the subsidence of that mighty flood, in which God himself declared, "every living substance that I have made, will I destroy from off the face of the earth" (Gen. vii. 4.) Professor Agassiz avows a profound respect for the Mosaic record. (See pp. 111, 138.) If the 6th and 7th chapters of Genesis be not mere myth, it is difficult to conceive how the Mosaic record can be reconciled with the position,¹ that all the several fauna in the several zoological provinces now found on our globe, originated in those localities, and did not radiate from another and a distant centre, till they reached their present localities. Be that as it may, the original production of animals in the several zoological provinces they now occupy, is *assumed* by Agassiz, without proof; and therefore the argument for the origin of the several races of men in their several localities, being thus based on a mere *assumption*, unproved, and incapable of proof, is utterly void of force.

Similar baseless assumption vitiates many of the arguments employed by the advocates of diversity of origin for the several races of men.

Again, 2d. *In his mode of treating this subject, Professor Agassiz is inconsistent with his avowed principles.*

He begins by declaring that the question of the unity or diversity of race among men, is one of science merely, and is to be discussed on grounds purely and exclusively scientific (p. 110.) And yet he soon begins to reason from the Bible, and attempts to shew that his views are not in contradiction of the Bible; and he hesitates not to offer a novel² interpretation, as the true and

¹ The author cannot but express his regret to notice that Dr Smythe seems to countenance the idea of some animals not destroyed in the Deluge. (See his Preface, p. xviii.) Dr Bachman, also, seems to abandon the universality of the Deluge. (See his chap. xvii.) Stillingfleet (*Origines Sacrae*, b. iii. chap. iv. vol. ii. pp. 104, 105) and Dr J. Pye Smith, admit only a local inundation. The reasoning of these authors to maintain this position is far from being conclusive.

² It is a novel and a bold position that Professor Agassiz takes, in asserting that "made of one blood," Acts xvii. 26, applied to men of all nations, relates not at all to a genetical connection, to affinity by ties of blood and descent, but to the higher union found in similarity of the moral and the intellectual nature.

the only true meaning of the Bible record on this subject, (pp. 134, 135, 138.) This is inconsistent; but it is an inconsistency not unusual with the opponents of the unity of the races. (See Two Lectures, &c. 1844, Introduction, p. 3. Ib. 1849, p. 7.)

Once more, 3d. *The theory of Agassiz is imperfect*; it is indeed *inconsistent with itself*. On this theory Genesis furnishes an account of the origin and early history of the white race of man. That account distinctly ascribes the race it treats of to an origin from one single human pair, Adam and Eve.

Yet Agassiz contends mankind *could not* have originated in *single individuals*; they must have originated in *nations*, as bees in swarms. This declaration is without restriction, it covers the whole of mankind, one race just as truly as another. If this declaration of Agassiz be true, then no one of all the several races of men could have originated in single individuals, or otherwise than in nations; yet he admits the authority of Genesis, and Genesis on his theory, declares that the white race, at least, originated in single individuals, the one sole primitive pair, Adam and Eve. Here is an obvious and a glaring inconsistency; a contrariety between the authority acknowledged by Agassiz, and his own scheme.

Now which of the two is to be believed, Professor Agassiz or Moses?

Again, 4th. *His theory is inconsistent with itself in another and a most important respect*. Thus, p. 136, he says, "Wherever we find a human race naturally circumscribed, it is connected in its location with what we call in natural history a zoological and botanical province; that is to say, with the natural limitation of a particular association of animals and plants; and this," (he adds,) "shews most unequivocally the intimate relation existing between mankind and the animal kingdom, in their adaptation to the physical world;" and he instances the Arctic race of men, the Mongolian, the Negro, the Hottentot, and the New Hollander, each race occupying its own peculiar zoological province. To shew more clearly that each race is thus closely connected with the fauna and flora of the region it occupies, and that this distinction of race is not produced, nor affected by climate, Professor A. refers us to China, and to corresponding latitudes in Africa and in America, and also to New Holland and

the extreme south of Africa and of America, where, in the regions so compared, the climate is very similar, but where the races of men differ most from each other, and where a corresponding difference is found in the fauna and the flora of these countries.

All this is certainly true, so far as it goes ; and if the reasoning of Professor A. from these facts be correct, then we shall find that *each race of men inhabits its own peculiar and appropriate zoological province* ; the argument being, that each race is *constitutionally adapted* to the region it occupies, and to *the animal and vegetable productions of that particular region. They all originated together in the same locality. They were created with a mutual adaptation the one to the other.* Thus the negro is not adapted to the fauna and the flora of South Africa, nor the Hottentot to those of central Africa. But if this be so, how comes it that on this great western continent, throughout its whole vast length and breadth, stretching almost from pole to pole, is found everywhere spread, native to the soil, *the one race*, the aboriginal American? the red man of the forest? the common American Indian?

Professor Agassiz does himself testify : “ It has been satisfactorily established, that over the whole continent¹ of America, south of the Arctic zone (which is inhabited by Esquimaux), all the numerous tribes of Indians have the same physical character ; that they belong to the same race from north to south, and that the primitive inhabitants of central tropical America do not physically differ from the primitive inhabitants of the more northern or southern regions.” “ In this case we have the greatest uniformity in the character of the tribes of an entire continent,² under the most different climatic influences. But in their physical peculiarities these tribes differ as well from the Africans, as from the Asiatic tribes, and the inhabitants of New Holland.” (P. 126.)

In this instance we find one race covering a vastly extended region of country, which must comprise several various zoological and botanical provinces ; for surely no one will contend that Pa-

¹ In the general remark (says Agassiz), the isolated case of Mongolians stranded on the western shores of America, as far as they are well authenticated, are of course excepted.

² See also Pickering on the Races, p. 16 ; Bachman's Doctrine of the Unity of the Human Races, pp. 269, 272.

tagonia and Mexico, Brazil and New England, Oregon and the cotton-growing states of the South, present all and severally one and the same fauna and flora?

Here then is an exception, fatal, as it would seem, to the theory of Professor Agassiz. For, if one and the same race of men are found flourishing and indigenous in different regions, characterized by different groups of animal and vegetable organizations, as well as by widely varied climates, then clearly there is no such adaptation in the constitution of any human race to the animal and vegetable groups by which it may be found surrounded, as to warrant the argument from the fact (even were it a demonstrated fact, which it is not), that those animal groups originated in that locality, to the origination of that human group also in the same locality.

There is plainly no essential connection between the different races of men, and the zoological provinces they may be found occupying, any more than there is between those races and the climatic influences that may surround them. This, the extension of the one aboriginal race over the entire American continent, north and south, plainly shows. The theory of Professor Agassiz is inconsistent with itself; it is based on only a partial view, and an incorrect classification of the facts in the case; it cannot stand.

From these facts, therefore, it follows also, that even if men originated from a common centre, and spread over the earth, radiating from that common centre (pp. 126, 127), their present differences cannot be accounted for by, or be owing solely to, influences that arise out of peculiarities of climate and mode of life. Because, in regions where these peculiarities are alike, races the most dissimilar are found; and over regions where these peculiarities are widely dissimilar, the same race is found to prevail as in America. We may therefore adopt the opinions of Agassiz on this point, and say (p. 127), *We can see but one conclusion to be drawn from these facts, viz. that these races cannot have assumed their peculiar features after¹ they had migrated into these countries from a supposed common centre. "We must therefore seek another explanation."*

¹ This language is perhaps stronger than the facts will warrant. The facts do not prove that the changes did not take place *after* migration thither; but the facts do

We may also adopt another conclusion of Agassiz, viz. "*The adaptation of different races of men to different parts of the world must be intentional, as well as that of other beings.*" (P. 137.)

For that there *is* an adaptation of man to the circumstances in which he is placed, and an adaptation of those circumstances to man, who is surrounded*and affected by them, admits of no question, although we may fail to detect wherein precisely that adaptation lies. It is not in climate, nor in climatic influence, nor in association with any one particular group of surrounding animals, or any particular class of vegetable productions, as we have just seen. Yet somewhere there must doubtless lie reasons why one race of men exists and flourishes best in one region, and another race in another locality.

Still then the inquiry recurs, Why is it that different races of men are found in different regions of the earth? Were they created where they are now found? Or have they originated at some other point, and gradually spread abroad over the earth? If this latter be the true solution, then how did these diversities arise? Are they the result of natural causes slowly operating? or were they impressed on the human family by a direct intervention of the Creator? If so, when and where did this intervention take place?

As to the *origin* of man, or of the inferior creation, reason can furnish no decision.

This is a point beyond the legitimate range of scientific investigation.

The existence, the distinctive characteristics, the qualities, the habits, the locality, and the mutual relations one to another, of the several races of man, and of the fauna and the flora of the several regions, or zoological provinces where these different races of man are found, are all subjects for scientific research and scientific reasoning. But the *origin* of things—of the lowest brute and of the meanest herb, just as truly as of man himself, lies beyond human observation and human consciousness. No mortal was present at the creation, to witness the mode or the place in which

prove that the changes were not the *consequence* of such migration; *i. e.* were not occasioned by the influences into which such migration brought them; *i. e.* the change is not the *effect* of climate.

any creature originated. No mortal has ever seen a new order of plants or of animals brought into existence.

Animals and plants, and differing varieties of men, are found existing in certain localities, possessed of certain distinctive qualities, and exhibiting certain numerical proportions, and bearing certain obvious relations to each other, and to the locality wherein they are found. These are *facts* which may be observed and classified, and used as the basis of reasoning, respecting the nature, the uses, and the relative importance of these several objects; but, *as to the origin* of any of these plants, animals, or races of men, the facts observed yield no information. On the *origin* of the smallest animalculæ, science, with all her boasted attainments, is incapable of throwing any light. We may conjecture, we may even make it appear *probable*, that men originated in nations as bees in swarms; or that men originated in the localities they now occupy; or that all these several races originated at some one central point, and thence radiated gradually over the earth, till they reached the localities where they are now found; but beyond a probable conjecture science herself cannot go.¹

When, therefore, a naturalist so justly distinguished as Professor Agassiz talks of evidence on this subject amounting, in the mind of a naturalist, to *demonstration*, that man originated thus and so, it is plain that for once this eminent philosopher *has forgotten the cool caution of sound science*.

Reasoning on man merely as a subject of natural history, this distinguished naturalist concludes, that the different races *could not* have originated from one pair, nor from a common centre, but rather that mankind originated in groups, or nations, as bees in

¹ On this subject the learned Johannes Müller, pronounced by Humboldt (*Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 353) to be one of the greatest anatomists of the day, thus writes:—"Whether the human races have descended from several primitive races of men, or from one alone, is a question that cannot be determined from experience." (*Physiologie des Menschen*.)

Müller is unquestionably right. Neither experience nor science can determine this point.

William Von Humboldt also says: "The first origin of mankind is a phenomenon wholly beyond the sphere of experience." Again: "A solution of these difficult questions cannot be determined by inductive reasoning or experience." (*Cosmos*, i. p. 365.)

These learned men are right. Revelation *alone* can determine the solution of these recondite points.

swarms; and that each race originated in the locality where now it exists, as did the fauna around it.

In reaching this conclusion, we think he reasons from insufficient, and indeed from false premises.

We believe that the brute creation did not originate in the several countries where now they flourish; but, even were that point conceded, his reasoning is not conclusive. He regards man as a mere animal, and bases his reasoning upon the merely animal nature of man. He says, it would be an inconsistency unprecedented in nature's laws, if, all other animals around him originating where they are, man alone should have sprung from a common centre elsewhere, and thence radiated to the points he now holds.

Were man possessed of an animal nature merely, this reasoning might hold good; but, in many and most important respects, man is different from, and superior to all other animals. He alone is a cosmopolite,¹ capable of living and flourishing in all climates and in all countries. He alone is possessed of reason, and of a moral nature, qualifying him to find motives for settling in some places, and avoiding others; and enabling him also to adapt himself to the circumstances around him, and to render circumstances seemingly unfavourable, tributary to his safety and his comfort.

If now it is no inconsistency in nature's laws (as it certainly is not, since the difference does exist) that man should differ thus widely from all other animals, it cannot be an inconsistency in these laws, that man should differ also in his *origin*; that *he* (however mere animals may have originated) should have sprung from one pair, and have radiated from one common centre. Differing in, so many other, and important respects from all animals, reason might seem rather to infer that man should have differed from them also in *the mode of his origin*; and that the very fact of man's having so many distinctive peculiarities appertaining to him as man, and constituting a wide difference between man and *all* more-brute animals, springs from and proves a mode of origin in man *different from that of brutes*. The Mosaic record accounts well for this superiority in man. Man was formed more imme-

¹ "Principles of Zoology," by Agassiz and Gould, chap. xiii. sect. 1, p. 154.

diately by *the hand* of his Maker, and his life was breathed into his nostrils by the very breath of God. The brute animals all issued from the teeming bosom of the earth, at the fiat of the Creator.

Most of the errors of naturalists in relation to man, spring from this one mistake. Because man is possessed of an animal nature, therefore they regard him, and reason about him, just as if he were an animal merely. They lose sight entirely of his higher nature, as rational and moral, although this his higher nature may be reasonably expected to affect his condition, his destiny, and everything relating to him, *not excepting his origin*. But, after all, reason cannot decide this question; and if we can find no better guidance than mere science can extend to us, the question as to the origin of man, whether in one place or in many, whether in groups and nations or from one sole original pair, must ever remain an inscrutable mystery, "*lost in the darkness of the beginning of the world.*"

This obscure point none but the Creator himself can elucidate. This elucidation is, as we believe, furnished in the Bible, which is shewn, by a long array of varied and accumulative evidence, to be an inspired book, the very Word of God.

The Bible teaching on this subject is briefly given, but it is very plain, as thus :

After recording the reduction of our globe from a state of wild chaos, and its being covered with vegetation, illumined by the heavenly orbs, and peopled with its various animal tribes, in a series of creative acts, which were extended through a period of six consecutive days, Moses tells us that on the sixth of those days God created man (Adam, l'homme, l'espece humaine, singulier collectif, says Cahen¹), forming out of the dust of the ground one man, Adam, and then forming also one woman, whom he gave to the man as his wife; and on these, the first and *only* pair created by his own hand, God pronounced the blessing of fertility, "*Be ye fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it;*" and he gave them also dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth," Gen. i. 28. Thus, we are told, God created man (*Adam*, the term is *generic*, designating the *human*

¹ La Bible, Traduction Nouvelle, par M. Cahen. Paris, 1832.

race, "*singulier collectif*," says Cahen), male and female created he them, Gen. i. 27.

The whole passage conveys the idea that this is the account of the *origin* of the *human race*. No hint is given by Moses, nor is any intimation found in any other part of the Bible, that other men, or other human beings were produced on earth, saving only this one primitive pair, and their descendants.

Ere long we read of the temptation of this first human pair, and of their fall by sin. The result of this event was that their offspring were, like themselves, depraved. After his sin Adam begat a son in his own likeness (Gen. v. 3), *i. e.* inclined to evil, not holy, not in the image of God. That image Adam had lost by sin.

Now it is abundantly plain that this depravity of nature, this proneness to evil rather than to good, appertains, to this very day, and it has always, and everywhere, appertained to man, and to all men of all countries, and of all the now differing races of men. No perfect character has ever appeared among men, saving only Jesus of Nazareth. This universal depravity of men is fully accounted for on the supposition that all men of all races are descended from one and the same primitive pair. But, reject that doctrine, and you have the *fact* of man's depravity still existing, but existing as a fact unaccountable, and inexplicably mysterious.

The Bible teaches also, that after the lapse of some centuries from the creation of man, such was the great wickedness of mankind, that God found it necessary to sweep away the impious race by a general deluge, from which one family alone, consisting of eight persons, was saved. Noah, with his three sons and their wives, were the sole survivors of that universal calamity; and from them and their descendants was the earth again replenished with inhabitants. Consequently, all men now on earth must be the descendants of Noah.

But mankind are now found exhibiting great diversity of complexion, form, structure, and habits, which constitute distinctive marks of different varieties or races.

These races are found occupying each its own peculiar portion of the earth's surface; each race is invariably propagated by

hereditary descent; and among these races a great variety of different languages are spoken.

For this diversity of language and of race also, the Mosaic narrative furnishes a solution.

When the descendants of Noah were on the plains of Shinar, they united together to erect a tower at Babel, on purpose to keep together, and to avoid "*being scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth,*" Gen. xi. 4.

To defeat this purpose, and to ensure the dispersion of man over the surface of the whole earth (see Gen. xi. 5-9), the Creator did himself interfere, by a direct and preternatural exertion of his own power, so as to produce diversity of language, and to effect the dispersion of man into all the different countries and different climates over the face of all the earth.

If, then, as naturalists tell us, the peculiarities in the complexion, the osteological structure, the muscular development, the nervous system, the veins, the arterial arrangement, and the respiratory organs, as well as in the cuticular secretions existing in the different races as now found, be necessarily¹ connected with the zoological provinces in which these several races of men are now seen naturally existing and best flourishing, and with the influences which there surround them; if, also, the languages spoken by the several races of men differ in the same proportion *as their organs of speech are variously modified*; and if, as we freely admit with Professor Agassiz,² "*the adaptation of different races of men to different parts of the world be intentional*" on the part of the Creator, then inasmuch as, instead of the creation of these several races of men, with all their distinctive peculiarities upon them as now, each in the locality where now it is found, as Agassiz supposes, Moses informs us that, at Babel, God himself did directly interfere, in order to produce, in the one uniform stock of Noah's descendants, the sole survivors of the Deluge, a variety of languages, and the dispersion and settlement of different branches of this one primitive stock, in all regions and all climates over the face of all the earth: and if, as none will deny, whatever God does, He does effectually, so as to *secure* the attainment of the object aimed at; it follows clearly, that the difference of complexion, of anatomical structure, and of constitutional peculiarities in dif-

¹ See Agassiz in Christ. Examiner, July 1850, pp. 136, 137.

² See Christ. Examiner, July 1850, p. 137.

ferent branches of mankind as now found, being necessary to produce diversity of language, and to effect dispersion into all climates (or at least being a necessary incident to such dispersion), the intervention of God at Babel did certainly secure them all.

This occurrence at Babel was, therefore, the time, and this the occasion, in which the Creator himself did miraculously interfere to produce, in a primitively more uniform race, all the changes necessary to constitute the various races now found.

The passage of Scripture demanded by Professor Agassiz in his challenge (p. 134), is here presented in Gen. xi. 5-9. The introduction of a constitutional law in man's very nature, to secure, sooner or later, all the varieties now found among men, and necessary to adapt these several races to their several localities in the zoological provinces they have permanently occupied, did take place at Babel, if Moses wrote the truth, and if the principles laid down by Agassiz himself, and by other naturalists, be correct. All that was necessary to secure the end he aimed at was certainly known to God; and every thing so necessary he was able to do.

Moses says that God did, at Babel, directly and miraculously interfere to produce diversity of languages, and to effect the dispersion of mankind "*abroad upon the face of all the earth.*" Mankind are now found actually speaking different languages; and found, too, spread "*abroad upon the face of all the earth.*"

But mankind are found, also, presenting great diversity of appearance and of structure, in these different countries; so that they are divided into different varieties or races, each race being adapted to the region it occupies, and the fauna and the flora found in that region.

If so, then this adaptation is inseparably connected with this dispersion. The purpose to disperse man, whether to disperse him from and in his first creation, or subsequently to the creation, must, therefore, have included the purpose to produce in man the peculiarities of his physical constitution, necessary to his being so dispersed. Moreover *the execution of this purpose to disperse man abroad over all the earth must have included the production in man of this adaptedness of his physical organization to live and flourish in the several regions over which he was to be dispersed.*

Agassiz supposes that this *execution* of the purpose to disperse

man over all the earth, took place in the original production of the several races, distinct as now, in nations, as bees in swarms, in the localities where they are now found.

But Moses tells us that at Babel this purpose to disperse man over all the earth was effected, and that by a great change wrought upon the *mass of mankind*, who were all the descendants of the one family of Noah.

If Moses is to be believed, this constitutional difference in man, which produced diversity in the organs of speech, which resulted in the dispersion of mankind into all countries on the surface of the earth, as they are now found, and which must have included all that constitutes the diversity of the races, without which men could not live dispersed abroad "*over the face of all the earth*," was miraculously effected by the Creator himself at Babel. (See Gen. xi. 5-9.)

Reasoning from the principles laid down by naturalists themselves, therefore, it is plain, the challenge of the scientific Agassiz to the contrary notwithstanding, that there is a passage in the Scriptures, pointing, by necessary and inevitable inference, at "those physical differences which we notice between the white race and the Chinese, the New Hollanders, the Malays, the American Indians and the Negroes, as having been introduced, in the course of time, among the children of Adam and Eve,"¹ even though the distinction between the dark races and the white is not there either formally made or alluded to in express terms.

If the Caucasian or white race alone be noticed in the earlier history of Genesis, what sense can be attached to the narrative given in the 11th chapter of Genesis, respecting the confounding of the language of all the earth at Babel? Do the branches of the white race alone speak varying tongues? Is the white race alone scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth?

Inextricable confusion and absurdity result from the attempt to restrict the history given in Genesis to the Caucasian race exclusively. No man, who has not some favourite theory to uphold, would think of so restricting it. The circumstances mentioned in the narrative itself, and the tenor and spirit of the whole Bible, go to show that that history details the origin of the *whole family of man*, from Adam in Eden, and from Noah after the Deluge; and

¹ Christian Examiner for July 1850, pp. 134, 135.

that at Babel we have an account of the origin of all the diversity of languages now prevailing, and with it, of the origin of all the various races of mankind.

