

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1850.

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Life of Robert Blair, Minister of St. Andrews, containing his Autobiography from 1593 to 1636, with a Supplement to his Life, and Continuation of the History of the Times to 1680.* By his son-in-law, Mr. William Row, Minister of Ceres. Edited for the Wodrow Society, from the Original Manuscript, by Thomas McCrie, D.D. Edinburgh: Printed for the Wodrow Society, 1848.

ROBERT BLAIR was a remarkable man, and lived through a large part of a century, in very eventful times. His history has not, hitherto, been so well known, as that of other Scottish worthies; but by the exertions of the Wodrow Society, it has recently been brought to light. He was born at Irvine, in the year 1593, and was the youngest of four brothers; the names of the other three were John, James, and William: the two eldest rose to be chief magistrates of Irvine, and William was first a regent in the University of Glasgow, and afterwards minister of Dumbarton.

Robert entered the University in the year 1611, and took his degree of A.M. in 1614. After teaching two years in the public school, he succeeded his brother as one of the Regents

ART. V.—*The Doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race, examined on the Principles of Science.* By John Bachman, D. D., Professor of Natural History, College of Charleston, S. C. Charleston: C. Canning, 29 Pinkney street. 1850. 12mo. pp. 312.

We regard this volume as one of uncommon interest and value. It reveals, on the part of the author, a learned, minute, and practical acquaintance with the sciences embraced in the argument. He is a practical cultivator of natural history; and has, we think vindicated a high rank for himself among naturalists, by laborious, ingenious, and, in the applications which raise natural history into the range of true science, fruitful, researches and discoveries. We admit, therefore, the competence of the author; and in the handling of his subject, he displays a vigorous and comprehensive grasp of intellect, which ought not to be impaired in the judgment of the reader, by the evidences of carelessness or want of culture in regard to the graces of style, or the absence of a clear logical order in presenting the ample and conclusive materials of his argument.

The doctrine of the unity of the human race, as it is essential to the whole religious system of the Bible, as well as taught in express terms, so it has been the common faith of Christendom. In modern times, however, a question has been raised, whether the extreme diversity existing among the several varieties of the race, especially between the Caucasian and African, does not require a distinct parentage to be assigned to the latter. Men of science, with few and questionable exceptions, were found on the side of the scriptures. The ground mainly relied upon by the scientific advocates of the unity of the race, besides the essential agreement of the several varieties in their structure and functions, was the indiscriminate mixture of blood, and the indefinite fertility of their offspring, against the established law of nature, which either prevents the mixture of different species of animals, or renders their hybrid product incapable of permanent self-propagation. To this a feeble resistance was first attempted,

on the allegation that the offspring of the different races of mankind, have shown a tendency to degenerate and die out, in accordance with the law of reproduction, as applied to different species. But as this assumption became clearly untenable, as a matter of fact, another ground of argument was taken up, and the attempt was made to show that hybrids are not necessarily sterile. About three years ago Dr. Morton, of Philadelphia, published in *Silliman's Journal*, a very elaborate collection of cases, which were supposed to show that new species of animals were permanently established by the mixture of contiguous species. Dr. M. did not, however, push his conclusion to the extent of denying the doctrine of the unity of the human race; but as his conclusions manifestly favoured the views of those who did, Dr. Bachman has felt himself called upon to re-examine this scientific problem; and in so doing, has scattered to the winds the proof gathered by Dr. M. in favour of the doctrine he had sought to establish. Meanwhile, the distinguished naturalist, Professor Agassiz, at the late meeting of the American Association for the Promotion of Science at Charleston, S. C., has startled us by expressing a very significant doubt, as to the question whether the various races of men are all sprung from the same parentage. While he expressly admits, that in the higher sense of the doctrine, as held by its advocates, he fully believes that all the varieties of men possess essentially the same physical, intellectual and moral constitution, and are subject to the same laws, entitled to the same privileges, and animated with the same hopes, he yet supposes them to have sprung from different centres of population. He also avows his belief, that the scriptures were addressed wholly to one race, and contemplate the destiny of that race alone, in all their statements; while they imply, in repeated instances, the existence of other races, having a distinct origin and a distinct history.