Herein are detailed the circumstances under which the power of the Creator was directly introduced for the purpose of so modifying the constitution and the physical frame of the different branches of Noah's family assembled at Babel on the plains of Shinar, as that, though still human, and each exhibiting all the attributes of a common humanity, yet each separate branch of this human family should become distinctly marked, and adapted to the region it should afterwards occupy; the negro branch especially, as fitted for burning tropical regions.

The constitutional law of change might be then at once and finally impressed upon the different branches of man, simultaneously with the "*confounding of the language of all the earth.*" (Gen. xi. 9.)

The operation of that new law might have been sudden and instantaneous; although it is not improbable that the operation would be gradual, developing itself through several successive generations, and developing itself the more fully the nearer each of these several divisions of the human family drew to the region of the earth, towards which an appropriate instinct tended, and for a residence in which the advancing change was adapting the constitution.¹

But, the change once wrought, remained permanent. The new varieties reverted not back to their original type, whatever that type may have been. Such, we know, is still the law impressed upon animal nature in the inferior creation. New varieties may be formed, and have not unfrequently been formed, especially in the dog, the horse, sheep, hog, &c. (see Pritchard's Researches, vol. i. pp. 349-353), but, when once formed, the variety remains, and does not revert back to the original form. (See Dr Bachman, Unity of the Human Race, pp. 179, 191. Pickering on the Races, p. 305.)

If to effect a separation of the one race of mankind into distinct

¹ Many historical facts, shewing the early population of most of the inhabited countries of the world, favour the supposition of the immediate migration to their "*appropriate zoological provinces,*" of the new races, resulting from divine interposition at Babel. (See, in this Lecture, the article "*Early Civilization.*")

bands or tribes, and their gradual dispersion over the earth, were the object aimed at in "*confounding the language of all the earth,*" as Moses distinctly asserts it was, that object, it is plain on the principles conceded by naturalists themselves, could not, with absolute certainty, be accomplished without the superaddition of a constitutional law or peculiarity, the operation of which should, sooner or later, produce such diversity in complexion, features, osteal configuration, and cuticular secretions, as are found now prevailing, and are indispensable to the permanent residence and well-being of men in the climates and the regions occupied by the several races. This view is based upon the plain teachings of Moses in Genesis. It is more rational and more philosophical than the theory of the distinct origin of many groups of men of different races in several localities; even if such multiplied creations of men do not amount to the separate creation of several distinct stocks of the same species of beings, at different and distinct centres; in contradiction of the law laid down by naturalists. Thus Dr Bachman says (see chapter xiii. and pp. 248, 256), "*The Creator never called into existence the same species in two or more localities.*" (See Pickering on the Races, pp. 302, 303.)

To avoid this inconsistency, it is maintained that the different races of men are distinct species, not mere varieties, of the same species. This point will be considered hereafter.

Nor is this view of the origin of the races liable to the objection urged by Agassiz when he says, p. 138, "To suppose that all men originated from Adam and Eve is to assume that the order of creation has been changed in the *course of historical times.*" For this change was effected in the order of nature long anterior to historical times, as truly as the Deluge, the occurrence of which no one denies, was anterior to historical times. It was therefore anterior also to the very oldest Egyptian monuments and records, and to the most ancient of the Chinese annals, and of the Indian histories, that are entitled to any, the least degree of credit.

This preternatural occurrence (the account of which is given by Moses, the earliest of all credible and authenticated historians, and a prophet inspired of God), took place at a period early enough to account for the appearance of the different races—

Negro, Mongol, and Caucasian—as distinct as now, on the earliest of the Egyptian monuments.

On the view of this subject here presented, everything is complete and consistent. Mankind are all one family, all descended from the one family saved with Noah in the ark; and the appearance of the present diversity of race and of language is explained by the miraculous intervention of God at Babel, which is distinctly revealed. All existing difficulties attending this subject are here obviated without resort to any one miracle more than is asserted in holy writ. It is only admitting that when the Bible says God interfered miraculously in the affairs of men, in order to effect a certain object, he did all that was necessary to secure that object. If the diversity of races, as well as difference of language, was necessary to secure that object, then the diversity of race as well as of language was provided for and secured in that very coming down of God at Babel mentioned in Genesis xi. *We are not obliged* in receiving this view of the origin of races and of languages among men *to decide how many races precisely were then originated.* Whatever was necessary to the dispersion of man abroad over the whole earth was then effected. To this day, on the number of the human races the most eminent naturalists are not agreed.

Make out then, if you choose, three with Cuvier; or with Blumenbach and with Morton, five; or eleven with Pickering; or sixteen with Malte-Brun; or any larger number, say one hundred¹ different races in as many zoological provinces. We can receive them all, and turn to this passage in Genesis, as accounting fully for their occurrence among the numerous branches of the human family descended from the same pair created in Eden, and again descended all from Noah.² In entire consistency with this view of

¹ See two Lectures, p. 33.

² This solution of the phenomenon of so many varieties among the descendants of the one Noachian family, founded on the 11th chapter of Genesis, the author first stated in a lecture on this subject delivered in Mobile, in January 1844.

In his Two Lectures, published in Mobile that same year, Dr Notchus notices the suggestion, p. 28, note: "It has been *supposed* that the varieties of the human race were produced at the tower of Babel when the confusion of tongues occurred; but so remarkable an occurrence would have been mentioned. We might just as well *suppose* that some were changed into monkeys, while others were changed into negroes. In urging a question of this kind, we want *facts.*" This is hardly courteous. In justice

the essential unity of mankind, is the whole current of revelation.

Having accounted, as above shewn, for the diversity of languages and of races among men, Moses briefly states the several subdivisions of the human family as migrating in different directions to people the whole earth. Very speedily thereafter the sacred history confines itself to the chosen race, who were to be the depository of true religion, the recipients and the guardians of the sacred oracles, and from among whom the Messiah, the Redeemer of mankind, was to spring. Prophet after prophet appeared among the chosen race, proclaiming the future advent of this illustrious personage, and announcing that, eventually, all tribes and all nations of men should submit to his sway. Throughout the prophetic books, though rarely is mention expressly made of dissimilar races (unless it be in the use of the terms *Ethiopian*, *i. e.* persons of changeless dark hue, and "the isles of the sea," "the Gentiles," and "the heathen)," yet all are spoken of as men, as responsible to God, and as awaiting the advent of a Saviour.

to Dr Nott, however, it may be remarked, he had probably only *heard* from others that such ground had been taken by his friendly opponent. The argument by which the author's view of the passage in Genesis is supported, was not published until July 1850, when it was given in Nos. 5 and 6 of a series of Essays entitled, "*Thoughts on Man and the Bible*," published in the Southern Presbyterian. To the suggestion that *facts are wanted* in relation to such a subject, *we reply*, On this subject *facts cannot be had*. Facts in this case are anterior to all observation. The doctrine of diversity of *origin* for the races of man is a mere theory—a mere supposition based on *assumption*, as has been already shewn. The doctrine that such diversity was occasioned by the direct intervention of God at Babel, rests on a distinct statement in revelation, from which this doctrine seems necessarily to flow.

The doctrine here advanced is also nearly resembling the position assumed by Dr Bachman of Charleston, S C.; only Dr B. supposes that from the beginning *the Creator implanted in the organisation of men an adaptation to produce such modifications as are essential to the health, comfort, and future increase of man's posterity, in the regions he is to inhabit.* (See p. 179.) Hence the production of new varieties in man.

From the strictures of Dr Bachman (see his chap. xvi. p. 241, &c.) on the work of Mr W. F. Van Amringe (New York, 1848), on the "*Natural History of Man*," it would seem that that writer has promulgated a view somewhat similar to that here presented. The change of race, Mr Van A. maintains, was effected miraculously among the sons of Noah. The error of Mr Van A. would seem to lie in attempting to fix the precise number of varieties so produced. He specifies four such varieties. Hence the objections urged against his view by Dr Bachman.

These objections do not apply to the view presented in this work.

The book of Mr Van Amringe, the author has not yet seen.

In the New Testament a like recognition of the common humanity, and the essential identity of all tribes of men, is found. Jesus is designated "the Saviour of the world." He is called "the second Adam." "*As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.) "*In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.*" (Col. iii. 11.) All are one in Christ. (See Rom. 5th chapter; 1 Cor. xv.) "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus." (Acts iv. 12.)

All this is perfectly plain, and in entire unison with the common origin of all the races of men; utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of diversity of origin. All men are depraved; because, descending from Adam a fallen being, they inherit his corrupt nature; and thus, being guilty, and therefore condemned, all men need a Saviour.

"*By one man's disobedience, many were made sinners.*" (Rom. v. 19.) "*By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.*" (Rom. v. 12.) Clearly, then, Adam acted as a public person, the head and representative of all his posterity, and of none others. If the whole population of the globe sprang from Adam, then all are affected by his fall.

But Jesus is the second Adam; for those endangered by the results of the first Adam's fall, Christ undertook, and for none else. This the whole plan of salvation presented in the Gospel, and this the whole reasoning of the Apostle Paul, imply and prove. If all men, without exception, sprang from Adam, then for all, without exception, salvation is provided in Christ; and such is the view presented in the Gospel, and authorized by Christ himself when he commanded, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," Mark xvi. 15.

But if the Bible history has respect to one race only, then Christ lived, and suffered, and died for that one race only. But what race was that? Who can be certain of which race Adam was the head? Moreover, if, as we are told, "it may be doubted, whether there be now a pure race on the earth" (see Dr Nott, 1844, p. 28), then no man living can tell that he himself is entitled to look for the benefits of salvation¹ through Christ Jesus;

¹ It is strange that the learned and pious Dr J. Pye Smith, lately deceased, should

and certain it is, that in that case the whole negro race at least are cut off from all the hopes of the Gospel; and the Mongolian and the Malay races equally so.

In that case, the entire missionary enterprise is a wild scheme, a lawless undertaking, utterly hopeless of success. (See Dr Nott's Two Lectures, 1849, p. 17.)

So wide-sweeping are the consequences which flow from the novel theory of a diversity of origin for the several races of man. It is a mere theory, resting on a bold assumption; it contradicts the explicit averments of holy writ; it runs counter to the whole Bible doctrine; and it completely nullifies the whole Gospel of

have overlooked the bearings of this theory of diversity of races. He had already abandoned the doctrine, that the Noachian deluge was universal, and he seems to have held the unity of the races, by a very feeble tenure. He says in his Supplementary Notes, p. 289: "If the two first inhabitants of Eden were the progenitors, not of all human beings, but only of the race whence sprung the Hebrew family, still it would remain the fact, that all were formed, by the immediate power of God, and all their circumstances would remain the same as to moral and practical purposes. Adam would be a figure of Him that was to come, the Saviour of mankind, just as Melchizedek, or Moses, or Aaron, or David; the spiritual lesson would be the same; the same necessity would exist for a saviour, a redemption, and a renovation of the internal character by efficacious grace.

"That the Saviour was, in his human nature, a descendant of Adam, would not militate against his being a proper redeemer for all the races of mankind, any more than his being a descendant of Abraham, Israel, and David, at all diminishes his perfection to save us, sinners of the Gentiles." (Scripture and Geology, Sup. Notes, p. 289.)

How Dr Smith would have been able to reconcile this with the teachings of Paul, especially Acts xvii. 26, and Romans chap. v., 1 Tim. ii. 11-15, and with sundry other places of holy writ, it is not easy to imagine. For the time Dr S. lost sight of the federal headship of both Christ and Adam. It is dangerous to yield a single item of the plain teachings of the Bible. Dr Smith had abandoned the universality of the Deluge. Dr Nott charges Dr Bachman with virtually doing the same in his admission of different centres of creation in his seventeenth chapter. Dr N. says: "Dr Bachman dodges the plain teachings of the Bible in chronology, but denies boldly that the Deluge was universal, that there was but one centre of creation, and that all the animals, &c. came from the ark, and asserts that his opinions have been prevalent among learned divines for the last half century. On the other side we have just been severely handled by Dr Hamilton of Mobile, for holding opposite opinions. Dr H. too, is right: for the plain teaching of Genesis is opposed to Dr Bachman, and we deny its historical accuracy. If the flood was not universal, and if the animals did not come from the ark, then plain language has no meaning." (Dr J. C. Nott, on Diversity of the Human Race, in Review of Dr Bachman on the Unity, p. 19, note.)

We may also affirm, that, "if the doctrine that all the human races are sprung from the one human pair created in Eden, be not taught in the Bible," then plain language has no meaning.

salvation by the Redeemer. Notwithstanding all the vehement protestations of deference for the Bible, made by the advocates of this diversity of races, the scheme is directly contradictory of the Bible.

Let any candid, unbiassed reader decide whether such language as the Bible employs in speaking of the creation of *one pair*, to people the earth, "*God blessed them and said, Be ye fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth,*" (Gen i. 28); again, representing one family alone saved from the Deluge, on purpose to people the whole earth; the descendants of this family visited miraculously to produce different languages, and to ensure the dispersion of men abroad over the face of all the earth; and then, afterwards prophets and apostles speaking of all nations as *men*, as brethren, as subject to one law, as lying under a common condemnation, and as having one common Saviour provided for all, does not necessarily involve the idea, that *all the varieties* of men, however differing now, whether Negroes, Monguls, Indians or white men, are descended from one pair, Adam and Eve; even though the peculiar distinctions by which these races are severally characterised, are not expressly noticed, and though no designation of the several races equivalent to the modern names, Indian, Malay, &c. is employed.

The evidences of a common humanity in all the several races of man, notwithstanding their peculiarities, are so numerous and so unequivocal, that probably the idea of a separate origin never occurred to any of the sacred writers. To those who receive as true the books of Moses (*i. e.* the Mosaic account of the creation, the Deluge, the confusion of tongues at Babel, and the subsequent dispersion of the descendants of Noah over the face of all the earth), such assertions, that the dark races and the fair are all descended from the same stock, was needless. The whole narrative implies it, and is utterly inconsistent with any other theory as to the origin of mankind.

The sacred writers were intent upon conveying truths of deep import to the higher nature of man, as a moral agent, as fallen and degraded, but yet capable of recovery. In these interests man, as *man*, is concerned. Before these high interests, the differences of complexion, of features, of figure, and of conformation, of language and of habits, sink into insignificance. As

such the sacred writers seem to have uniformly regarded the case, dwelling on these high interests, and noting not at all, or incidentally only, this difference of race. In one place alone, and that the very one where we might, not unnaturally, look for it, is there a statement made, which seems, the more closely it is contemplated, the more plainly to cover this whole ground, and to attribute this diversity now found among men in different climates, to a direct intervention of the Almighty, subsequent to the flood, and not many ages after that event; when at Babel, God is declared to have effected some great change in *man*, of such nature, as to produce a diversity of languages, and to ensure the dispersion of men over the whole earth, and their permanent settlement in different lands, and in different climates; or, as the naturalists express it, in different "zoological provinces."

This result we know has been effected: and such, the Bible tells us, was the manner and such the occasion, *when it was effected*. We can thus account for all the phenomena presented in the varying races of mankind, without supposing any one miracle beyond what the Bible unequivocally affirms, and *without doing violence to a single passage, or to so much as one solitary word of holy writ*.

An additional and a very strong proof is thus elicited, of the divine origin of the books of Moses; inasmuch as, the more light the researches of science pour upon us, the plainer and the more consistent are the teachings of these books seen to become.

If we find ourselves compelled to abandon some position which we had held as a Bible-taught truth, we find that the error lay, not in the Bible, but in our mode of interpreting it. We look at the Bible again, and we find its teachings, now made all the plainer to us, and perfectly consistent with the results of scientific discovery, or of the researches of learning. The first impression derived from reading the first chapter of Genesis, would probably be, that *in the six days of creation* there spoken of, this earth and the entire material universe were brought into existence, and reduced to their present order. Yet Moses does not say so. When, then, the wonders of geological discovery were first given to the world, it is not surprising that the first impression made thereby on the minds of theologians was, that the doctrine of the earth's existence, and of its having been subjected to repeated

convulsions prior to man's creation, is contradictory of the Bible. A closer, calmer examination of the first of Genesis shews, that the teachings of Moses are not only not inconsistent with, but that they are most wonderfully accordant to these the discoveries of modern science.

So also, when the diversity of races among men began to attract attention, and to provoke discussion as to the origin of these races, it was but natural that they who hold the Bible to be an inspired book, and who find therein the doctrine broadly stated, that God created one human pair and one only, to be the progenitors of all men inhabiting the earth, should seek to account for the present diversity among men by the influence of climate, food, and other causes operating through a long course of time upon different branches of the human family, to produce this diversity; and numerous instances of *analogous*¹ changes among inferior animals, certainly lend strong confirmation to the hypothesis, and shew that if *time* enough can be found prior to the historic age, it might possibly have been effected.

But now that the result of antiquarian research among oriental monuments seems to render it probable, nay, almost certain, that this diversity existed, as distinctly marked as now, in the very earliest ages of which we have any record, so that we *cannot be certain*, we cannot establish it by proof, that sufficient time intervened between the Deluge and the construction of those oldest monuments² on which we find the delineations of men exhibiting

¹ See Bachman, *Unity, &c*, part i. chap. iii. and iv. See Lawrence, *Lectures on Physiology*, p. 303, &c. Pritchard, vol. iii. chap. vii.

² On this subject consult Dr Morton (*Cran Egyptiaca*, pp. 60, 61.) He says: "Negroes are abundantly represented in the pictorial delineations of the Egyptian monuments of every epoch; some of them are nearly 3500 years old, and, as if to enforce the distinction of race, are placed side by side with people of the purest Caucasian features. The delineations of negro feature supposed to be the most ancient, have not yet been identified with the epoch to which they belong;" *e. g.* in a tomb at Thebes, the age of *Amontuoneh*, an unplaced king, supposed to be before the 16th dynasty, and consequently more than B.C. 2000. (Rosellini, Appendix, No. 13. Wilkinson's *Ancient Egypt*, vol. iii.)

So also in the procession of the age of Thothmes IV. at Thebes, negroes bear tribute, about B.C. 1700.

At Thebes (in a catacomb), Amunoph III. receives homage from "black chiefs of Cush, in Ethiopia." (*Topography of Thebes*, p. 136.) ;

Negroes are found abundantly on the monuments of Horus, Ramses II., of the 19th dynasty, and Ramses III., in Egypt and Nubia. (See Champollion, *Monuments de*

this diversity of feature and of complexion, it is but what we might expect to find in a divinely inspired document, when we discover that in the brief record given in Genesis respecting the earliest times, this very difficulty is met, as has been proved above; shewing that the difficulty was anticipated and provided for by the unerring mind which guided the pen of Moses, as the amanuensis of heaven, in recording the events attending the production of the universe, the origin of man, and the infancy of society, by pointing out the very occasion and time of introducing a diversity of language among men, and of impressing on the human constitution that law, the operation of which was indispensable to effect that diversity in the appearance and physical structure of different branches of the one human family, without

l'Egypte, plate 110. See also the monuments found at Beit-Oalli, in Nubia, where Ramses II. makes war on negroes. (See *Champ. Mon.* tom. i. pl. 71, 72: Rosellini, *Mon. M. R.* Tav. 75. See also Morton's *Crania Egyptiaca*, p. 62.)

In his *Crania Americana*, p. 88, Dr Morton thus reasons on the antiquity of the negro race: "The great antiquity of the negro race admits of no question, and has even led some philosophers to surmise that it was the primitive stock of mankind." Dr Caldwell says (*Thoughts on Unity of the Human Species*, Philadelphia, 1830, p. 72): "According to accredited dates, it is about 4179 years (in 1852, 4201 years) since Noah left the ark. He and his family are believed to have been of the Caucasian race. We shall assume this as a truth. But 3445 years ago (now 3467) a nation of Ethiopians is known to have existed. They were dark-skinned, very different from the Caucasian, and they settled near Egypt. Supposing that people to have been of the stock of Noah, the change must have been completed, and a new race formed in 733 years, and probably in a much shorter period.

"The recent discoveries in Egypt give additional force to the preceding statement, shewing that the Caucasian and negro races were as perfectly distinct in Egypt upwards of 4000 years ago as they are now. If, then, the Caucasian race was derived from the negro, or the negro from the Caucasian, by the action of external and natural causes, the change must have been effected in, at most, a thousand years; a theory which the subsequent experience of thirty centuries proves to be a physical impossibility: and we have already ventured to insist, that such a commutation could be effected by nothing short of a miracle." (P. 88.)

In this conclusion of Dr Morton we fully concur. The change into different races from one, could be effected by nothing short of a miracle; and by a miracle it was done, as we have shewn.

These considerations are strengthened by the facts stated in the *Ethnological Journal*, that in the tombs at Sakkara, so early as the 6th dynasty, more than B.C. 3000 years, the hieroglyphic name K U S H, the name for the negro, is found by Lepsius. (See *Ethnological Journal*, No. viii. p. 310.)

The author of this work has looked over the plates of the tombs in Lepsius' *Denkmähler*, but has not yet detected this name.

which the dispersion of mankind, as they are now found, over the face of the whole earth, would have been impracticable.

This view discovers to us a perfect consistency between the Bible statements and all the known facts of science; and it is in harmony with the entire system of truths and of doctrines pervading the whole Bible.

Man, wherever found, is one family; all men are sprung from one common original stock, notwithstanding the great variety of races now found among them. Such is the doctrine of the Bible. Are we here told that the several races of men are so widely separated by distinctive marks, which are invariably propagated by hereditary descent, and have been so propagated from the earliest times, as the monuments of Egypt, and the writings of the ancient classics shew; that *these races must be regarded as distinct species, and not mere varieties*—just as the lion, the panther, and the tiger, are so many distinct species of the great cat family; each species perfectly distinct, and invariably propagating its like; and that it is an axiom in natural history, that each species was in its *origin* distinct and separate, as now we see it? That consequently it would be contrary to the established laws of nature, had the several human species which are now perfectly distinct, all sprung from one common stock, and not had each its separate and distinct origin?

We answer, the objection thus urged is plausible, but not sound. *Man is an anomaly in the animal kingdom.* His counterpart cannot be found in the whole range of scientific investigation; and *an anomalous case cannot be properly subjected to the tests and the reasonings of other and ordinary cases.*¹

If the several races of men are distinguished by peculiarities in

¹ That man is an anomaly among the animated tribes of earth, naturalists themselves do feel; and this the deniers of the original unity of the human races do feel and virtually admit, when in reply to the argument for such unity derived from the production, now and then, of new varieties among the several species of inferior animals, they deny the analogy, and contend that the production of new varieties among the lower animals, does not prove that similar permanent and hereditary varieties have been produced by climate, diet, the lapse of time, &c., among men. And in this they are right. The analogy is not complete; man is not a mere animal; man is an anomaly in the animal kingdom.

“Now all these changes (says Dr Nott) we freely admit, but does this prove that physical causes have the same power to change man?” (Two Lectures, 1844, p. 21.)

This question implies the admission, “*Man is an anomaly.*”

each, as numerous, as great, and as strictly hereditary as those which separate the several distinct species in the animal kingdom, these races have also other, higher, more important, and more numerous *points of resemblance*, than are found among the several species of any kind of animals; resemblances that constitute a bond of union, a proof of *identity of nature* such as no class of animals can shew; resemblances, or rather an identity of nature, for which nothing can satisfactorily account but "*their genital connection by natural descent*" from a common origin. (Agassiz, p. 135.)

The powers of thought, of reasoning, of forecast, the faculty of speech, the whole class of moral emotions, together with the capacity for progressive improvement, distinguish human nature everywhere, "*eminently developed in civilized society, but which equally exist in the natural disposition of all human races. These capacities constitute a higher union among men*" (Agassiz, p. 120), and they defy all attempt to classify men as the mere brute animals may be classed.

Besides, it has hitherto been generally admitted that one mark of distinct species is found in a *strong repugnance to sexual connection between distinct species, and in the utter sterility of hybrids*. Rarely, indeed, are hybrids found among animals roaming at large. Among domesticated animals, hybrids are sometimes produced by artificial means; *e. g. mules, the offspring of the horse and the ass*. Now it is found, as a general rule, that *such hybrids are sterile*; they do not, and they cannot propagate the hybrid race, generally speaking.

Now it is undeniable that, in this respect, there is, at least, a wide difference between the several human races, and the species of irrational animals. In every part of the world, throughout the whole southern country of these United States, in every European colony and settlement among the dark races over the face of the earth, mixed breeds, persons, and families of mingled blood are found, and they are not observed to be perceptibly less fertile in their union with persons of mingled blood, or with persons of either of the original races, than are others. Nay, some writers declare that such mixed breeds are peculiarly fertile in their union. Assuredly infertility of hybrids, which is undeniably found applying to the species among

brute animals, cannot be predicated of the offspring of parents of different races in the human family, whatever may be found to be the case in particular instances in Mobile, or in New Orleans; and whatever confidence may be attached to the contrary opinion held by very respectable medical men, based on the fact, that occasionally Creole families in New Orleans die out, and leave no heir to their property. (See Dr Nott's Two Lectures, pp. 45-47.)

No sober-minded, unbiassed inquirer, who has no theory to maintain, can avoid discerning the failure, in this instance at least, of all attempts to prove that the races of men are distinct species.¹ If this were true in the proper sense of the word species, as used in natural history, there would be no ground for the remark made by Dr Nott, and often repeated by others, that "*probably a pure race of men cannot now be found on earth.*" (See Two Lectures, 1844, p. 28; also Review of Dr Bachman, pp. 10-15.)

The fertility or infertility of hybrids may not constitute an infallible test of species; but it is, generally speaking, a characteristic mark; and no one can fail to notice a *great difference* in this respect between the several races of man, and the several species of any one class of animals. Nowhere are found the lion, the tiger, the panther, &c. mixing freely, and their hybrid offspring amalgamating the several species by imperceptible degrees. But such constant mingling of the human races is everywhere palpable; the races melt the one into the other, and have done so in every age.

Here then, in one important point, is a difference between man and other animals amply sufficient, it may be contended, when viewed in connection with the higher nature common to all the varieties of men, to shew that *these varieties are not*, properly speaking, *specific*, and that all this diversity of type, propagated though it is by hereditary descent, is but like the characteristics of new varieties arising now and then among the inferior animals,

¹ On this point the accomplished anatomist, Johannes Müller, thus expresses himself: "The different races of mankind are forms of *one sole species*, by the union of two of whose members descendants are propagated. They are *not different species of a genus*, since in that case their hybrid descendants would remain unfruitful." (Cosmos, vol. i. p. 351.)

and is not at all inconsistent with identity of origin and community of descent from one primitive pair.¹

The general repugnance to sexual union manifested in the different species of brutes, shews the *design* of the Creator, that the species be preserved distinct and pure: in the brute races this end is attained. If the several races of men be species, this design at least has signally failed, for we are told that "*probably now not a pure race exists on earth.*"

This expression is perhaps too strong; but undeniably, the several races of men have extensively intermingled.²

On the views presented in this work, it is plain that no great weight can be attributed to the occasional appearance of new varieties among the several races of animals; nor yet upon the changes which have been observed to result, in some instances, in men as well as in lower animals, from climate, food, and peculiar treatment.

With those who attribute the diversity of races among men to these causes, operating through a long course of time, such cases are all important: but not on the theory advocated in this work.

Many interesting facts illustrative of these points are presented in the learned work of Dr Pritchard, vol. i. book ii. pp. 105-376; by Dr Bachman on the Unity, &c. chap. ii. iii. iv.; Dr Lawrence, sec. ii. chapters i. and ii. But all that these facts can serve to

¹ On this subject the learned Baron Humboldt thus writes: "So long as attention was directed solely to the extremes in varieties of colour and of form and to the vividness of the first impression of the senses, the observer was naturally disposed to regard races rather as originally different species, than as varieties. In my opinion, however, more powerful reasons can be advanced in favour of the unity of the human races." (Cosmos, vol. i. p. 852.)

The work entitled the "Unity of the Human Races," by Rev. Thomas Smythe, D.D. of Charleston, S. C. may be also consulted with great advantage. It is a work of great research, and replete with valuable information on the various points therein discussed; although in all the conclusions therein drawn, the author of these pages cannot concur. (See also Dr Bachman on the "Unity," chap. ii. iii. iv. and v. See also Dr Nott's Review of Dr Bachman, and consult Dr Morton's paper on "Hybridity as a Test of Species." See Pritchard, vol. i. book ii.)

² Says Dr Nott of Mobile, "Is there any example on the earth at the present day of two races living together without mingling?" (Physical History of Man, 1849, p. 28.)

The Editor of the London Ethnological Journal remarks (see No. iii. p. 129), "The primitive races no longer exist, rigorously speaking. All or nearly all the inhabitants of the earth are of mixed blood."

shew is, that the constitutional change effected by the intervention of God simultaneously with the confounding of language at Babel, and which issued in the speedy appearance of various races among men, is not an event altogether anomalous.

On the alleged intellectual inferiority of the dark races, and especially of the negro, too much stress has been laid as an argument for diversity of origin. An idiot is not the less a child of the same parents, on account of his inferiority to his more highly gifted brothers.

Nor do the facts that have been collected with great industry, and presented with much ingenuity by several writers in illustration of the ancient civilization of the dark races, carry that weight in this argument which those who adduce the facts seem inclined to attribute to them.¹

¹ See the curious and very interesting array of historical facts on this subject, presented by Dr T. Smythe, in "The Unity of the Human Races," chapters iii. iv. and v. pp. 46-84. See also Pritchard's Researches, vol. ii. p. 346, &c. Pickering on the Races, p. 319.

Some very curious and beautifully sculptured negro figures from Egypt, forcibly strike one in ranging through the Egyptian Halls of the Museum in the Louvre at Paris.

But the author has searched in vain throughout the plates and illustrations of the magnificent works of the Champollions, Rosellini, Birch, Wilkinson, Sharpe, Vase and Perring, Caillaud, Nestor de l'Hote, Prisse and Lepsius, including the "Tombs," &c. (which are all in his own library), to find the evidence of negro superiority, indicated in the remark of Dr Smythe in his Unity, &c. "The truth seems to be that the most ancient Egyptians really did have more or less of the peculiar characteristics of the negro race." (P. 64).

Of this negro character of the old Egyptians, the published copies of the Egyptian pictorial delineations shew no trace; none, at least, that is obvious to ordinary inspection. Negroes are often and very distinctly depicted at Ipsamboul, at Beit Oalli, at Thebes, &c. but generally as captives. There is also, in the portraits of the Pharaohs, occasionally a very palpable difference in the style of features, and sometimes in the complexion, though this last is not a token that can be relied on. These ancient paintings shew different families reigning at different periods, sometimes Nubians in feature, sometimes strictly Egyptians, almost Grecian in feature, but never anything clearly approaching to the negro. (See Champollion, Monumens de l'Egypte et de Nubie, Plates vol. i. Plate iii., which exhibits the portrait of Sesostris or Ramses III. that of his queen Nofré-Afri, and that of a princess his daughter.

Compare this plate with plate xi. representing the same Sesostris holding a group of captives, among whom are negroes and Asiatics, and one with the features of a Mongul, a Chinaman seemingly. These are delineated at Ipsamboul in Nubia. Negroes are delineated side by side with Egyptians, see Plates xv. xvi. xvii. Compare also the magnificent Plates xxxiv. and xxxv. with Plate xxxvii., where an entirely different

Whether negroes ever acted a distinguished part or not in India and in Egypt, as some conclude was the case, from the negro-featured sphynxes, &c. in Egypt, or in Nubia, and from the reputed negro

race is depicted; but they are not negroes, although their lips have a more than Jewish fulness.

In Plate xlix. are three portraits: that of Thouthmosis IV. of the eighteenth dynasty, supposed by Wilkinson and by Dr Eadie (see *Early Oriental History*, p. 85) to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus of Israel; that of Thouthmosis III. (the king Moeris of the eighteenth dynasty); and also that of Amenotph, or Amenophis II. also of the eighteenth dynasty. These are represented in a temple of Phrè, or of the Sun, at Amada in Nubia. The style of feature is different from that of Sesostris, but is still pure Caucasian. The monarch represented by the first of these last mentioned portraits, Thouthmosis IV. of the eighteenth dynasty (not of the eighth, as it is erroneously printed in my copy of Dr Smythe's book), is he whose queen, as Dr Pickering assures us (see his work on the Races of Man, p. 185), we have evidence to believe was a negress."

She was probably a Nubian, or an Ethiopian of a dark complexion. No instance of a negress, with the indications of royalty, appears on the monuments. (See Champollion, *Monumens, &c.* Plate lxxiii. vol. i. at Beit Oalli; and Plate lviii. bis. representing a series of portraits at Kalabsché. See also the portraits of queens in Plates cxxxix. cxxxx. and cxxxix. vol. iii. from the tombs of the queens at Thebes.)

There is, indeed, the head of Amenophis III. of the eighteenth dynasty, taken from the paintings adorning the tomb of that monarch at Thebes, which is given in Plate cxxxii. tom. iii. of Champollion's *Monumens, &c.* Of this head Champollion says (see his *Explication des Planches*, vol. iii. Plate cxxxii.) "Le type nègre domine en cette figure; la mère du prince était une Ethiopienne." The negro type predominates in this figure; the mother of the prince was an Ethiopian. The original painting has been transferred to the "Bibliothèque Royale" at Paris.

It must require a lively fancy to make out negro features in this head. Plate cclxvii. of Champollion presents two figures of Africans, quite black, and in a becoming dress. They seem to have been attendants on the court.

In Plates x. and xi. of the "*Monumens Egyptiens*" of Mon. E. Prisse, are two curious delineations. Of these, the one, that of Amounoph III. of the eighteenth dynasty, delineated in a temple at Karnak at Thebes, has more than the Hebrew fulness of lips given in Amenophis III. of Champollion (Plate cxxxii.) It has the thick lips and projecting under jaw of the negro. Yet it is far from a negro head. (See Pritchard, vol. ii. pp. 235, 236.) The oldest representation of negro features yet found by the writer, is in one of the plates of Lepsius's "*Denkmähler aus Egypten, &c.*" attributed by Lepsius to the twelfth dynasty.

The bride of Solomon, whose dark complexion may possibly be intimated in the "*Song of Solomon*," chap. i. vers. 5, 6, was probably an Egyptian princess, of a dark brunette complexion, and Arab features. Yet women are usually painted on Egyptian monuments of a much lighter hue than the men. (But see Champollion's *Monumens*, vol. i. Plate iii. also Plates xi. and xx. in the "*Auswahl, &c.*" of Lepsius, Leipzig, 1842.)

Many of the Arab, the Egyptian, and the Nubian women, to this day, when quite young, are dark (almost black, indeed) but comely. (Lane's *Manners and Customs of Modern Egyptians*, vol. i. p. 50.)

origin of the queen of one of the Pharaohs (Thouthmosis IV. of the eighteenth dynasty, see Pickering, p. 185), cannot materially affect the argument.

All the attributes of humanity appertain to the dark races as truly as to the white—to the negro, as to the Caucasian.

“His follies and his vices stamp him man.”—MONTGOMERY.

A great difference of intellect is sometimes noticed among members of the same family. Since the several races differ in features and in complexion, why may they not differ also in intellectual power and capacity, without detriment of their claim to a common origin? From time immemorial the negro has been an oppressed race, secluded from all elevating influences. Remove the pressure, and who shall say of what even the negro intellect shall not prove capable? Who shall say that there is not, even now in the unexplored heart of Africa, a civilisation and a refinement of its secluded negro population, entitled to rival that of the Mongolian race, the Malay, or even the Caucasian?¹ (See Pritchard's Researches, vol. ii. p. 346.)

Dr Pickering states that Egyptians, and others of the white race, are represented labouring in the fields, and never are negroes so represented. This is true; but it is also true that negroes are represented as captives, often as menials, and subordinates in public processions, but never as persons of rank and dignity; unless it be, possibly, in Champollion's Plate cclxvii. at Thebes, Biban-El-Molouk.

¹ It has been triumphantly asked, where are the arts, the civilisation, the literature of the negroes? What negro has ever written a page worth preserving? It is enough to say, in reply, the circumstances around him, invariably affect the character of man, whatever be his race.

The white race have ever occupied regions of the earth, where the soil, the climate, and all the influences around them, impelled to labour, to thought, to contrivance, for the promotion of comfort, yea even for the preservation of life. Hence the attention paid to agriculture, to the mechanic arts, to architecture, and to letters. If active and reflecting, he must improve, and civilisation follows. If supine in the regions he inhabits, the white man would speedily perish.

But the negro, what call is there for him to exert himself? Inhabiting chiefly tropical regions, clothing he needs not; a hut, which in a few hours he may construct, is all the habitation he requires, while the soil he treads, yields him spontaneously a superabundant supply of food, palatable and wholesome. Everything conspires to make the negro in his native wilds, indolent, rude, and ignorant, and to keep him so. And yet, from the reports brought by Clapperton and other travellers, it is not improbable, that even among the negroes in the interior of Africa, a civilisation indigenous and unique, but considerably advanced, has existed for ages.

Indication of strong sense, sound judgment, and an exquisitely vivid imagination, is not unfrequently observed among negroes of pure blood.

The writer of these pages, in intercourse with the negroes around him, of whom a goodly number are included in his pastoral charge, has often been forcibly struck with the clear perceptions, the active fancy, the eloquent thoughts, and the beautiful figures that mark the prayers and the exhortations delivered occasionally to their fellow-servants, by negroes of the fullest African type; sometimes by native-born Africans. But little more than an hour previous to the present moment (Tuesday, March 23, 1852), in conducting his weekly service among the blacks of his charge, the prayer uttered by a negro he called on to lead in devotion, a thoroughly uneducated negro, who cannot even read, chained his attention, and interested him exceedingly by its clearness of thought, boldness of original imagery, simple-hearted devotion, and perfect good taste throughout. The germs of a masterly eloquence are in that negro, and in more than one that the writer could designate here in Mobile.

Often in listening to the original and felicitous figures that leap as it were from the negro's heart in prayer, has the writer been reminded of that touching designation, which, as he has somewhere read, the Bushmen of South Africa apply to the Deity, "*The Beautiful.*"

Medical men do not come into immediate contact with the negro mind in its free and unembarrassed action, as does the minister of God's word.¹ (See Two Lectures, &c. 1849, pp. 31-33.)

¹ In October 1823, the author was examined by the Philadelphia Presbytery, and licensed, in company with three other candidates for the ministry, one of whom was Jeremiah Gloucester, a full-blooded negro, the son of a negro, who was the pastor of a coloured church in Philadelphia. Young Gloucester evinced good talents. He died early.

A few years afterwards a full-blooded negro preached more than once in the author's pulpit at Newark, N. J. On one of those occasions, a man of great intelligence, and who has since risen to some distinction as a political editor, was awakened under this negro preacher.

There are those now living at Harrisburg, Penn, who must recollect Peter Miller, as he was called, a black negro, a preacher, who visited that place about 1819. Miller proved himself a great rascal; but he was shrewd, sensible, and certainly, at times, eloquent.

Somewhere about the year 1828, while residing at Newark, N. J. when attending

That there is, in comparison with the white man, any essential inferiority of intellect native to the negro, the observation and experience of nearly thirty years of familiar intercourse with whites and with blacks, as a minister of religion (of which time nearly twenty years have been spent amid the negro population of the South), would never lead the writer to believe. A difference there certainly is in the intellectual character, as well as in the physical organization of the two races; but a decided and essential inferiority of the one to the other in point of intellect he cannot discern. A negro man, quite black, John Moore, late a communicant in the author's church, and but lately deceased, evinced as much pathos and originality of thought in prayer, and as much ingenuity and shrewd sense in reasoning from the Scriptures, as do nine tenths of the members of our white churches. In vividness of imagination, at least, the negro would seem rather to excel the white man.

It is, then, obvious to remark, that *corroboration is lent to the doctrine of the common origin of all men*, by the fact that all men, of all races, are capable of religion,—that *the religion of the Bible is adapted to all men*,—and that its effects on men of all the several races, when by them it is cordially embraced, are IDENTICAL.

the funeral of a young negro man, the son-in-law of Peter Pettit (an old negro servant of the family of Mr Hugh K. Toler, and who was long known as the driver and owner of a line of hacks then running between Newark and New York, long before a railroad was thought of), the writer of these pages found present a young negro man of good appearance and good address, a Mr Wright, a licensed preacher, and invited him to address the company assembled, who were almost exclusively negroes. After some hesitation, modest but perfectly unaffected, the invitation was accepted; and a more appropriate and a more touching address the author has seldom heard from any minister, white or black. Wright was a very dark negro, but an educated man, trained in Princeton Seminary, where he was greatly respected for his good talents, good sense, and modesty. If yet living, he ought by this time to be a preacher of great merit.

One other instance only will be here mentioned. Somewhere about May 1840, on a steamer on the Delaware River, the author fell in with a black negro, unknown to him, and never met with since. Abolitionism was the topic of discussion. That negro maintained a long argument with several gentlemen around him; he vindicated the claim of the negro to full equality with the white man, both intellectually and morally, and he boldly took the ground, that the negro is the *original type of the human race*, and that the white man and the red are but degenerated varieties of the negro.

The argument he conducted with great tact and ability, evincing a ready wit, clear perceptions, and considerable information. Few men could acquit themselves better in oral discussion than did that genuine negro.

The illustration of this point might fill volumes.

Find man where you will, and be he black or white, tawny, olive-complexioned, or red, he has his religious system, the alleged cases in exception notwithstanding.

Moreover, to ALL the Gospel is adapted. It appeals to principles that are common to all and inherent in each—principles which appertain to man alone, and which distinguish him immeasurably above the highest of the lower animals.

Moreover, wherever the religion of the Bible is embraced, its practical operation is the same. In persons totally unapprized of the nature of its influence upon others, it produces the same effects as in all others. It arrests attention; it produces deep solicitude, under a sense of personal demerit; a simple-hearted trust in the promises of mercy through a Redeemer; a grateful, and sometimes a most triumphant joy in the full belief of pardon obtained, and reconciliation with heaven effected: a warm affection for all who can be deemed good people; and an intense desire to see others embracing the same happy religion. This identity of effect on persons of the most widely differing character, tastes, and even races, is manifested in every time of increased religious interest at the South. It is amply testified in the records of almost every missionary station in the whole heathen world.

Often has the writer been struck with the identity of religious influence in persons the most unlike. The accomplished lawyer, the skilful physician, the refined lady of finished education, and the negro servants that wait behind their chairs at table, are sometimes seen together earnestly pondering their prospects for eternity: and though, in some cases, previously ignorant, all and equally, of the process through which the minds of others have been led in the same pursuit, each of them is affected substantially as the other; alarmed, sorrowing under conscious unworthiness, absorbed in prayer, faintly trusting, joyfully confident, very solicitous to be made pure, and greatly desirous to induce others to secure the same heavenly peace.

All these facts, occurring every year and almost every day, and occurring at every point on earth where the genuine teachings of the Bible are promulgated, argue identity of nature in all men; and they well comport with, and strongly corroborate, the doc-

trine, that all men, no matter what their complexion or their race, sprang originally from one and the same stock. These facts seem utterly inconsistent with the idea of diversity of origin.

The records of Christian missions within the last half-century furnish a full refutation of the objection which has been urged against the unity of the human races, on the ground of incapacity in the dark races to appreciate the elevating influences of Christianity. Thus, says Dr Nott (*Two Lectures, &c.* 1849, p. 17), "Our religion, once so widely spread in Northern Africa, disappeared with the Roman sword which protected it; and it needs not the inspiration of a prophet to foretell that the religion of Christ can never be comprehended and adopted by African¹ races, so long as their physical type remains unchanged. What has been the result of missions to Africa, to China, to India, to the American Indians, &c. ? Much as we may lament such a result, it would seem as if these philanthropic efforts, so far from producing good fruits to the dark races, in the main do more harm than good. The dark races borrow the vices, but never the virtues of the white man," &c. &c.

In this passage, the direct bearing of Christianity² on the individual recipient, and its incidental results in refining and elevating society, are confounded. Of the former, the writer appears to be entirely unconscious: hence the latter only does he notice. But even of the latter influence flowing from Christianity on the dark races, the history of Christian missions in the isles of the great Pacific, at some stations in India, and among several aboriginal tribes of our own western forests, not to mention the negroes of the South, yields ample illustration.

If the dark races borrow the vices of the irreligious white colonists and traders, that results, not from the attempt to Christianize them, but from the total absence of discreet efforts to that end. Where the white race has approached the dark in the true

¹ Dr Nott must here have forgotten that, in other places, he himself contends stoutly (and with justice and truth) for the Caucasian origin of the tribes of Northern Africa. (See *Two Lectures*, 1844, pp. 12, 16, and 35, 36. See also Professor Agassiz, *The Christian Examiner* for July 1850, p. 134. See Morton's *Crania Americana*, p. 22-31. See Pickering on the Races, the map.)

² On the capacity of the negro, and other dark races, to derive benefit from Christianity, see some excellent remarks in Pritchard's *Researches*, vol. i. book ii. chap. i. p. 212.

spirit, and bearing the teachings of Christianity, the dark races do learn the virtues of the Christian white man, *assert the contrary who may*. The statistics of Christian missions at several stations show a greater annual increase to the churches there organized, than is gained by a large proportion of the churches in this Christian land. (See *Missionary Herald* for several years past.)

The incapacity of the dark races to appreciate the elevating influences of Christianity, is a position not borne out by the facts in the case.

Dispassionately examined with all the facts in the case, the alleged inferiority of the dark races as to intellect, or as to capacity for religious influence and moral improvement, presents nothing inconsistent with the doctrine of a common origin for all the races of mankind.

Further, this doctrine of a common origin is borne out, and strongly corroborated by *the traditions everywhere prevailing among men*.

On this point all the traditions and the systems of cosmogony found among the ancient Egyptians, the Chaldæans, the Hindoos, the Chinese, and even among the barbarous tribes of America, both north and south (see on this point Lecture VI. of this work, on Creation, and the authorities there adduced), have a direct bearing, as corroborative evidence.

But especially the ampler traditions of a mighty deluge, and of the preservation of only one family from that catastrophe, and the descent of all these widely dispersed tribes, which preserve these similar traditions, from that one family so preserved (see in this work Lectures IX. and X. on the Deluge), are directly and strongly corroborative of the common origin of all the races of men from one primitive pair. If the doctrine of a diversity of origin for the several races of men be admitted, then the existence of all these harmonizing traditions among tribes of men so widely dispersed, and totally unconnected in manners, religion, language, and modes of thought, as well as by their widely separated countries, is totally inexplicable. These numerous and wonderfully accordant traditions¹ may, of themselves, almost compel a belief in a common origin for all men.

¹ For a copious selection from these ancient traditions, embodying the chief facts of

See, for instance, the tradition found among the Iroquois Indians of this country: they believe that the first woman was seduced from her obedience to God, and that, in consequence of it, she was banished from heaven. She afterwards bore two sons: one of them attacked and slew the other. More children afterwards sprang from the same woman, who were the ancestors of mankind. (Mœurs des Sauvages, quoted by Faber in his Origin of Pagan Idolatry, vol. ii. p. 38.)

Sir William Jones asserts: "We might produce from the Puranas themselves, and even from the Veda, which appears to stand next in antiquity to the five books of Moses, the same account of the creation and fall, expressed by symbols very nearly similar." (Asiat. Researches, vol. iii. p. 425.)

The tower of Babel is mentioned by several ancient Greek writers, Herodotus, Strabo, Diodorus. The confusion of tongues the ancient Greeks attributed to the anger of Saturn. (Plato in Politico. Philo de Confus. Ling. Jacob Bryant, Mythol. vol. iv. p. 100. Clarkson's Researches. See also Dr Redford, Scrip. Verified, p. 157.)

Mr Burke, of the London Ethnological Journal, says: "The fundamental fables of all the mythologies reach back to an extremely remote period." Again: "Not only is there a close connection between the mythologies and religious views of all the ancient centres of civilization, but this connection also extends to their arts, sciences, social institutions, and languages" (p. 151). Again (p. 152), this author remarks: "We are led to the conclusion, that *all ancient civilization must have sprung from some common centre.*"

the early Mosaic history, see Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge, vol. i. p. 29, &c.; Faber's Origin of Pagan Idolatry, vol. i. pp. 200, 206, 208, also vol. ii. chap. iv. pp. 106 124; Faber's Horæ Mosaicæ, chap. iv.; Sumner's Records of Creation: Tompkins' Hulsean Prize Essay, 1849, p. 91.

William Von Humboldt says: "The separate mythical traditions found to exist independently of one another, in different parts of the earth, appear to refute the hypothesis of an original gregarious condition of mankind (the very hypothesis of Agassiz), and they concur in ascribing the generations of the whole human race to the union of one pair.

* The general prevalence of this myth has caused it to be regarded as a traditionary record transmitted from the primitive man to his descendants." (Cosmos, vol. i. p. 355.)

Hamilton Smith says (*Natural History of the Human Species*, p. 176): "In high Asia we find the legends of Europe extant in their sources." Again (p. 170), he remarks: "The Hindoo diluvian Titan is clearly the snowy group at the sources of the Ganges. In this high region are the localities commemorative of traditions more than once repeated, at successive more distant stages, in proportion as the earliest nations moved further from *their original common centre*, or mythical tales spread onwards with time. There is Natabundana, perhaps Dhawalaghiri, where the patriarch god himself, in the form of Kapila, conducted the ark, and secured it to the rock, according to Hindoo lore; and, on the north, where the Tahtar legend places Natagli, the boatman god of the mountain, with his family, in one of the peaks of Altai; for it is not a fact which always marks a pagan source, as has been remarked, when man's existence is made to commence after the diluvian cataclysis. There is constantly a *record* of antecedent existence, though *not a history*, among early nations. It is variously told, but not the less the same in substance, in both hemispheres, and in the South Sea Islands" (p. 171).

Again, remarks the same writer: "There cannot be a doubt, that with scarce an opposable circumstance, all man's historical dogmatic knowledge and traditionary records, all his acquirements, inventions, and domestic possessions point to Central Asia as the locality connected with a great cataclysis, and as the scene where human development took its first most evident distribution" (p. 171).

Humboldt mentions a similar tradition of a great deluge, as prevailing among the rude tribes on the Orinoco in South America.

The tradition among the Tamanacs further relates that "a man and a woman, with a canoe, saved themselves upon a high mountain called Tamanacu, and that throwing behind them, over their heads, the fruit of the *Mauritia* palm, they saw, arising from the nuts of these palms, men and women, who reseeded the earth." Here, among the savages of South America, is a fable similar to that of Pyrrha and Deucalion, commemorating the grand catastrophe of a general inundation.

"These ancient traditions of the human race" (says Hum-

boldt), "which we find dispersed over the surface of the globe, like the fragments of a vast shipwreck, are of the greatest interest in the philosophical study of our species. Like certain families of plants which, notwithstanding the diversity of climates and the influence of heights, retain the impress of a common type, so the traditions respecting the primitive state of the globe, present among all nations a resemblance that fills us with astonishment: so many different languages, belonging to branches which appear to have no connection with each other, transmit the same facts to us. The substance of the traditions respecting the destroyed races and the renovation of nature is everywhere almost the same, although each nation gives it a local colouring. In the great continents, as in the smallest islands of the Pacific Ocean, it is always on the highest and nearest mountains that the remains of the human race were saved: and this event appears so much the more recent the more uncultivated the nations are." (*Humboldt's Travels and Researches*, pp. 190-192.)

This last named circumstance necessarily results from the distinctness with which the facts are carefully handed down by tradition, while the rude tribes have no clear ideas of number or duration. Humboldt found also strange symbolical figures and hieroglyphic inscriptions high on the rocks near the Orinoco, commemorative of this event (p. 191).

Dr Redford (*Scrip. Verif.* p. 113) remarks: "The evidence on this subject is both universal and complete; the harmony in the traditions of all nations, in all parts of the earth, is such as could have arisen only from the fact itself. There are no conflicting traditions among either the ancients or the moderns. They all embody but one story" (p. 113).

Baron Cuvier thus argues from these traditions: "Could the traditionary ideas of nations who possessed almost no natural affinities, whose language, religion, and laws had nothing in common, could they all conspire to one point, did not truth bring them together?"

It is plain that Moses could not have known that these traditions did exist, and would continue to exist and be handed down among men everywhere, and so adapt his history to the traditions. That is utterly impossible. It is equally plain that all the nations and tribes on earth have not gathered the materials for these tradi-

tions from the books of Moses; for, to nearly all these nations these books are still unknown. There is no possibility of accounting for the stubborn facts in this case, but by admitting the truth of the Deluge as literally universal, and the rescue from that deluge of one family alone, as Moses relates, and as these traditions all unanimously declare; but if so, then all the different races now on earth have one common origin; they are, without one solitary exception, descended from the one family which alone survived the Deluge in the days of Noah.

Sir W. Jones in a discourse on the "Origin and Families of Nations," thus argues:¹ "That *Nature*, of which simplicity appears a distinguishing attribute, *does nothing in vain*, is an axiom in philosophy. But *it is vain and superfluous to do by many means what may be done by fewer*. We must not, therefore, as says the great Newton, *admit more causes of natural things than those which are true, and sufficiently account for natural phenomena*. But it is true

¹ Asiatic Researches, vol. iii. p. 420.

Mr Cony in the Introductory Dissertation, prefixed to his learned "Ancient Fragments," remarks: "Mr Faber, in his admirable work on the Pagan Idolatry, has collected and separately examined all the different systems of the heathen mythologies; and has shewn, that there is such a singular, minute, and regular accordance among all these systems, not only in what is *obvious and natural*, but also in what is *arbitrary and circumstantial*, both in *fanciful speculations and in artificial observances*," as to render untenable every other hypothesis than this, "that they must have all originated from some common source," (p. vi.)

• In the same manner (says Mr Cony, p. vii.) we may ascertain the region from which mankind originally dispersed; and from the testimonies of Egypt, India, and Phœnicia, no less than from Greeco, respecting the grand events of primeval history, the birth and achievements of their gods and heroes, the Deluge, the origin of arts, and the civilisation of mankind, taking only such as are substantiated by the concurrent testimony of the rest, it may be shewn, independently of Scripture, that the primitive settlements of mankind were in such places, and attended with such *circumstances* as the Scripture instructs us was the case, (p. vii.)

In the remains of Phœnician history by Sanconiatho, who wrote in the old Phœnician, and who is supposed to be the oldest writer of the heathen world, we have much that is valuable.

In the *Generations*, the first contains an allusion to the fall; and the second to Cain. In the Chaldæan fragments of *Berosus*, the Babylonian, is much that is curious.

Berosus has given a full and accurate description of the Deluge, which is wonderfully consonant with the Mosaic accounts, (p. xiii.)

The Fragment of Nicolaus Damascenus relates also to the Deluge, the ark, and its resting upon Mount Ararat. (Cony's Ancient Fragments, Introd. Diss. p. xiii.)

A full account of the tower at Babel is also given in *Berosus* from Abydenus, (pp. 34, 35.)

that one pair at least of every living species must have been at first created; and that one human pair was sufficient for the population of our globe in a period of no considerable length (on the very moderate supposition of lawyers and political arithmeticians, that every pair of ancestors left, on an average, two children, and each of them two more), is evident from the rapid increase of numbers in geometrical progression, so well known to those who have ever taken the trouble to form a series of so many terms as they suppose generations of men in two or three thousand years. It follows, therefore, that the author of nature created, but one pair of our species; yet had it not been for the desolations occasioned by water and fire, earthquakes, war, famine and pestilence, the earth would not now have had room for its multiplied inhabitants. (*Asiatic Researches*, vol. iii. p. 420.)

Reason, tradition, and the Mosaic record do, then, all combine to assure us that all men of all the different races now existing have originated from one primitive pair.

Another argument for the oneness of man's origin is derived from the very *early spread of civilisation*.

Many writers seem to suppose that man originated in barbarism, and by a long and tedious process gradually improved himself, until he became civilised; and that, therefore, the antediluvians and the early nations after the flood must have been little better than savages. If mankind originated in separate and far distant localities, the several races would have long continued separate, and without intercourse one with another, and barbarism might have long prevailed. But if mankind were all of one stock, the antediluvians would have had constant intercourse one with another; and the original perfection of the nature which the Mosaic narrative leads us to believe was conferred on man, would produce the arts and refinements of civilised life at a very early period. And this the Mosaic history of antediluvian times seems necessarily to imply. (See *Gen.* chap. iv.) The construction of the ark by Noah, implies a very advanced state of knowledge and of the arts of life. This knowledge and skill in the mechanic arts, we cannot suppose would be lost among the descendants of Noah. The probability is, that great and rapid improvements would everywhere be made. The attempt to erect a lofty tower at Babel corroborates this supposition. The same attention to

the arts, to building, carpentry, the working in metals (which implies a knowledge of mining, of chemistry, of mathematics), would be carried with them by the separate branches of the Noachian family, in their migrations to the several regions where they finally settled. Hence we can account for the abundant evidence of early civilisation, even from the remotest times, in nearly all countries on the face of the globe.

Thus in the *Ethnological Journal* we read (p. 152): "The earliest historical traditions date their origin, not from periods of barbarism, but from periods of high civilisation. Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, was a great conqueror. Some of his immediate successors are stated to have built pyramids, and such like mighty works."

Again (p. 154), "That a high degree of civilisation existed in times long anterior to the commencement of regular history, is a position which cannot be much longer denied. It was not by barbarians that the pyramids, temples, and other vast works of Africa were erected. The cave temples¹ of India are the remnants of a civilisation whose memory has wholly perished; while neither the traditions nor history of Italy² and Greece enable us

¹ For an account of the cave temples of India, see Pickering on the Raees, p. 349, &c.; also Elliot's *India*, *passim*; *Recollections of Northern India*, by Buyers, chapters vii. viii. and xvii.; Forbes' *Eleven Years in Ceylon*, vol. i. chap. vii. viii. ix. x. and vol. ii. Appendix. See also in *l'Univers Pittoresque*, "Inde, par MM. Dubois de Jancigny et X. Raymond," plates 19-34 inclusive, and the description in the body of the work.

² For the remains of ancient art in Italy, consul Pritchard's *Researches*, vol. iii. chap. iv.; Mrs H. Gray's *Etruria*, and Lepsius, "*Chronologie der Egypter*," p. 2.

Lepsius says: "The only way in which we can hope to arrive at correct views of the history of Greece and Italy, from a period which has been generally abandoned to mythology beyond the limits of history, is by combined efforts in archæological research among the monumental remains of those remote times. The fantastic-rich world of art of the Pelasgic pre-Etruscan age, the primitive medal system (Muntz system) of the primitive Italian populations, and the fragments of sculpture, the vases, and varied remains of art from the ruins and the environs of Mycene, Troy, and other cities, once flourishing in heroic times, and disappearing with them, the tombs, aqueducts (or fountains), with stone vaults (arches), from a time anterior to the invention of the concentric arch—which are found all over Italy, Greece, and Asia Minor—loom up like monuments of stone and metal, above the misty sea of ever varying fable, and may now be esteemed as historical monuments, because they represent historic circumstances.

"But (adds our learned author) even the utmost limits of Greek antiquity can hardly be extended beyond the Homeric times; and in the antiquity of Rome, not higher than that of the latest kings." (*Chronologie der Egypter*, p. 2. See also Richardson's *Geology*, p. 90; Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, p. 708.)

even to conjecture who were the nations that erected their Cyclopean buildings. (See Lepsius. Chronologie der Egypter, p. 2 .) Even in the New World, the kingdoms destroyed by the Spaniards were founded on the ruins of far mightier empires, whose shattered works speak of a condition and a power rivalling in greatness and in antiquity that of Egypt itself."

Again, this writer says: "The further back we remount into ancient times, the more do we find the vestiges of their power, the more pure and elevated the traditions of their philosophy."

Again, he remarks, p. 157: "The mythologies and primeval traditions of all enlightened, and even of the most barbarous tribes, are fundamentally the same. Everywhere we find certain singular coincidences in customs, opinions, language, &c. *which, the more fully they are developed, the more clearly are they found to point to a common source.*"

The learned Dr Tholuck says: "That a higher condition of the human race has preceded the lower is a truth which, at all times, by the profoundest men, has been acknowledged." (See Neander's Denkwürdig Reiten, vol. i. p. 234; Obs. note 1.)

All this accords precisely to the universal tradition, that a golden, a silver, a brass, and an iron age, have succeeded each other in the history of mankind. (See Heeren's Asia, vol. i. chap. ii. pp. 311, 333, 363, 366.)

Tompkins, in his Hulsean Prizo Essay, 1840, affirms: "The theory that the human race has emerged from a state of proper barbarism, may be safely considered as exploded, and that on purely scientific grounds.

"Researches into the physical history of man have gone hand in hand with investigations of his language, at once extensive and minute; and both have tended to prove beyond all reasonable doubt, in the first place, that at least all those nations with whose literature and religion we are best acquainted, *must have had a common origin.* But the same investigations shew that, so far from having ascended, in the course of ages, from an almost brutal type to his present condition, the general course of things has been the reverse. *Even of the African tribes it has been shewn they have sunk to their present low grade within historic times.*"¹ (P. 24.)

¹ Pickering, in his valuable work on the races, suggests the idea that Africa was

Again, this writer remarks: "Wherever ancient monuments remain to shew the earlier type of nations now both physically and morally debased, they invariably prove that that type approached a standard of a higher order" (p. 26.) We must, therefore, either assume an eternal existence of a human society, or a point of time in which God himself brought into existence the human being already trained in his present relations of life.

Now the Bible tells us that man has fallen from his original dignity; yet he brought with him, into his fallen state, many high qualifications and powers from that more happy time. *If it were not so, the most important appearances of the most ancient history would be inexplicable.* The facts meeting our view in evidence of a high civilization in almost every country, long anterior to historic times, and anterior even to tradition, go directly to illustrate the truth of the Mosaic doctrines as to the early condition of society, and also as to the descent of all varieties of men from one common stock, originally very elevated, both intellectually and morally, though subsequently degraded morally, without having lost entirely the high faculties originally conferred on the primitive stock. There are too many points of resemblance among all the great subdivisions of the human family (a resemblance approximating to identity of character and of powers), to leave room for the supposition that the several races of men could, by any possibility, have had each an independent origin, at so many separate and far distant points.

Finally, *the languages of mankind afford evidence amounting to demonstration, that all the now differing races of men must have had a common origin.*

the original centre of the earth's population, and that from that region the several settlements of mankind were sent forth. Dr Pickering produces some striking considerations in support of his theory. (See his work, p. 306.)

It is a curious and interesting fact, though not much noticed by writers on these subjects, that Eratosthenes, himself an African, a native of the Greek colony of Cyrene, and who was, probably without exception, the most learned man of all the ancients, possessed of more extensive information than Aristotle himself, and who was also the preceptor of the celebrated geographer Strabo, when tracing the connection between Southern Africa and its native tribes, with Asia towards India, and with the Egyptians, asserts (as Strabo himself informs us), "The four principal races of South Africa have not only a well-regulated monarchical institution, but also stately temples and royal palaces; the beams in their houses are arranged like those of the Egyptians." (Strabo, xvi. c. iv. See also Bunsen, Egypt's Place, &c. vol. i. pp. 119, 120.)

This point has been so ably argued by Dr Wiseman, a learned dignitary of the Romish hierarchy, in his Twelve Lectures on the connection between Science and Revelation (see Lectures i. and ii. vol. i.), that but little is left for fresh explorers in the same field.

Whoever considers the nature of language, the philosophical character of its structure, even in languages of the rudest tribes, must be satisfied that language, like reason, is a divine gift, a sort of inferior inspiration from the Almighty.

That men should have *invented* the languages they speak is simply *a sheer impossibility*; as a little reflection will shew. Like thought it is natural to man; like his physical frame it is of complicated structure, yet diversified as are the complexions of men who speak it. It is found, also, to accord in many of its characteristics to the peculiar disposition and temperament of those who speak it.

If, in anything relating to man, the controlling influence of the One Supreme Mind is manifested, it is in the nature, the characteristics, the logical structure of language as such, and in the wonderful variety of forms, varying with the varying characteristics of those who speak it; and yet evincing the power of fundamental principles, common to all languages. The striking identity, in unison with an endless variety, is in perfect accordance with the identity of human nature itself, in all the numerous varieties of man.

If originally one family, as Moses relates, man must have spoken, at first, but one primitive tongue. If so, then, whatever changes may have been subsequently wrought on languages, still, amid all the diversified classes of spoken languages and dialects, some fundamental principles of structure, some organic materials, the evidence of a common origin, may be expected to present themselves in all languages: and such precisely is the fact. The question, "*Were all human languages originally one?*" is replete with interest, and has occasioned most laborious research by men of the very highest talent. On this question Dr Redford thus forcibly writes (see his *Scrip. Verified*, p. 159):

"This is a question which has been long and laboriously treated, and until late years with an aspect far from favourable towards the Mosaic record. The course of inquiry seemed to prove that the immense differences existing among the languages

of the world, could never have arisen out of a common or parent stock ; but as these inquiries have advanced, and become matured, unsuspected affinities have been discovered, and fragments of some original tongue have appeared everywhere traceable, as supplying common elements to them all.

“ Moreover, it has been determined by these researches, that as each class of languages is marked by affinities with other classes, and these affinities bear no trace of being descended lineally from each other, but to be independent branches from a common stock or root ; the conclusion is naturally and necessarily drawn, that, *at one period, there existed only that one form of language*, which has communicated these common elements to all, and which so identify and concentrate them, as to make it next to impossible that they should have had independent and original formations of their own. The differences are not great enough to necessitate independent originations, and the resemblances are too striking to comport with any theory but that of a common source. So that the strictly philological controversy may now be said to have deprived the unbeliever of all right to question this one part of the Mosaic statement.”

Even those who, like Klaproth, entertain no reverence for the sacred history, still accede to the theory of *a single primitive tongue*. Referring to his own researches, the celebrated Klaproth says, “ The universal affinity of language is placed in so strong a light, that it *must be considered by all as completely demonstrated*. This (the affinity) appears inexplicable on any other hypothesis than that of admitting *fragments of a primary language* to exist through all the languages of the old and new world.” (“ Asia Polyglotta.” Vorrede, s. ix.)

Frederic Schlegel, Paravey, Mérian, Humboldt, Herder, and all the most eminent linguists and philosophers have come to the same conclusion.

The celebrated philologist, Count de Gebelin, expressed his decided opinion, thirty or forty years ago, in the “ History of Languages,” published originally in his great work, “ Le Monde primitif analysé,” 9 vol. 4to. that “ *all existing languages are derived from one.*”

Herder, though no believer in the inspiration of Moses, is yet

as clear and strong upon this point as we could wish. He says : "As the human race is a progressive whole, the parts of which are intimately connected, so must language form also a united whole, *dependent upon a common origin.* There is a great probability that the human race, and language therewith, go back to a common stock, to a first man, and not to several, dispersed in different parts of the world." He even infers, that mankind must, in the first instance, have been "*widely and suddenly divided.*" (Pp. 160, 161.)

Abel Remusat, the learned author of "Researches into the Tartar Languages," admits that "beyond the epoch when profane history ceases, there was a confusion (of tongues) which gave rise to them all, and which such vain attempts have been made to explain," (p. 161.)

The editor of the London Ethnological Journal (p. 155), remarks : "It is not only in civilized and partially civilized countries that we find traces of the old religions and mythologies. We are perpetually startled by their occurrence when investigating the superstitions of the most remote and barbarous tribes. In Europe and Asia, we meet them among the northern Fins and Laplanders, and Samoides, and Ostiacks, and Tongonsi; we meet them in New Zealand, and in numerous other islands of the Pacific, and we meet them in the wilds of North America. And wherever we meet them, we also meet *numerous words derived from the very languages* to which the antique civilizations can be traced."

Again, on pp. 151 and 152 of the same journal, occurs this passage : "When we select from a multitude of dialects the words which have immediate relation with religion, art, learning, and civilization in general, we are struck with surprise at the unexpected affinities which present themselves between languages, in many respects the most different. When we next reduce to their ^{primitive} elements these similar words, by dividing those that are obviously compound, and stripping verbs and nouns of their prefixes and terminations, we bring the greater part of them into three or four classes, each immediately related to one or other of the ^{primeval} languages of the ancient world, while these languages are all found to be connected together by numerous affinities."

The *early* opinion of the distinguished scholar and historian Niebuhr was opposed to the doctrine of a violent and miraculous confusion of tongues; but his later and more matured judgment is given *in favour* of the Mosaic account. He says: "This fallacy escaped detection among the ancients, probably because they admitted several distinct races of mankind. They who deny these (distinct races), and go back to a single pair, *must*, to account for the existence of idioms different in structure, SUPPOSE A MIRACLE; and, for those languages which differ in roots and essential qualities, adhere to that of '*the confusion of tongues.*' The admission of such a miracle offends not reason, since, as the remains of the ancient world clearly shew, that, before the present, another order of life existed, so it is certainly credible that this lasted entire after the commencement, and underwent, at some period, an essential change." (See his History of Rome. See also Redford, pp. 162, 163.)

These testimonies are of the more importance, since they come from philosophers, nearly all of whom are unfriendly to revelation. They clearly establish the fact of *an original unity of speech*.

But the demonstrated unity of speech is of itself a strong proof of the original unity of all the human races—their descent from one common primitive stock. The original unity of all languages being *thus* established, the truth of the Mosaic account of the confusion of tongues at Babel, may be thus argued. If there was at first one only language spoken on earth, while yet in the remotest periods of which historic records or traditions have reached us, many various languages were already spoken, then it is plain, from the slowness with which languages now change, notwithstanding all the numerous sources of corruption and admixture, the occurrence of some sudden and anomalous event that speedily broke men off into distinct bands, and effectually changed their language, becomes highly probable.

Since we now find that, notwithstanding all the changes effected by national convulsions, and the mingling of foreign words and strange dialects, the Saxon tongue has remained essentially unchanged for 2000 years—the Arabic is unchanged by the lapse of time—and even the modern Italian is, as to its main and essential points, the very Latin of the Roman dominion—and

since, moreover, we know that radically different languages were spoken among different branches of the human family within a few centuries after the flood, there *was not time* for the one primitive language to branch off into several languages *naturally*, and under the ordinary influences now operating, because no foreign languages originally existed to furnish the means of intermixture with it, and corruption of it. *The change must then have been sudden; and if sudden, it must have been miraculous, which is precisely what Moses teaches.*

From sources the most unexpected and the most diverse, we thus find evidence springing up of the truth of the several teachings of the books of Moses.

The doctrine of the unity of the human species, of the common descent of all the several races of mankind, however widely differing among themselves, from one primitive pair, the origin of the whole population of the globe, is not, it must be confessed, unattended with difficulties, physiologically considered, and some naturalists of eminence demur to this doctrine; but these difficulties, when calmly considered, sink into insignificance before the varied and overwhelming proofs which go to establish the original unity of the races.

The doctrine of diversity of human races contemplates man as only an animal. That doctrine rests much on a mere assumption of a point questionable at the best. It overlooks the fact, that in one important characteristic of species the varieties of men are not specific in the full sense in which species are distinguished in the lower animals; the varieties of men intermingle freely, and their offspring are not sterile, as is the case normally among lower animals. That theory overlooks the many weighty points in which as intellectual, speech-using, and conscience-possessing beings, capable of indefinite progress and improvement, all the human races present points of resemblance and almost of identity, which throw at an unapproachable distance from them all, even the highest orders of the inferior creation, rendering a classification of man on principles adapted only to the brutes, inapplicable, inappropriate, and therefore unphilosophical. That theory involves also the disregard of an admitted axiom in philosophy, which forbids the introduction of more causes than are needed to account

for the effect, since the known laws of increase will readily admit the population of the globe as now from one original human pair. From all these circumstances, naturalists of eminence have rejected, on purely scientific grounds, the doctrine of diversity of races, and have maintained the original identity of all the races of men.

Besides all this, the ablest advocates of diversity of races have utterly failed in all their attempts to reconcile their theory with the teachings of revelation. They are compelled to use the word *species* with at least a modified meaning in their philosophical reasonings; and they are compelled also to put, upon several passages of holy writ, an interpretation novel, unnatural, and absolutely untenable. Their theory is also utterly in defiance of the facts of ancient history; it bids defiance to the earliest traditions everywhere current among the most widely separated nations; and it is absolutely disproved and refuted by the results of the most extensive and thorough researches of philologists, who almost to a man, even though contrary to their previous bias and their hostility to revelation, are compelled to admit all languages shew proof of derivation from one primitive tongue, and all mankind must have sprung from one original stock.

Against all these facts, the doctrine of diverse races is in direct opposition. It is also in contradiction of revelation; it is at variance with the facts of the Mosaic history, with the general spirit and teachings of the prophets, and it is utterly inconsistent with the whole plan of salvation through a Redeemer connected by birth with the human race, who was the second Adam, sent to recover and to save the degraded and imperilled progeny of the Adam who sinned in Eden, and none others. The doctrine of the one origin of all the races of man as descendants of Adam, and as such contemplated in the salvation of the Gospel, is alone consistent with the whole Bible, with all the plain facts of science, fairly examined side by side with the evidences of a nature common to all the races of men, and infinitely above that of the lower animals. This doctrine alone comports with the facts of ancient history, the traditions preserved among all nations pointing to a common origin, with the early civilisation, vestiges of which are found in all the countries of the earth; and this doctrine of unity

is sustained by evidence that amounts to demonstration, by the clearest deductions of the ablest philologists of all countries and of all creeds.

In view of this array of corroborative evidence for the original unity of the races of men, the difficulties and objections that rest on physiological grounds may well be set aside as of little weight; and these, in all probability, derive their force from the limitations of our knowledge, and will gradually disappear as human knowledge extends. If any position may be deemed certain and demonstrated, it would seem that the Original Unity of all the varieties of the human family may be so deemed; and thus in this, another and an important point, like as in relation to the Creation and the Deluge, the accuracy of Moses as a historian,¹ and his authority as an inspired penman, are signally illustrated from history, and corroborated by science itself. Well then might the learned Adrien Balbi affirm, "No monument, either historical or astronomical, has yet been able to prove the books of Moses false; but with them on the contrary agree, in the most remarkable manner, the results obtained by the most learned philologues, and the profoundest geometricians."

William Von Humboldt tell us, "The comparative study of languages shews us that races now separated by vast tracts of land are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat." He tells us, that even now, one long chain of kindred tongues, the Indo-Germanic languages, extends from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, and from Sicily to the North Cape; yea, that a period existed when the *whole family of mankind was, in the strictest sense of the word, to be regarded as one living whole.* (Cosmos, vol. ii. p. 111.)

In exact agreement with these deductions of the profoundest philological research is the teaching of Moses, who says, that while the descendants of Noah dwelt on the plains of Shinar, planning the tower of Babel, "the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech." The whole population of the globe then constituted but one family; *all men are therefore still of one blood.*

¹ The Chevalier Bunsen says, with great point and beauty, "History was born in that night, when Moses, with the law of God, moral and spiritual, in his heart, led the people of Israel out of Egypt." (Egypt's Place, &c. vol. i. p. 23.)

POSTSCRIPT.

In the note pp. 458, 459, the author stated his inability to find in Lepsius's Plates illustrative of the sixth Dynasty, the name KUSH, the designation for negro, stated by Mr Gliddon in the London Ethnological Journal to have been found at Sakkara by the Baron Lepsius. It is but right to add here, that in an interview with Mr Gliddon to-day, April 19, 1852, he was asked to point to the inscription in Lepsius's "Denkmahler," above referred to. Mr G. replied, the statement was made on the authority of a verbal communication from Lepsius, whom he met at Berlin, but that the inscription is *not* as yet published in Lepsius's great work.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

THE plan proposed for this volume is now completed. After a brief outline of the course of reasoning employed to shew the necessity for a revelation from God, the reader will find here presented in one connected series the chief arguments in favour of the divine authority of the Bible, as also the most plausible of the objections against it.

The character of Moses as a philosopher and a statesman is briefly delineated; the evidence for the authenticity of the Pentateuch, and also for that of the book of Genesis more particularly, as the production of Moses, and as divinely inspired, is here detailed in opposition to the views of German neologists.

The Mosaic account of creation in six days is examined, and the most important objections raised against that account are discussed. Then follows a review of the popular objections urged against the Mosaic story of Cain, as though it involved the idea of a populousness of our globe at that early period, such as could not have been existing, had not other races of men, besides that of Adam, been then already created.

The mention made in Genesis of giants, and the longevity ascribed in that book to the antediluvian patriarchs, next receive a passing attention.

The subject of the great Deluge in the days of Noah is discussed more at large. That the Deluge was strictly *universal* is shewn to be plainly taught in the Mosaic narrative; and the truth of that narrative is vindicated in a careful, and as the writer believes, in a candid examination of all the chief difficulties that have been suggested on various grounds against that universality. Its truth is further illustrated by the several traditions found among all nations, in countries the most widely separated, of a great flood in the times of their earliest ancestors; traditions very distinct, universally prevailing, and all harmonizing to a de-

gree quite irreconcilable with any other view, than that of the actual occurrence of a mighty inundation that covered the entire earth, just as Moses relates.

The subject of *Death* among the creatures of God is also considered ; and the question whether death in the irrational part of the animal creation be, or be not, the result of the sin of Adam, is freely examined.¹

The last Lecture is devoted to a subject of intense and daily increasing interest, the Unity of the Human Species, and the origin of the varieties of race, and of the diversified languages now spoken by the population of our globe.

It is not without great diffidence that the author, utterly obscure as he knows himself to be, has ventured to deal so freely with the language and the arguments of one whose name is familiar to the scientific and the learned in every civilized country under heaven.

But even Agassiz may err ; even he may sometimes reason inconclusively. That he has done so in the theory presented in the *Christian Examiner* for July 1850, to account for the origin of man, and the diversity of human races, the writer of these pages does, after a very careful examination of the subject, and of the piece of Professor Agassiz, firmly believe ; and he believes also, that in his Lecture on that subject he has shewn it.

The view taken in that Lecture, of the influences consequent on God's coming down among men at Babel, to confound men's language, and to effect the dispersion of mankind over the whole earth, as laying the foundation by a constitutional law of change then and there impressed on man's physical nature, for the speedy appearance, in the several branches of the one Noachian family, of all the diversity of complexion and of structure that would be adapted to the regions of their future abode respectively ; a diversity such as we *now* find to be existing, and such as abundant evidence shews has existed *from a period not greatly posterior* to the era of the Deluge, is believed to be simple, natural, and indeed

¹ The author is gratified to notice that in the work of Dr Hitchcock, "The Religion of Geology," published since these Lectures were delivered from the pulpit, and also in a discourse of Dr Buckland on this subject, which has very recently come into his hands, the same views, substantially, in regard to death, as those herein unfolded, are maintained by those justly distinguished writers.

necessarily involved in the narrative itself as given in Genesis, when all the circumstances of the case are considered.

It is entirely consistent with all known facts, and with the whole tenor of scriptural history, and of scriptural doctrines, as well as accordant to widely spread tradition; while it has this further recommendation, that it does violence to no one sentence, and to no one word of holy writ, and it enables us to obviate every chronological and every archæological objection against this important doctrine, that *Mankind are One Family*, all made of one blood; all brethren by descent from one primitive pair, and all contemplated in the salvation provided in the second Adam, as being all involved in the evil entailed by the sin of the first Adam in Eden.

In regard to the Bible alone, of all books, it can be said that the more thoroughly its statements are sifted, the more consistent, rational, and trustworthy are they found. Every assault made upon it, however its friends may thereby falter for a brief season, issues eventually in brightening the evidence of its truth, and strengthening the demonstration that it is from God.

Had Moses written his own conjectures merely, or the result of his own wide-spread research, long ere this his statements would have been convicted of error. But, in fact, the extension of human knowledge, though it gives birth every now and then to fresh difficulties, and to new objections against the Mosaic narrative, very soon furnishes also the means to remove those difficulties; and thus, from every department of human inquiry, from every branch of knowledge, evidence springs up, and light is derived, converging all to one point, the illustration of the truth and accuracy of this wonderful document, the Mosaic record; producing all together a complete demonstration of its divine origin. For, assuredly, no human mind, however gigantic its powers, could possibly have accumulated the knowledge, varied, accurate, and embracing subjects the most recondite, which the books of **Moses** embody. None but the unerring Mind could have guided **Moses**, in that early age especially, in the composition of this wonderful book, and more particularly the book of Genesis.

The author frankly admits that, at times, especially during the earlier course of his inquiries, the plausible character of some of the difficulties he had to consider, and the confidence with which

some of these objections are presented, staggered him. Again and again he paused, in almost breathless solicitude. But a recollection of the overwhelming proofs for the divine origin of these books reassured him, and cheered him on in his work. Diligent research, accompanied by patient thought, cleared away each rising difficulty, presented before his mind fresh evidence of the perfect truth, the wonderful accuracy, and the entire trustworthiness of these venerable documents, in each particular, even those that had been most confidently assailed.

Each step he advanced tended to increase his confidence in the books of Moses, and his reverence for their teachings; and the feeling has been growing upon him, and deepening every day. *The Bible is an awful book.* It is immeasurably removed above the noblest of all merely human productions. It is the embodiment of heavenly wisdom. It is the recorded words of the Infinite Mind.

The author thinks he has reason to bless God that he has been driven by circumstances to that course of reading and reflection, the results of which are here laid before the reader.

The Supplementary Lecture given in the Appendix, on the Literary Excellence of the Bible, seems connected, almost as a corollary, with the argument presented in the body of the work. It was originally delivered January 1844, before the citizens of Mobile, as one of a series of Lectures from different citizens. The next were the Two Lectures of Dr J. C. Nott, referred to in this volume.

In the course of this work, frequent allusion is made to the astounding claims now confidently advanced for an antiquity to the monuments of Egypt, and to the earlier dynasties of her Pharaohs, which, if established, would effectually overthrow the received chronology of the Bible, and would shew to a demonstration that (as Bunsen has expressed it) the Hebrew records furnish no certain chronology older than the age of Solomon.¹

A few remarks on that subject may not inappropriately close this volume.

Let me here premise, that should it even be admitted that the original Hebrew numbers are lost from the text of all copies of the

¹ See his *Egypt's Place*, &c. vol. i. Preface, p. vii.; and also vol. i. pp. 161, 163.

Jewish Scriptures, and that the Septuagint chronology itself is erroneous, as some seem now ready to admit, so that it should at length be received as an axiom, that chronology forms no part of revelation (a position we are by no means prepared to accede to), still, even then, the evidence for the divine origin of the Bible would remain untouched; its doctrines, its precepts, and its promises, would retain their beauty and their appropriateness.

But this claim for high Egyptian antiquity carries improbability on the face of it, as many considerations unite to shew. Bunsen assures us that monuments now exist in Egypt of an antiquity higher than 5000 years;¹ and that the lists of Manetho make the duration of the whole Egyptian empire, from Menes to Alexander, to have lasted somewhere between 4900 and 5400 years.²

Mons. Ampère tells us³ that Lepsius declares monuments are now existing in Egypt, the date of whose erection is 2500 years before Abraham; and Mr Gliddon stated, in 1848, that the discoveries of Lepsius up to that time left the date of Menes, the first mortal king of Egypt, still oscillating between the 36th and 58th century B.C.⁴ This would shew that Egypt must have been populous and highly civilized long before the flood, and even some centuries before Usher's date of the creation of Adam.

Lepsius⁵ himself, towards the close of his great work, "Die Chronologie der Egypter," part ii. p. 499, gives B.C. 3893 as the date of the accession of Menes, and the commencement of the Egyptian empire, which ended with Nectanebo, B.C. 340. But the geological formation of Egypt discountenances, if it does not effectually refute this lofty claim, and shews that the very soil of Egypt, the ground on which those monuments stand, and where the Pharaohs reigned, has not existed so long.

The lands of Egypt are a deposit of the Nile; and the Delta certainly has not presented even the first muddy formation of a morass much more than about 5000 years since.⁶

¹ Egypt's Place, Introd. p. xxviii.

² *Ib.* &c. vol. i. p. 83.

³ See *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris) for Dec. 1817, p. 1035; and see *Lecture III.* of this work, p. 131.

⁴ See Gliddon's *Otia Egyptiaca*, pp. 25, 39.

⁵ *Die Chronologie der Egypter*, von Dr R. Lepsius, pp. 498, 499. Berlin, 1849.

⁶ See *l'Égypte Pharaonique*, par Mons. D. M. J. Henri, tom. i. p. 38. Paris, 1846.

A part of the lid of the coffin of Mycerinus, the fourth king of the fourth dynasty, the eighteenth of the Egyptian kings, and the builder of the third pyramid¹ (this wood is now in the British Museum in London), who is represented as reigning somewhere about B.C. 3500, was found in the third of the pyramids of Gizeh. Ampère dates this coffin at B.C. 4000. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, p. 677, Nov. 1846.) Now it is utterly incredible that wood, and that the several papyrus rolls, should have existed so many thousands of years. The world can shew no approximation to a parallel of such durability in materials so frail and perishable.

A similar antiquity has been claimed for the records of China, of India, and of Chaldæa. All these claims have been demonstrated to be groundless. No authentic records, in any of those countries, can be assigned to a date much beyond B.C. 1300.²

Further, this high Egyptian antiquity is made out by assuming that the lists of Manetho, Herodotus, Eratosthenes, &c., are substantially correct, and that the names found in the tombs and palaces of Egypt, surrounded by the cartouche, or royal ring, when similar to names given in the lists, are the very same, and designate the same persons. It also further assumes, that these kings and these dynasties were successive, and not reigning, many of them, contemporaneously.

But in the first place, the idea which is necessarily involved in the mode of computation employed to reach this high antiquity, viz. that from the very earliest of these monarchs, the whole of Egypt had been reduced under the sway of one sovereign, is exceedingly improbable. It is unparalleled in history. All countries of which we have any accounts, were first occupied by a variety of distinct tribes or petty principalities, often waging relentless war on one another, like the Indian tribes of our own country; like the several parts of Britain in time of the Saxon heptarchy. It was long before one tribe mastered the others around it, and before one man ruled over a large kingdom formed

¹ See Vyse's *Pyramids*, vol. ii. pp. 94, 95, and plate; also Lepsius, *Auswahl*, taf. vii.

² See Lepsius, *Chronologie*, &c., pp. 4, 9, 13, 24; also Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, &c. vol. i. pp. 241, 242; *Cosmos*, vol. i. pp. 114, 115, note.

Ampère gives B.C. 4000 as the age of the coffin of Mycerinus. (See *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1846, p. 677.)

by the union of all these petty tribes scattered in distinct bands over an extensive region. Such was, in all probability, the case in Egypt, in the times of her earlier Pharaohs, and even until within a short period of the temporary sojourn of Abraham in that land.

We know, also, that extensive mutilations on the monuments were made even by the Pharaohs themselves. Such mutilations are seen at Medinet Habou (see *Revue des Deux Mondes*, p. 1028, Dec. 1847); at Luxor (*id.* p. 1010, Dec. 1849); and at other places (*id.* p. 93, Jan. 1849.) If, from a petty vanity, the Pharaohs thus mutilated the monuments of their predecessors—the sacred records of the empire—what confidence can we place in the truth of the records yet left? Why may not the priests, and other persons in power, have altered names in these monuments also, inserting the names of ancient and possibly of fabulous monarchs, to feed their national vanity, and gratify their morbid desire of a reputation for matchless antiquity to their country?

It is well known, also, that great diversity prevails among even the ablest Egyptologists, as to the true reading of many even of the names of ancient Egyptian kings. Instances of this are to be found in every part of their writings. (See Ampère, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1846, pp. 687, 688.)

Besides all this, the sources whence the lists of Egyptian kings and dynasties have been drawn, are liable to suspicion.

Of Egyptian history we know absolutely nothing beyond what can be gathered from the Greek writers, Herodotus and Diodorus, and the lists of Manetho, as compared with existing monuments, and with some few papyrus rolls.

But Herodotus furnishes no regular series of dates. Diodorus reckons according to generations; but in his series many chasms occur, to measure which no clue is left us. In the numbers given by Manetho, numerous errors have found place.

On the monuments again, no regular series of dates appears. Certain tables or series of royal names have been found, as at Karnak, at Abydos, the royal papyrus of Turin, &c.; but all attempts at a complete arrangement of these royal names, and their identification with the names on the lists given by Greek writers, are attended with perplexing difficulties. The learned

differ widely on these points. Thus Bunsen would assign to the series of provincial kings *before Menes*, several names that Lepsius places in the tenth dynasty (Eg. Place, p. 51), a difference of considerably more than one thousand years.

Speaking of the papyrus lists, Bunsen remarks : "Here we find no chronology, any more than upon the Stelæ" (p. 34.) Again : "Here we have still no history, in the proper sense" (id.) In another place Bunsen remarks (p. 24) : "As the Egyptians possessed no work on history among their sacred books, so neither had they any connected chronology." Again : "The sacred books contained *no history*, but *much* that was *historical* : they gave no chronology, but constituted its basis and touchstone. If they are ancient," adds Bunsen, "and extend beyond the period of the Hyksos to the empire of Menes, the foundation of Egyptian Chronology and History is not entirely lost for the modern investigator" (p. 26.)

True, if they are so ancient : but who shall prove this ? Who can render it even probable ?

Bunsen tells us (p. 131) that according to Manetho, Egyptian history is divided into three great periods : the Old Empire, the Middle Empire, and the New Empire. The Old Empire commenced with Menes, and ended with the third king of the thirteenth dynasty. From that time commences the Middle Empire, the period of the rule of foreigners, called Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings. Their occupancy of the throne was the commencement of the Middle Empire. Their expulsion was the commencement of the New Empire, which opens with the eighteenth dynasty, and extends to the thirtieth dynasty, about thirteen hundred years.

The Middle Empire, or dominion of the Shepherd Kings, occupied, according to Bunsen, about nine hundred years. (See Eg. Place, vol. i. pp. 131, 133.)

Now the chief monuments yet standing in Egypt are the works of the eighteenth and following dynasties.

The Shepherd Kings are said to have extirpated the monuments of the Old Empire ; and the native sovereigns, who regained the dominion in the eighteenth dynasty, destroyed the monuments of the Hyksos period.

What means, then, could the Egyptians of the New Empire possess, and especially those in the yet later times of the Ptolemies, for making out a history of the Old Empire, and for furnishing lists of the kings of that Old Empire, after an interval of a thousand years had elapsed (and in the times of the Ptolemies, an interval of more than 2300 years), during which one thousand years a race had ruled in Egypt hostile to the old Pharaohs, and determined on eradicating every monument commemorative of the acts and the very existence of those old Pharaohs ?

Now the sacred books of the Egyptians contain no history, properly speaking, and certainly no chronology.

The monuments shew no connected chronology : they furnish, here and there, annals of some particular reigns, and some few lists of royal names ; but very little that is properly connected. For the making out of a regular series of chronological dates, reliance is placed on a comparison of the contents of these several lists on the monuments, and in certain papyri, with the lists given by Greek writers, chiefly Herodotus and Manetho.

But it is certain that neither Herodotus, nor Diodorus, nor any Greek historian, nor Manetho, himself an Egyptian priest, in the comparatively modern time of the Ptolemics, after the last of the Egyptian monarchs of the New Empire had passed away, could have had access to any sources of information other than what the Egyptian hierogrammatists themselves possessed. Of Egypt's old Pharaonic dynasties, these Greek writers could learn no more than what the Egyptians, their contemporaries, after even the New Empire was no more, could tell them. But of those old Pharaohs, the Egyptians themselves of that age had but little more than the vestiges of tradition.

Where, then, is the possibility of finding *authentic records* of the old Pharaohs, the very last of whom was separated, according to the shewing of these Greek writers themselves, by an interval of upwards of two thousand years from their time, and of even this interval, the first nine hundred years had left no monuments ? The facts speak for themselves.

Accordingly we find Bunsen himself admitting that a comparison of the lists of Eratosthenes and Manetho " can leave no rea-

sonable doubt that both are derived from the same *fountain head of tradition*.¹ (Vol. i. p. 126 : see also p. 14.)

But a tradition respecting historical names and dates, running back from two to three thousand years, is a very slender foundation on which to rest a chronology that is to overturn the chronology given in the books of Moses.

In another passage Bunsen very distinctly and very truly remarks : "The question of any value attaching to either the Egyptian or the Greek traditions, relative to the earlier periods of the Egyptian history, turns upon the point," what dependence can be placed on the knowledge which the Egyptians of the New Empire did themselves possess, of their most ancient chronology ? (P. 5.) That is to say, in other words, whether the Egyptians of the New Empire, which commenced a little before the time of Moses, had received any genuine historical knowledge of their primitive ages, from the desolation consequent on the Hyksos rule ? (P. 4.)

Bunsen and Lepsius maintain that such knowledge had been preserved ; that "the ancient king mentioned in the Book of the Dead" belonged to the fourth dynasty, and that, though the section in that book which mentions him, may be of a much later date than his own lifetime, yet we possess "*authentic contemporary monuments, not only of him, but of the Pharaohs, his ancestors, in nearly uninterrupted succession, during the previous two centuries and a-half, back almost to the beginning of the third dynasty, and all written in the same character as that papyrus exhibits.*" (P. 31.)

This is certainly an important point if it can be clearly established. The inscriptions, &c. on these so-called *contemporary monuments* are presented in the several publications of Lepsius, especially in his great work the "*Denkmahler aus Egypten, &c.*" now in progress.

But to me, I confess the evidence for the continuous connection, and the remote antiquity of these several monuments, running back

¹ The genuine Egyptian traditions concerning the mythological period embraced "*myriads of years.*" (P. 14.)

Bunsen admits also : "The Egyptians, like all other nations possessing very ancient records, *the Jews only excepted*, have from very early times exaggerated the dates of their history." (Vol i. p. 6.)

to the commencement of the third dynasty, is not made clearly apparent.

In relation to the Greek authors¹ furnishing lists of the dynasties, on which reliance is placed for the means of identifying the kings whose names are found on the monuments, and so assigning to them their several chronological positions, especially those of the first seventeen dynasties, or the Old Empire, the learned and judicious Heeren thus expresses himself:—

“Neither Herodotus nor Diodorus distinguishes these dynasties. One merely observes, that according to the lists given him by the priests (probably those of Memphis), the first king, Menes, had 330 successors, of which they knew only the names, as no monuments were left. It is only in setting out from Moeris and Sesostris, that he gives the names of some few kings, but certainly not a consecutive list, although the priests might have given it to him as such. Diodorus mentions some other kings, but he does not determine the number. It is therefore impossible to found upon the dynasties of these two authors any exact chronology.

“But Manetho, in the work of which we have only a few incomplete extracts, classes in chronological order the thirty-one dynasties preceding the conquest of Alexander. Are these dynasties, then, all successive, or partly contemporaneous? Is it possible that Egypt was *at once* formed into a large empire?

“Rosellini contends for successive reigns, chiefly on the authority of Manetho.

“But suppose Manetho really thought so, how did he reach this conclusion? The Egyptian priests, anxious to give to their state a high antiquity, had already cited to Herodotus and Diodorus catalogues of kings certainly not following each other in chronological order. Might not the same thing have been done in the

¹ Herodotus is supposed to have visited Egypt about B.C. 450 years, *i. e.* just about 100 years before the close of the new empire, full 2200 years after the end of the old empire. (See Bunsen, p. 109; Lepsius, p. 498.) Bunsen says the system of Herodotus and the Egyptian computations differ by about 10,000 years. (P. 109.)

“Manetho, the author of the famous lists of dynasties, so much relied on, was a Nest of Sabennytus, residing at the court of the first Ptolemy, and also under Ptolemy Philadelphus II. He was long after the very last of the Pharaohs, even of the new empire.” (Bunsen, p. 58.)

lists given to Manetho?" (Historical Researches, Egypt, vol. i. pp. 98-110.)

"Among the Hindoos," says the same writer (see his India, p. 164) kings are mentioned on their lists as great sovereigns of the very period during which the epics prove there were several small states. So it might have been among the Egyptians, and so in all probability it was. Bunsen himself, while he denies that contemporary sovereigns are found on the lists of the new empire, *i. e.* from the opening of the eighteenth dynasty, does also stoutly maintain that in the old empire contemporary kings are given, especially in the twelfth dynasty and in the fourth. "We may venture to assume, from the investigations of the monuments of the old empire, that in it *joint reigns occur*, and especially in the twelfth dynasty, one of those preserved in the papyrus, *i. e.* the royal papyrus of Turin." Again: "In this oldest record of Egyptian chronology we have a method directly opposed to the system of a chronological canon. We may call it the dynastic, its aim being to *register every sovereign*, whether contemporaneous or successive."

"The sum-total of the reigns recorded in such or such a dynasty will be considerably greater than the duration of the dynasty" (vol. i. pp. 55, 56).

Again, p. 126: "We find Manetho conforming to the same Egyptian method for the old empire, and that, namely, of inserting in the list of reigns the name of every king of the same sovereign line, *co-regents inclusive*, in the form of *one continuous order of succession*."

On page 132 Bunsen remarks: "In the middle empire the Theban and Xoite kings were *contemporaneous with the shepherds and with each other*." This period comprises 900 years.

These concessions of the Chevalier Bunsen prepare us to receive with greater confidence the statements of Mr R. S. Poole, in his *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, claiming to adduce proof from the monuments themselves that several of the dynasties which have been generally represented as successive, were actually contemporaneous, as *e. g.* the twelfth and the fifth; and that thus the monumental history of Egypt covers not a period of duration beyond what may be readily reconciled with the Mosaic chronology as given in the Septuagint

—a conclusion, to the accuracy of which Sir J. G. Wilkinson has affixed the sanction of his great name in these matters.

Bunsen places the accession of Menes, the first mortal King of Egypt, at about B.C. 3648 ; Dr Pritchard places it at B.C. 2214 ; Wilkinson at B.C. 2320. Lepsius places Menes at a period still more remote than does Bunsen, viz. B.C. 3893 as the year of the accession of Menes ; and the empire of the Pharaohs ended, according to Lepsius, with Nectanebo, B.C. 340.¹

Manetho, as corrected by a comparison with Syncellus, would make Menes B.C. 2720, *i. e.* about 440 years after the Deluge, reckoned according to the Septuagint chronology, which gives 5586 as the interval between the creation and the birth of Christ, and places the flood at B.C. 3154. Looking, then, at the many sources of error in these ancient authors, at the uncertainty of the sources whence they had to draw their information, and at the difficulties attending the subject itself, it seems abundantly plain, that (as Dr Eadie has expressed it in his admirable compend of Egyptian history, given in the “ Early Oriental History,” published in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, pp. 76, 77), “ *an approximation to the truth,*” on all such abstruse points, is all that can be obtained.

The strenuous defenders of Usher’s dates are plainly at fault, in view of the facts furnished by the monuments : while the advocates of the extreme antiquity contended for by Bunsen and Lepsius, are equally opposed by the facts and reasonings published by Mr Poole, and by the conceded contemporaneousness of many of the kings of the early dynasties, if not also of whole dynasties, given in the Egyptian authorities.

Between extremes, the middle ground is alone safe. Discoveries in Egyptian archæology are not yet ended, and discovery has been so rapid of late years, that we may hope to be, ere long, in possession of data, on which to form a final and satisfactory decision on the whole question of Egyptian, and perhaps also, of Scriptural chronology.² Comparing together the statements and

¹ Die Chronologie der Egypter, &c. von Dr R. Lepsius, pp. 498, 499. Berlin 1849.

² The author has made but passing allusions in this work to the discoveries of Layard and his co-labourers among the ruins of Nineveh, &c. to the investigations of Major Rawlinson in the cuneiform writing ; or to Mr Foster’s work on the Rock inscriptions

the conclusions of the different explorers in this field, it seems plain, that thus far at least, no dates are *positively established* for the antiquity of Egypt, which forbid us to believe that, though one of the oldest, if not the very oldest nation on earth, there was, nevertheless, ample time, in the interval between the flood and the first king of Egypt, to allow the increase of population sufficient for the establishment of such a nation as the empire of the pyramid-building Pharaohs must have been.

For all that Egypt yet has shewn, and for all that the antiquity-loving Egyptologists have yet proved, we can hold to the Mosaic record, its chronology (as found in the Septuagint) included.

“ This ancient record,” says a sensible and candid writer (Dr Eadie, see his Introduction to the Early Oriental History, p. i. Lond. 1852), carries us back to a dim and remote era. It has not the aspect of a legend which has risen, no one can tell how, and received amplification and adornment in the course of ages

“ It is neither a confused nor an unintelligible statement. Its sobriety vouches for its accuracy.

“ As its genealogy is free from extravagance, and as it presents facts without the music and fiction of poetry, it must not be confounded with Grecian and Oriental myth, which is so shadowy, contradictory, and baseless a region of grotesque and cloudy phantoms.”

In this venerable record, there is nothing that lifts itself above vulgar humanity, nothing that might not, nothing that did not happen in those distant and primitive epochs.

No other account is more likely, or presents fewer difficulties.

around Mount Sinai in Arabia, because these subjects are not directly connected with the points here examined. They relate to times less remote, and are reserved, with other points of importance and interest, for a future volume.

NOTE.

THE following noble testimony to the sacred character of the Mosaic history of the Creation, as contained in the first chapter of Genesis, is extracted from an article in the Theological and Literary Journal for April 1852, from the pen of the editor, David N. Lord, pp. 543, 544, and may appropriately be introduced here :—

After shewing that the creation in six days is re-asserted in Exod. xx. 11—where it is given as a reason for the observance of the weekly sabbath—and that it was reiterated by God himself, on giving to Moses the law written on tables of stone, Exod. xxxi. 16, 17, the writer thus proceeds :—“ If that announcement from Sinai, and ratification of the history of the creation given in Genesis, is held to be a fiction, it must of necessity lead to the rejection of the whole Pentateuch as a fabrication. If, without any conceivable motive, and against every consideration that would govern a candid and holy being, a misrepresentation so stupendous, and so sure to be exposed, is incorporated in the Decalogue itself, both as it is represented to have been pronounced by the Almighty Lawgiver, and written by him on a durable table of stone, what certainty can be felt that any of the other remarkable declarations are not equally false? If no trust is to be placed in these great attestations which God is represented to have given to that part of the law, no other attestations which he is said to have given the other enactments and institutions can be entitled to reliance. Neither visible theophanies, audible voices, miracles, nor prophecies, which are declared to have attended the communication of commands, and to have shewn that they were from him, can yield them any corroboration. Indeed, it would be absolutely incredible that the whole was not, in an equal measure, a fabrication.

“ But the rejection of the Pentateuch as false in its claims to a divine origin and authority, would necessarily draw after it the rejection of all the other books of the Old Testament; for they all recognise the truth of the Pentateuch, and proceed on its histories, enactments, and institutions, as verities. They exhibit the Israelitish nation as sustaining the relation to God which the Pentateuch represents; and the priesthood, the sacrifices, the covenants, the promises, and the whole system of laws, as instituted by God,

as that record relates. If they are not his work, it is impossible that the other should be. But their rejection draws after it also, as necessarily, the rejection of the New Testament ; for the latter ratifies, in the fullest manner, all the great historical statements, the enactments and the religious institutions of the former, and it is on them that the work of redemption which it reveals is founded. If the Mosaic history of the creation and fall, the destruction of the ancient world, the adoption of the Israelites as a peculiar people, their deliverance from Egypt, the proclamation of the Law at Sinai, the institution of the priesthood, sacrifices and rites of worship, and the interpositions, commands and revelations that are recorded by the prophets that followed, are not from God, it is impossible that the New Testament can be, which everywhere recognises them as realities, and is dependent on them for its truth and propriety. The whole Bible, as a revelation, thus stands or falls with the first chapter of Genesis. This intimate connection with other parts of the Word of God, is in a great degree peculiar to that record of the creation. The histories, narratives, and even the enactments of many other chapters, might be supposed to be supposititious, without necessarily destroying the credibility of the inspiration of the remainder. But the subversion of this, from its incorporation in the Law of Sinai, necessarily carries with it the subversion of all that follows."

To the truth of all this, the writer of these pages yields his hearty assent ; and he deems these views entirely consistent with the position taken in this work ; while they present in a strong light the reasons which have weighed with him in the production of this volume.

MOBILE, April 16, 1852.

A P P E N D I X.

THE INDEBTEDNESS OF MODERN LITERATURE TO THE BIBLE.¹

WHEREVER man is, there is character, both intellectual and moral ; and the *doings* of the man develop that character. In the actions of his life, in the tenor of his confidential discourse, and in his epistolary correspondence, the *individual* traces an impress of himself.

But *communities*, as well as individuals, may be said to have and to exhibit a character of their own. The acts of the government, the enactments of the legislature, the proceedings of public bodies, the prevailing customs, and the tolerated vices, all furnish a representation of public character : while in *the current literature*, the manifestation of that character is more decisive still. National character is often as distinctly marked in national literature, as the character of the individual is marked in letters to his intimate friends. In German literature, in French, in English, in Italian, and in Spanish, there is a distinct character, intellectual and moral, appertaining to each one, and peculiar to itself. *La Henriade* never could have been written by an Englishman, nor *Othello* by a Frenchman, nor Goethe's *Faust*, nor the *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto, by either of them.

In like manner, *each great age of the world*, and almost each successive generation of men, has exhibited its own peculiar literary character. The writings of King David or of Isaiah, the productions of Homer or of Herodotus, could not possibly be confounded with the literature of the Augustan age ; nor could the productions of Chrysostom or of Augustine be mistaken for writ-

¹ Delivered before the citizens of Mobile, in the Lecture-room of the Government-street Church, Mobile, Tuesday, December 26, 1843. .

ings of the age of Leo X, any more than writings such as those of Luther, of Melancthon, or of Erasmus, could be palmed on literary men as the product of the nineteenth century. Constitutional temperament, education, the company he keeps, the sentiments he hears, the books he reads, the scenes he witnesses, and the objects he pursues, all combine to influence the opinions, and modify the character of the *individual*. In like manner, the constitution of society, the prevailing forms of government, political changes, and antecedent revolutions, all combine to modify national character, and to determine the character of the age itself, and consequently to affect the character of its literature also.

Among the causes thus operating on the human mind, the views entertained of religion cannot be the least influential; and consequently, the extensive dissemination of writings, such as those of which the Bible is made up, *must* have told, and told powerfully, upon the sentiments and the writings, at least, if not also upon the conduct of men. To some few among ancient writers, such as Plato and Seneca, the Scriptures were probably not wholly unknown. But it is in modern times only, that these sacred writings have been made extensively known: it is, therefore, in modern literature, chiefly, that we can look for the influence of revealed truth; and hence, I have proposed to treat of *The Indebtedness of Modern Literature to the Bible*.

First, then, *Wherever present, the Bible has fostered the spirit of sound learning*. From times of the remotest antiquity, it would appear that learning and religion have been closely connected together. Not to enlarge on the fact that even among the ancient heathen the priesthood were usually their learned men (just as though religion, even in its basest counterfeits, professing, as it does, to deal with the interests of the inner spirit of man, must necessarily cultivate the intellect, as a part of her own peculiar province), it is obvious that the chief agents employed of heaven to receive and to promulgate revealed truth, were the friends and cultivators of learning. Moses, the Jewish lawgiver, "*was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,*" and was, unquestionably, the most distinguished man of his age. The author of the book of Job was evidently a man of highly cultivated mind. The royal Solomon, and among the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel, were all accomplished scholars: while, even so early

as the time of Samuel, seminaries of learning, called "*schools of the prophets*," were maintained, from among the students in which were selected those on whom God sent the spirit of prophecy.

The first teachers of the Christian faith were trained for years near the person, and under the instructions of their divine Master, so as to be thoroughly versed in ethics and theology; and then they were supernaturally endowed, at once, with a knowledge of the languages necessary for the successful prosecution of their mission—a knowledge which, otherwise, the tedious labour of years could alone have secured to them. Paul, from whose pen we have more than from that of any other of the New Testament writers, was a man not only of unusual mental vigour, but also of varied reading, and of extensive, if not profound erudition. But, besides this learning found in some of the sacred writers, the very nature of the Bible is such as to call for attention to learning, at least in those who study in order to expound it. A divine revelation must be communicated in some particular language or languages, which, to men of other nations, must be foreign and unintelligible without study. The original tongues of the Old and the New Testament have now, for many ages, been almost entirely forgotten. A knowledge of these languages can, therefore, be acquired only by careful study.

In addition to all this, the Bible is, in some parts, of antiquity so great, that it embodies allusions to times, and places, and persons, so remote, and so entirely removed out of the range of ordinary knowledge; that, in order to understand it fully, not only must various languages be studied, but a wide range of investigation must be made in history, chronology, geography, and sundry other branches of knowledge. Accordingly it has been found, in every age, that where the Bible was, there learning flourished. Among the most assiduous cultivators of learning, in their day, were the advocates of revealed truth in the first four centuries of the Christian era. During the long night of intellectual darkness, in what are called the middle ages, learning was confined, almost exclusively, to the cells of the monasteries. But in those cells the Bible was, and was studied; while on the great mass of men, from whom the Bible was withheld, the deep darkness of utter ignorance rested. So long as the church taught the traditions of men, keeping the Bible hid from public view, learning languished, and

was found only among the clergy; but when the Reformation insisted on the exclusive authority of revelation in matters of faith and practice, and proclaimed the Bible as the book for the people, learning revived, the study of ancient languages was entered upon with ardour, other branches of learning received increased attention, numerous versions of the Bible in modern tongues were made, and published for the use of the people. Commentaries and expository works of various kinds were produced and published, and the art of criticism was once more called into operation, and greatly improved. So true it is, as the learned Blackstone remarks, when advocating the necessity for a liberal education at the university, as a preparation for the study of law, "The sciences are of a social disposition, and flourish best in the neighbourhood of each other; nor is there any branch of learning but may be helped and improved, by assistance drawn from other arts." Blackstone's Commentaries, book i. § 1, vol. i. p. 19. And we may add, there is no one branch of learning which can be thoroughly mastered, without attention to many other departments of knowledge; yea, a love for one learned pursuit will inevitably impel to the study of kindred and illustrative branches of knowledge. Thus it was actually found that, wherever the Bible was, there learning took up her abode, and multiplied her votaries, and achieved her triumphs. But learning is the foundation of literature. In fostering learning, then, the Bible has rendered essential service to the cause of literature. It has called it into existence, and mainly determined its character.

For, secondly, *Some of the profoundest works of modern literature have been called forth by the Bible.* Wherever the Bible is known and duly prized, it awakens a spirit of learned research. Ancient languages—the classics of Greece and Rome, as well as of Judea—become objects of diligent study; and learned lexicons, and laboriously compiled grammars, and critical editions of the ancient classics (those of Greece especially), are put forth as a means of elucidating the sacred text, or of fitting the student of revealed truth rightly to investigate, properly to appreciate, and correctly to expound it. For the same purpose also the vast stores of ancient history must be unlocked to furnish the world with such works as Prideaux's Connection of Sacred and Profane History, the Annals of Archbishop Usher, and the works of Lightfoote, of

Horne, of Lardner, and Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible. An immense amount of learning has been employed in framing commentaries on the Bible and expositions of its several books. Pole's Synopsis of Critical Expositions, Blayney's Jeremiah, Lowth's Isaiah, Newton on the Prophecies, Ainsworth on the Pentateuch, Michaelis on the Old and on the New Testament, Campbell's Notes on the Gospels, Rosenmüller's Scholia, and the Commentaries of Kuinoel, are all works of great learning, and they discover vast research.

Besides this, in reply to the objection of infidels, many able works have been written in defence of the Bible, from Watson's Apology, Leland's View of Deistical Writers, and Paley's Evidences, down to the Evidences as presented by Bishop McIlvaine of this country, and by Bishop Wilson of Calcutta. For vigorous thought, sound reasoning, lucid arrangement, and beautiful simplicity of style, many of the productions of this class stand unrivalled in our language. The works of Paley especially are models of composition and of felicitous reasoning.

In other departments the Bible has called forth the works of Bochart, of Reland, and Lowth on Hebrew poetry, all distinguished for profound erudition; while in our own language (to say nothing of Milton, of Young, and of Pollok) such writers as Jeremy Taylor, Horne, Hooker, Barrow, Sherlock, Bishop Butler, and a host of others (constituting the very flower of our English literature) were induced solely from reverence for the Bible. In English literature the Bible has proved the most liberal of all patrons.

But, thirdly, *The science of jurisprudence is largely indebted to the Bible.* This every sound lawyer will readily allow. In the books of Moses, written in the very remotest age of the world, and when mankind were everywhere little better than barbarians, we have presented in brief a body of laws which to this day is admitted by those most competent to judge to be the very best code ever given to mankind—the model on which all subsequent legislators have proceeded in framing their statutes.

“As God,” says Blackstone, “when he created matter, and endued it with a principle of mobility, established certain rules for the direction of that motion, so when he created man and endued him with free will to conduct himself in all parts of life, he laid

down certain immutable laws of nature whereby that free will is, in some degree, regulated and restrained, and gave him also the faculty of reason to discover the purport of those laws. These are the eternal and immutable laws of good and evil, to which God himself always conforms, and which, as applicable to man, reason can discover, and which are so admirably ordered of God as always to promote the substantial and permanent happiness of men—such, *e. g.* as that we should live honourably, hurt nobody, and render to every one his due. Indeed to these three precepts Justinian has reduced the whole doctrine of law. This is THE LAW OF NATURE. But further, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, God hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce his laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or Divine Law, and they are to be found only in the holy Scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are found, upon comparison, to be really a part of the original law of nature, as they tend, in all their consequences, to man's felicity; but, though agreeable to right reason, reason, unaided and alone, could not make them known. Upon these two foundations—the law of nature and the law of revelation—depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should contradict these.”¹

¹ I think myself happy in being able to introduce the following noble testimony to the value of the Bible, in legal science and civil government, from the pen of that able jurist and distinguished man, Chief Justice Hornblower of New Jersey, found in his charge to the Grand Jury of Essex County, N. J. Jan. 7, 1843. “We have in the Bible a wiser and a holier rule of action than the wisdom of man ever conceived, and in fewer words than all the learning of the schools ever compressed the wisest of their maxims: ‘Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.’ This is emphatically the golden rule. It is universal in its application, and eternal in its principles. It lies at the foundation of our jurisprudence, legal and equitable, civil and criminal; and if acted on, this would do more to purify society, and elevate man to his true dignity as a rational and immortal being, than all the learning of the schools, and the vain philosophy of the world.

“It is a short and simple lesson that all may learn, from the lisping child of civilization to the grey-headed and untutored savage of the wilderness—a lesson which, if all would inculcate and practise, would smooth down the asperities of life, mitigate the sorrows incident to humanity, sweeten the springs of domestic enjoyment, strengthen and beautify the bonds of the social compact, dispense with the officers of justice, demolish our prisons, and pull down the last scaffold that should ever be erected for the execution of the convict.

“But instead of this, we are constantly told of the dignity and perfectibility of human

Thus full and explicit is the great commentator on law, in regard to the supreme authority of the Bible in legal science : and in the writings of the ablest jurists everywhere are found, expressed or implied, similar concessions to the fundamental importance of the Bible in the science of jurisprudence. So close, indeed, is the connection between biblical and legal knowledge, that “ during the middle ages (as Selden remarks) the clergy, as they then engrossed every other branch of learning, so they were particularly remarkable for their proficiency in the study of the law : it was then taught by them in the monasteries, in the universities, and in the families of the principal nobility.” “ Nullus clericus, nisi causidicus” (every priest is a lawyer), is the character given of them soon after the Conquest. The judges, therefore, were usually created out of the sacred order, as was the case also among the Normans ; and all the inferior officers in courts of law were supplied by the lower clergy, which has caused their successors to be denominated CLERKS (clerici) to this day.

But again, fourthly, *The Bible has greatly contributed to promote the general diffusion of intelligence among the mass of the people.* Various considerations combine to assure us that such is the fact. The testimony of all competent and impartial observers

nature, the noble qualities of the mind, and the elevating influence of education in the illustrious fields of art and science upon the happiness of man : and each lecturer in his turn has just discovered some new principle in nature, or above nature, which is to be the rule of life, &c.

These points in human intellect can tell me whence Moses derived his science or legislation without admitting the supernatural and divine authority of the Ten Commandments. I shall begin to listen with more reverence to the teachers of human perfectibility. In this short and comprehensive code we find given to us a perfect rule of action, embracing the whole ground of man's existence : a rule, not only prescribing our duty to God and man, in our external behaviour, but reaching to the secret thoughts and feelings of our hearts in every possible condition of life, and in all our relations to our Maker and our fellow-beings. The wisdom of ages, the learning and philosophy of the schools, have never discovered a single defect in that code. Not a virtue which is not there inculcated. Not a vice, in its most doubtful and shadowy form, which is not there prohibited. Whence, then, I ask, did the great Jewish lawgiver derive his spirit of legislation ? If that code was written by the finger of the Almighty, let us bow to it with holy reverence, and seek no better rule of life, nor any wiser principles of action. But if they emanated only from the capacious mind, and were dictated by the wisdom of Moses—then Moses was a wiser, a more learned man, than any of our new teachers ; and I had rather be under his jurisdiction and keep his commandments, than learn new rules of civil polity and social intercourse from the most learned and wise of the present day.”

declares, that among the mass of the people in those countries yet destitute of a knowledge of revelation, gross ignorance prevails. The little learning they do possess is confined to a very small class, the privileged few : the body of the population are, in point of intellect, but little elevated above the brutes around them. Yea, even in nations nominally Christian, the difference in the amount of intelligence among the common people, where the Bible is open to all, and among those where it is not in their hands, is almost incredibly great. Go among the poorer population of Catholic Ireland, of Italy, of Spain, or even of France, and you will find the grossest ignorance almost universally prevalent. They are taught to delegate the care of their future interests to their priests, and with the delegation they seem to abandon almost the power of thought. In such communities you will find many minds naturally shrewd, vigorous, and active, but shrunk and paralyzed for want of having their powers called into proper action. Relying on mere outward rites, truth, in all her majesty, her beauty, and her far-reaching influences, seems hid from their view, and lost even to their wishes. . . . Now, with such a people, compare the same class of population as found in Scotland, or in new England, where the Bible is, emphatically, "*the people's book*;" where it is found in every house, in the rich man's library, and on the cottager's table, where it is read in every school-house, and where its sacred precepts are reverently listened to around the cheerful hearth of the day-labourer, and you will find a great difference in the amount of popular intelligence. This the Scottish poet, Burns, well understood; and accordingly he describes his cottage labourer closing the pleasant family intercourse on Saturday night :

"The cheerful supper done, wi' serious face,
 They round the ingle form a circle wide;
 The sire turns o'er, wi' patriarchal grace,
 The big ha' Bible, ance his father's pride:
 His bonnet reverently is laid aside,
 His lyart haffets wearing thin and bare:
 Those strains that once did sweet in Zion glide,
 He wales a portion with judicious care;
 And, ' *Let us worship God,*' he says, with solemn air.

"The priest-like father reads the sacred page,
 How *Abram* was the friend of God on high,

Or *Moses* bade eternal warfare wage
 With Amalek's ungracious progeny :
 Or how the *royal bard* did groaning lie
 Beneath the stroke of Heaven's avenging ire :
 Or Job's pathetic plaint, and wailing cry,
 Or rapt *Isaiah's* wild seraphic fire,
 Or other holy seers, that tun'd the sacred lyre.

"Perhaps the *Christian volume* is the theme—
 How guiltless blood for guilty man was shed :
 How He who bore in heaven the second name,
 Had not on earth whereon to lay his head :
 How his first followers and servants sped—
 The precepts sage they wrote to many a land :
 How he, who lone in *Patmos* banished,
 Saw in the sun a mighty angel stand,

And heard great Babylon's doom pronounced by Heaven's command.

"Then kneeling down, to Heaven's eternal King
 The saint, the father, and the husband prays.
 * * * * *
 From scenes like these, old Scotia's grandeur springs,
 That makes her loved at home, revered abroad."

Yes,—in such a country it is that you find a thinking, reasoning
 community, given to reflection, and comparatively free from super-
 stition: Nor is the cause of this difference unintelligible or ob-
 scure. By the amazing truths which it presents, the Bible is di-
 rectly calculated to awaken thought, intense thought; and it fur-
 nishes abundant materials to feed and to maintain thought. Des-
 tined to revelation, man's thoughts are confined to this world, its
 pleasures, its cares, and its interests: and what can the mere no-
 tion of a local deity, like the heathen idols, or of a patron saint to
 look to for protection, do to elevate the thoughts and stimulate
 the intellect?

How meagre and unimportant were the notions of superior
 beings, entertained by the most polished of ancient pagan philoso-
 phers. But, open the page of inspiration before man's eye, and
 what a host of glorious truths and ennobling ideas is at once pre-
 sented to his mind! The nature and attributes of the Eternal
 Spirit, his boundless power, his spotless holiness, his inflexible jus-
 tice, man's responsibility, and, above all, the stupendous discove-
 ries of divine mercy in the plan of redemption, are truths blazing

on every page of the Bible,—truths admirably adapted to arrest attention, to awaken thought, profound, intense, long-continued thought, and by their influence to touch the springs of human feeling, expand the very dimensions of the mind itself, and new model the entire character. These and similar truths (presented only in the Bible) cannot be uninfluential on the mind that perceives and contemplates them. Just so far as the Bible is known and studied in a community are these truths known, and so far must their influence be felt. But if an ennobling influence be thus diffused over the public mind, the effects of that influence cannot fail to shew itself on the literature, which is at once the offspring and the gauge of popular intellect.

But, fifthly, *The Bible has elevated the tone of morals in human society, and has awakened a gentler spirit in man's bosom.* That the standard of morals is greatly elevated by the Bible, no well-informed person can doubt. A comparison of heathen tribes, ancient or modern, with a Christian community in this respect, presents ample confirmation of this position. The picture of heathen morals drawn by the Apostle Paul in the first chapter of Romans, and in sundry other passages in his epistles, is found reflected in the pages of the most polished writers of classical antiquity, both Greek and Roman; and the testimony of missionaries long resident among the heathen of our own day, and that of observant and impartial travellers, assures us that it is a faithful likeness to the present hour. The pages of ancient learning and elegance are often defaced by unutterable abominations, which appear to have been placed there with hardly a consciousness of impropriety on the part of the accomplished writers. There *may*, indeed, be similar abominations perpetrated in the bosom of society now, and possibly the amount of actual wickedness is not very greatly diminished in our day, for the human heart is always the same. But, if so, the evil is perpetrated secretly and cautiously, not challenging notice in open day. It is, even by the perpetrators, felt to be an evil, a thing to be ashamed of, not protruded before others and openly gloried in. Works which, in the polished age of Augustus, were everywhere well received, would not now be tolerated: no man would dare to publish them in any country in Christendom. Even in the corrupt capitals of Europe, however reckless the dissipation of actual life, literature must present at least the

external aspect of decency. The unprincipled and the abandoned may now be as desperately wicked as were the most dissolute among the heathen of old, but there is now, through the influence of the Bible, an incomparably larger proportion of human society, than heathenism ever knew, that love and practise purity of life; and the influence of these serves to restrain the open exhibition of licentiousness, in every part of the community, and in every grade of society.

Moreover, the *peaceful spirit of revelation* has spread its influence far and wide through every part of human society. Men no longer deem all foreign nations barbarians, lying almost beyond the pale of humanity. No longer is warfare conducted in the spirit of sanguinary ferocity that prevailed among ancient pagans, and still prevails among heathen tribes. Formerly captives taken in war were put to death in cold blood, without any sense of injustice, any feeling of shame. The mildest doom impending over the captive was to pass his life in hopeless slavery under his conqueror, or those to whom that conqueror might sell him. "Even so late as the sixteenth century (says Chancellor Kent), in many instances, shipwrecked strangers were made prisoners, and sold as slaves, without exciting any complaint, or offending any public sense of shame. Numerous cases occurred of acts of the grossest perfidy and cruelty towards mere strangers, as well as towards enemies. Prisoners were put to death for their gallantry and brave defence in war. There was no reliance to be placed upon the word and honour of men in power." (Kent's Com. vol. i. p. 9.) But a decided reformation of manners and improvement of feeling has been effected in modern times; "and," says Chancellor Kent again (vol. i. p. 10), "the influence of Christianity (*i. e.* the Bible) has been very efficient towards the introduction of a better and more enlightened sense of right and justice among the several governments of Europe. It taught the duty of benevolence to strangers, of humanity to the vanquished, of the obligation of good faith.—of the sin of murder, revenge, and rapacity. The history of Europe, during the earlier periods of modern history, abounds with interesting and strong cases, to shew the authority of revelation over turbulent princes and fierce warriors, and the effect of that authority in meliorating manners, checking violence, and introducing a system of morals which inculcated peace, moderation,

and justice." Just so far as the doctrines of the Bible are received which teach that *men are all of one race*,¹ members of one family, children of the same heavenly Father, may the spirit of humanity be expected to prevail; and when, moreover, the soul's immortality is fully admitted, it throws a sacredness over the estimate of human life, and presents war and bloodshed and violence in a most repulsive light. Accordingly, a more humane and liberal spirit characterizes the intercourse of nations one with another: a resort to war (except in cases of absolute necessity) is everywhere condemned by public opinion, and *modern literature shews the influence of this change*; it is more liberal, it breathes less of a sanguinary spirit, and exhibits far more refinement, gentleness, and delicacy of feeling. More especially is this change apparent in the different manner in which woman is everywhere treated in Christian society, and the different light in which she is depicted and spoken of in literary works. On this point much might be said, but this brief allusion must here suffice. As woman sways a gentle but all-commanding influence at the domestic hearth, and in the community around her; as her spirit is pre-eminently the presiding genius of home, with all its calm joys; so, in the literature of modern times, the altered position of woman seems to shew itself, in a pure and hallowed influence shed over the whole range of literary production. Her gentle spirit is there, as in the home of the mind. But it is the Bible that has elevated

¹ It is gratifying to be able now (April, 1852) to adduce the testimony of a scholar like Bunsen, expressed in a work published long after this Lecture was delivered—as to the decided teaching of the Bible, that men are all of *one race*. Under the head of "Greek and Roman Research" in ancient history, Bunsen thus expresses himself:—"Soon after the time of Diodorus, and in the days of Pliny himself, when the spirit of Greek historical research, whether as regards Egypt or the ancient world at large, had become extinct, *new life was imparted to it* by the inspiring sentiment of the *unity of human nature, shed abroad by the Christian religion*." (*Egypt's Place in the World's History*, vol. i. p. 158. Eng. Trans. Lond. 1848.) Here the learned Bunsen asserts that historical research derived *new life* from the doctrine of the *unity of human races* taught in the *Bible*.

Again: "In the contemplation of human history, Faith begins, as the Sacred Books do, with the divine origin of things, and starting from the *great facts of creation* and the **UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE**." (*Idem*, p. 164.)

This testimony is full and explicit: it needs no comment. *A mere vulgar prejudice*, as the advocates of diversity of races call the doctrine of the unity of races, could hardly have exerted this enlivening influence on the spirit of historical research. Error is not usually ennobling in its influences.

woman, cultivated her mind, polished her manners, and chastened her spirit; and through her it has sent this gentle influence on human intercourse and on modern literature.

But again, sixthly, *The Bible has furnished to modern literature topics of peculiar grandeur, and thoughts of rare beauty, utterly unknown where revelation is not.* How poor and unsatisfactory were the conceptions of the most distinguished writers of classical antiquity concerning the nature and the destiny of man, and especially concerning a superior power. How human in their passions, and degraded in character, are *all* of the numerous gods and demi-gods with which Homer peoples his Olympus. How even the wisest of the ancient philosophers encumber their description of a supreme deity by the notion of the stern decrees of irresistible fate to which the highest of their deities is subject. Among many things that are beautiful, and some that are truly sublime, this poverty of thought respecting the great First Cause exerts an influence that is continually felt. In the writings of the wisest of the ancients, *man* is often represented as equal in dignity of character to their gods, if not positively superior.

But now, what a commanding influence over the whole range of human thought and conception, flows from the sublime idea presented in revelation, of one God, the cause of all things, himself uncaused, eternal, unchangeable, supremely independent, perfect in his nature, and infinite in all his attributes. The presentation of that one glorious conception to the mind is like the rising of the sun to the bodily vision; the darkness and uncertainty previously existing on every object are dissipated, and a world bursts forth in all its beauty of forms, its symmetry of proportions, and its multiplicity of mutual relations, each object appearing in its true nature, its proper position, its due connections. Who can estimate the far-reaching influence on human thought of this one discovery of a spiritual being, the Creator of all, who said, "*Let there be light,*" and there was light; who "*spoke, and it was done; who commanded, and it stood fast?*" What a subject for reflection—an Almighty God, omnipresent and omniscient! How can it do other than influence and new model the whole current of human thought, and the very modes of expressing thought? Now, this grand idea is derived from the Bible, and no one yet has estimated the amount of sublime thought and ennobling sentiment

it has shed over our modern literature, even those portions of it that have proceeded from men who scoff at that very Bible to which they are indebted for nearly every thought that gives force and beauty to their productions ; as, *e. g.* that conception of Byron's, presenting, in the presence of Manfred, the Spirit of Evil to the gaze of the startled Abbot, who exclaims, with pious horror,

“ Ah ! he unveils his aspect . on his brow
The thunder scars are graven : from his eye
Glares forth the immortality of hell !”

The doom of Cain was obviously in the writer's mind. And what but a reflected image of grand ideas presented in the Bible, is that beautiful passage near the close of Childe Harold, the address to the ocean ?

“ Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll !
Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee, in vain .
Man marks the earth with ruin, his control
Stops with the shore : upon the watery plain
The wrecks are all thy dead, nor doth remain
A shadow of man's savage, save his own,
When, for a moment, like a drop of rain,
He sinks into thy depths with bubbling groan,
Without a grave, unknell'd, uncoffin'd, and unknown.

“ Time writes no wrinkles on thine azure brow ;
Such as creation's dawn beheld, thou rollest now,
Thou glorious mirror, where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in tempests . in all time
Calm or convulsed, in breeze or gale or storm,
Icing the pole, or in the torrid clime
Dark heaving : boundless, endless, and sublime.
The image of eternity—the throne
Of the invisible ;—even from out thy slime
The monsters of the deep are made ; each zone
Obeys thee ;—thou goest forth dread, fathomless, alone.”

Compared with such images, the finest figures of ancient classic eloquence are tame and common-place. But every one of these splendid images is furnished in the Bible. Thus, the creation of the monsters of the deep *out of the slime of ocean*, is an idea suggested by that passage in Genesis ii. 20, 21. *And God created great whales (sea-monsters), and every living creature that*

moveth, which the WATERS brought forth abundantly, after their kind. The impotence of man on the ocean is suggested by *contrast* from the scriptural declaration of God's exclusive power to say to the boisterous element, "hitherto shalt thou come, and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." Job xxxviii. 11. While the idea of the ocean's being God's throne, and the *Almighty's form glassing itself in tempests upon ocean, as in a mirror*, is only a beautiful presentation of the thought so often found in holy writ, that *God, as king, sitteth upon the floods; he maketh darkness his pavilion round about him; thick clouds and tempests are under his feet;—yea, he rideth upon the wings of the wind.* That fine passage in Manfred, in which the sage defines the fiend, and declares himself the architect of his own destiny:

——— "Back to thy hell.
 Thou hast no power upon me, *that I feel* ;
 Thou never shalt possess me, *that I know.*
 What I have done, is done. I have within
 A torture which could nothing gain from thine :
 The mind which is immortal, makes itself
 Requital for its good or evil thoughts,
 Is its own origin of ill, and end,
 And its own place and time ; its innate sense,
 When stripped of this mortality, derives
 No colour from the fleeting things without ;
 But is absorbed in suffrance or in joy,
 Born from the knowledge of its own desert.
 Thou didst not tempt me, and thou couldst not tempt me ;
 I have not been thy dupe, nor am thy prey,
 But was my own destroyer, and will be
 My own hereafter.—Back, ye baffled fiends !
 The hand of death is on me,—but not yours :"

is but a poetic amplification of the Bible doctrine, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

The several passages in different writers in which remorse is so vividly described—such as that of Pollok, book iii. p. 83—

“ There is a fire, that on the verge of God's commandments
 Burns, and on the vitals feeds of all who pass—
 Who pass—there meet remorse ! ”

An that splendid passage in Byron's *Giaour*—

“ The mind that broods o'er guilty woes,
 Is like the scorpion, girt by fire,
 In circle narrowing as it glows ;
 The flames around their captive close,
 Till, inly searched by thousand throes,
 And maddening in her ire,
 One sad and sole relief she knows,
 The sting she nourished for her foes,
 Whose venom never yet was vain,
 Gives but one pang, and cures all pain,
 And darts into her desperate brain.
 So do the dark in soul expire,
 Or live, like scorpion girt by fire :
 So writhes the mind remorse hath riven,—
 Unfit for earth, undoom'd for heaven ;
 Darkness above, despair beneath,
 Around it flame, within it death ! ”—

are plainly based upon the Bible representations of the restlessness of the wicked, to whom there is no peace ; and especially upon that terrific image of unending remorse hereafter, *where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*. So that graphic couplet from Shakespeare's *Henry VI.*—

“ Suspicion always haunts the guilty mind ;
 The thief doth fear each bush an officer.”

And again—

“ What stronger breast-plate than a heart untainted.
 Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just ;
 And he, but naked,—though locked up in steel,
 Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted ”—

exhibit, only more amplified, the thought of Solomon, “ The wicked flee when no man pursueth ;—but the righteous are bold as a lion ! ” *Prov. xxviii. 1.*—The same thought, doubtless, gave birth to those striking lines in Scott's *Marmion* :

“ Thus oft it haps, that when within
 They shrink at sense of secret sin,

A feather daunts the brave :
 A fool's wild speech confounds the wise,
 And proudest princes veil their eyes
 Before their meanest slave."

There is a curious and very beautiful idea presented in Campbell's *Gertrude of Wyoming*, viz. that the very dagger which slays the cruel foe is sharpened by contact with the heart it smites :

" Old Outalissi woke his battle song—
 * * * * *
 To whet a dagger on their stony hearts,
 And smile avenged, ere yet his eagle spirit parts."

A similar thought is involved in the bitter taunt that Gratiano throws out against Shylock, as he is whetting his knife on the sole of his shoe, in the trial of Antonio, on his bond, before the Duke, in the merchant of Venice :

" Not on thy sole, but on thy soul, harsh Jew,
 Thou mak'st thy knife keen !"

Now, in both these passages, the *thought* is but a reflected image of the figure so often employed in the Bible, of "*a heart of stone*," to denote extreme obduracy in evil.

It is from the Bible alone that we derive any certain knowledge of a future state—the idea of a heaven of purity and joy for the righteous, of a hell of sorrow for the wicked. How puerile were the conceptions of the ancient philosophers as to the condition of the good in Elysium (a land of discontented shadows, pining ever after earth and its pleasures), and of the fantastic griefs of the bad in Tartarus, when compared with the recorded decision of the Bible, "*whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap*"—in heaven or in hell for ever ! How many pleasing associations, also, are connected with our knowledge of angelic beings, spirits yet nobler than men ! But the existence of angels is made known to us only in the Bible.

Withdraw the Bible, then, from among men, destroy the knowledge of all that is taught in the Bible, and what words can express the change which would at once take place in our literature ? The origin of man, the Fall, the Deluge, the early history of our

race, the primal settlement of nations,—the history of the patriarchs, the origin and early history of that singular race the Jews, are all effectually swept out of memory : with them, the splendid creations of Milton's genius sink into annihilation ; Bunyan's Pilgrim and his Holy War are lost to us ; the manly reasoning of Paley, the profound argument of Butler, the eloquence of Barrow and Sherlock, of Tillotson and Taylor, of Howe and Flavel, of Robert Hall, of Dwight and Chalmers, share a similar fate. The learned labours of Prideaux and Leland, and Stillingfleet and Watson, of Leslie and West, of Michaelis, of Bengel and Kennicott, of Beza, of Calvin, of Luther, and of a host innumerable, are all buried in eternal oblivion ; while the sweetest strains of Klopstock, of Tasso, of Dante, of our own Thomson and Pope, of Cowper and Montgomery, of Campbell and of Scott, die away in eternal silence. The reasonings of Locke, of Stewart, of Reid, and even of Brown, must be entirely new-modelled ; and scarcely will the department of natural science remain unscathed, so wide-spread, so almost universal would be the sweep of destruction among the noblest works of our literature, that must follow in the train of the Bible's extinction.

Moreover, from the mere remnant of literature that would escape utter oblivion, the richest ornaments, the most striking thoughts, the most impressive figures, would be erased :—for the choicest of all these are borrowed from the Bible. When you meet with a peculiarly grand thought or forcible figure in the works of such writers as Dryden, Pope, Byron—aye Shakespeare himself, the master deeply learned in the human heart—you will find, almost certainly, that it is drawn from the Bible ; it is the echo of some thought there found. Thus that beautiful closing line in the funeral song on the burial of Sir John Moore, "*We left him alone with his glory,*" is obviously but a reflex image of the sublime picture furnished by Isaiah, when describing Sheol, the place where the dead are congregated : "All the kings of the earth, even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house." Isa. xiv. 18.

In like manner, Byron's *Giaour* has a fine passage, in which, after Hassan has been slain by a sudden onslaught of his foe, the *Giaour*, the mother of Hassan, is represented as awaiting his return, and wondering at his delay ; thus—

"The browsing camel bells are tinkling,
 His mother looked from her lattice high,
 She saw the dews of eve besprinkling
 The pasture green beneath her eye,
 She saw the planets faintly twinkling:
 'Tis twilight—sure his train is nigh.
 She could not rest in his garden bower,
 But gazed through the grate of his steepest tower:
 Why comes he not? his steeds are fleet,
 Nor shrink they from the summer heat;
 Why sends not the bridegroom his promise'd gift?"

This spirited description is but a modern application of a yet finer passage in the triumphant song of Deborah, the Jewish prophetess and Judge (Judges v. 28-30): "The mother of Sisera looked out at a window, and cried through the lattice, 'Why is his chariot so long in coming? Why tarry the wheels of his chariots?' Her wise ladies answered her, Yea; she returned answer to herself, Have they not sped! Have they not divided the prey? to every man a damsel or two: to Sisera a prey of divers colours, of divers colours of needlework, of divers colours of needle-work on both sides, meet for the necks of them that take the spoils!"

That touching passage in *Childe Harold*, in which the untimely death of the Princess Charlotte of England, and of her new-born son, is lamented, is but a sweet echo of one of the most beautiful passages found in the Hebrew prophets—

"Hark! forth from the abyss a voice proceeds,
 A long low distant murmur of dread sound,
 Such as arises when a nation bleeds
 With some deep and unmedicable wound;
 Through storm and darkness yawns the pending ground,
 The gulf is thick with phantoms;—but the chief
 Seems royal still, though with her head dis-crowned
 And pale—but lovely, * * * *
 Scion of chiefs and monarchs! where art thou?
 Fond hope of many nations—art thou dead?
 Could not the grave forget thee, and lay low
 Some less majestic, less beloved head?"

This is truly beautiful, but its whole beauty is borrowed. It is only a skilful application of that passage in *Isaiah* which represents the shades of the monarchs of earth gathered in Acheron,

and awaiting the coming of the shade of the mighty king of Babylon : "The abyss from beneath is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming : it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth : it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and shall say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols : the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee. How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art *thou* cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" (Isaiah xiv. 9-12.) So also that affecting picture which the noble poet presents to the widowed husband of the lamented princess—

" Of sackcloth was thy wedding garments made,
 Thy bridal fruit is ashes : in the dust
 The fair-haired daughter of the isles is laid ;—
 The love of millions— * * *

is but a judicious application of the figures which are furnished in the Hebrew prophet's delineation of the afflicted daughter of Judah, Lam. ii. 10 : " The elders of the daughter of Judah sit upon the ground, and keep silence : they have cast up dust upon their heads, they have girded themselves with sackcloth ; the virgins of Jerusalem hang down their heads to the ground." And also, Jeremiah vi. 26 : " Oh, daughter of Judah, gird thee with sackcloth, and wallow thyself in ashes : make thee mourning as for an only son, most bitter lamentation."

Nor is it a far-fetched nor an improbable idea that would attribute the poetic beauty which invests the introduction, by Shakspeare, of the ghost of Banquo, and of that of Hamlet's father, to the ideas awakened in the poet's mind by the Old Testament record of the raising up of the spirit of the prophet Samuel, by the witch of Endor ; and also the whole of the great dramatic bard's supernatural machinery of the witches in Macbeth, the fairies in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and the obedient spirits of Prospero in the *Tempest*, to the obscure intimations given in the sacred record, of men's having attempted, in times of old, to have dealings with familiar spirits. I here hazard no conjecture as to the true interpretation of such passages in holy writ. I am

alluding merely to the influence which the popular understanding of them has had on prevalent superstitions, and on our literature, into which these superstitions have been wrought with so much skill, and so fine an effect. Nor can we doubt that the idea of Mephistopheles in his Faust, and of his dance and song of the witches, was so suggested to Goethe;—and of his Manfred to Byron. In his last-mentioned poem, also, the appearance of the shadowy outline of the fiend before Manfred, slowly only, and with horror, discerned by the pious Abbot, thus—

“ *Manf.* Look there!—what dost thou see?

Ab. Nothing!

Manf. Look there, I say,

And steadfastly :—now tell me what thou seest!

Ab. That which should shake me,—but I fear it not.

I see a dark and awful figure rise,
Like an infernal god, from out the earth ;
His face wrapt in a mantle, and his form
Robed as with angry clouds”—

strongly brings to mind that sublime passage in the book of Job (Job iv. 14-16): “ In thoughts from visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up. It stood still—but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes;—there was silence, and I heard a voice.” The dream of Clarence, in Shakspeare’s Richard III., is cast in the same mould. These are but specimens, hastily selected, in illustration of my position, that many of the finest sentiments, and the most beautiful images that adorn our modern literature, are only the echoes of thoughts expressed in the Bible.

And nowhere is this rich echo of Bible thoughts more distinctly perceptible than in that inimitable address of Portia, when personating the learned Dr Balthazar, to the relentless Shylock, in order to move him to abate the rigour of his demand against Antonio, in the Merchant of Venice.

“ The quality of mercy is not strained ;
It droppeth, as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the earth beneath. It is twice blessed

It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes ;
 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest : it becomes
 The throned monarch better than his crown.
 His sceptre shews the force of temporal power,
 The attribute of awe and majesty,
 Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings.
 But mercy is above this sceptred sway ;
 It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
 It is an attribute of God himself ;
 And earthly power doth then shew likest God's
 When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
 Though justice be thy plea, consider this,
 That in the course of justice none of us
 Should see salvation : we do pray for mercy ;
 And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
 The deeds of mercy."

So clearly does this fine passage re-echo Bible thoughts throughout, that it is difficult, as we hear it, not to feel as though listening to sentences selected directly from the Bible itself. And truly the language used in the Bible comes very near it: *e. g.* "Mercy rejoiceth against judgment," Jas. ii. 13. "The discretion of a man deferreth his anger, and it is his glory to pass by a transgression," Prov. xix. 11. "Mercy and truth preserve a king; and his throne is upholden by mercy," Prov. xx. 28. "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." "Verily I say unto you, if ye forgive not every man his brother their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you."

Again—that much admired passage in the *Tempest*—

"The cloud-capt towers, the gorgeous palaces,
 The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
 Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
 And, like this unsubstantial pageant faded,
 Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
 As dreams are made of, and our little life
 Is rounded with a sleep"—

is nothing more than a fine amplification of two short passages from the Bible: "The fashion of this world passeth away." And again, "What is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." From the same source, doubtless, sprung that fine passage in Prior's *Solomon*:—

“ A flower that does with opening dawn arise,
 And, flourishing the day, at evening dies ;
 A winged eastern blast, just skimming o'er
 The ocean's brow, and sinking on the shore ;
 A fire, whose flames through crackling stubble fly ;
 A meteor, shooting from the summer sky ;
 A bowl, adown the bending mountain rolled ;
 A bubble breaking—and a fable told ;
 A noontide shadow, and a midnight dream ;
 Are emblems which, with semblance apt, proclaim
 Our earthly course.”

So also that of Fawkes :—

“ If life a thousand years, or e'er so few,
 'Tis repetition all, and nothing new ;
 A fair where thousands meet, but none can stay ;
 An inn where travellers meet, and post away.”

And how majestically does Shakspeare make the fallen Wolsey echo the sentiment of the Hebrew prophet, “ All flesh is grass, and the glory thereof as the flower of grass ?” &c.

“ Farewell ! a long farewell to all my greatness !
 This is the state of man. To-day he puts forth
 The tender leaves of hope, to-morrow blossoms,
 And bears his blushing honours thick upon him ;
 The third day comes a frost—a killing frost ;
 And when he thinks (good easy man !) full surely
 His greatness is a ripening—nips his root,
 And then he falls as I do.”

Just so says the prophet, “ The wind passeth over it, and it is gone.”

The Bible is replete with images of the highest sublimity—passages, many of which breathe also a most touching eloquence. Such are the song of Deborah and Barak in Judges ; the reception given by the shades of Hades to the spirit of Babylon's king, as presented in Isa. chap. xiv. already referred to. Such also is the triumphant song of the Israelites on viewing the destruction of Egypt's martial hosts in the Red Sea (Exodus, chap. xv.) Such is the prayer of Jonah (Jonah, chap. ii.) ; and where shall we find, in any writings, a passage fuller of grand imagery than the prayer of

the prophet Habakkuk, chap. iii. 3-16? Where are sublimity and beauty more richly combined than in the 104th Psalm, "O Lord, my God, thou art very great?" &c. &c. Where can you find a more touching description of goodness worthy of the Deity than in Psalm ciii., "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him?" &c. &c. How beautiful and how appropriate, too, is the picture drawn by Moses (Dent. xxxii. 9-14) of the care of Jehovah for his own covenant people: "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings; so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him. He made him ride on the high places of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields; and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock!" But I forbear; the Bible is full of such imagery—grand, striking, and affecting. Do you look for pathos? What more pathetic than David's lament over Jonathan and Saul slain in battle? (2 Sam. i. 17-27) What more affecting than the royal father's heart-piercing lamentation over his fair-haired but rebellious son? "O my son, Absalom! my son, my son, Absalom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!"

Would you ponder deeply the treasured results of wisdom—the dear-bought fruits of experience? You have, in the book of Proverbs, an exhaustless storehouse of wisdom for the guidance of your conduct in all the diversified circumstances of human life. The one short book of Proverbs contains more sound practical wisdom than can be gathered from all the boasted teachings of all the renowned philosophers of antiquity and of modern times combined.

Now the Bible, thus teeming with wisdom and blazing with beauty of thought and splendour of imagery, has for ages been in the hands of men; and these thrilling passages have been before their eyes and present to their minds; and they have mingled in the thoughts, and assisted to mould the conceptions, and to determine the phraseology of our most masterly writers.

Let the Bible and its influences, direct and indirect, be blotted

out of existence, and you at once extinguish the sun that illumines our literary heavens, and you impair the strength and mar the beauty of our whole literature.

That book which, whenever possessed, has fostered the spirit of learning in all its varied departments—which has given birth to some of the profoundest works in existence written solely for its illustration—which has laid a broad foundation for the science of jurisprudence—has promoted (far as it has been known) general intelligence among the mass of the people—which has decidedly elevated the tone of morals, has imbued mankind with a gentler spirit, and has mitigated the horrors of war—that book which (besides doing all this) has furnished to our most admired writers topics of unrivalled grandeur and images of peculiar beauty, so that its annihilation would deface the largest and the fairest portion of our literature—that book may well awaken our admiration, insure our respect, and commend itself to our closest attention as the sun of true knowledge, the light and glory of our literature, a prize invaluable to human society, a boon of priceless worth to every young man.

And that book is the Bible, heaven's best gift to man. It is the repository of noble thoughts, the originator of splendid imagery, the oracle of soundest wisdom. It is a counsellor to the young—a solace to the aged. *It is the grand text-book to the true student.* It sparkles with brilliance, it blazes with beauty, and it breathes the spirit of liberty. It is emphatically and pre-eminently THE BOOK FOR THE PEOPLE!

“ Most wondrous book ! bright candle of the Lord !
 Star of eternity ! the only star
 By which the bark of man could navigate
 The sea of life, and gain the coast of bliss
 Securely,—only star which rose on Time,
 And on its dark and troubled billows still,
 As generation drifting swiftly by,
 Succeeded generation, threw a ray
 Of heaven's own light, and to the hills of God—
 The everlasting hills—pointed the sinner's eye.
 This book—this glorious book—on every line
 Marked with the seal of high divinity ;
 On every leaf bedewed with drops of love
 Divine—and with the eternal heraldry

And signature of God Almighty stampt
From first to last—this ray of sacred light,
This lamp, from off the everlasting throne,
Mercy took down, and, in the night of time,
Stood casting on the dark her gracious bow,
And evermore beseeching men, with tears
And earnest sighs, to read, believe, and live !”—POLLOCK, B. I.

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
32 BRUSH STREET, LONDON.

222 1/HAM



3153