We have no intention of entering at present into the merits of the question discussed by the author. All that we have space to do, is to state the posture of the parties to this controversy, and the relation which it holds towards the scriptures. On this last point we think the learned gentlemen who have

conducted the scientific argument, on both sides, have fallen into a serious mistake. Dr. Bachman himself plants his heavy and well managed battery on wrong ground. And while the selection of his position may evince entire confidence in the weight of his metal, and the success of his cause, yet it exposes him to unnecessary annoyance and some damage, and prolongs needlessly the issue of the contest. He has cleared away with his own hands the breast work of defence, to whose protection he was legitimately entitled.

In the first place, these gentlemen must bear in mind that this is not purely a question of science; at least not of natural science. It is partly a historical question; and in a still higher and more commanding sense it is a religious question. It is not, therefore, like the questions touching revelation which grew out of the early inductions and generalizations of astronomy, geology, and antiquarian research. It is not simply a question of interpretation. It enters into the heart of the very object for which the scriptures were given. The injudicious intermeddling of some friends of revelation was ruled out, in the other cases, on the ground that the scriptures were not given to man for the purpose of teaching science. In this instance, the same objection cannot be allowed. The very object of the Bible was to clear up the history of the fall of man, to explain the condition in which he is found, and to reveal a plan for his recovery. The question under debate involves, therefore, not only the anatomical and physiological structure and functions of the several races or varieties of men; but still more vitally their moral character and condition. They have all not only the same number of bones, muscles and organs, as the naturalists have demonstrated, but they are all sinners. This is the important point to which the scriptures speak. How came this to pass? Clearly not by creation. How then? Natural science is silent, and the Bible answers, by the transgression of the natural head of the race, in consequence of which death entered into the world; and the result has been that all their descendants have inherited from their progenitors a corrupt and dying nature. Of course this solution reaches no farther than to their natural offspring. The question is, does it include all varieties

of men? All need a solution; for all are in the same moral condition, and require the same provision for the future. Does the solution of the Bible include all? This is obviously another form for the question, was the Bible intended for all classes of men, and is it true of all? The progress of human culture and civilization make it certain, that the scriptures are to be the common property of all, from the Caucasian down to the African. Now if the great absorbing fact in their condition, their sinful nature and consequent need of salvation, is not to be referred to their derivation from one source, or as the scriptures express it, to their being "made of one blood," then it is clearly wrong to give them the scriptures at all. We have no warrant for offering the salvation of the Bible to any but the race of whom it is the genuine history. If its statements are to be limited as Agassiz intimates, to the race to whom it was given, while there are other races of men, proceeding from other centres of population, how can we determine to whom its privileges of right appertain? If it be answered that the New Testament authorizes the offer of the gospel to every creature, we reply that this is no more general than the statement, that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The very rule of interpretation set up by these gentlemen, is, that the universality of the terms, is to be restricted to the race contemplated by the revelation in question. Where then is our warrant for offering salvation to the African? If they do not belong to our race, that is, are not descended from our first parents, they are not, in the sense declared by the scriptures, either partakers of our guilt or of our remedy. How then came they to be sinners? and how are they to be saved? The doctrine of Agassiz utterly breaks down here. And as the savans have warned theologians not to tread on their ground, while they are settling questions of pure science; so now we are entitled to warn them to respect ours, in questions of religion. For if any question is a question of religion and revelation, this is one. It involves not only the history of the fall, but the plan for the redemption of the race; or in other words, both the relation to Adam and the relation to Christ. Both are on the same footing. Both stand and fall together.

And it is needless to say that these constitute the very marrow of the scriptures.

We repeat that the inspired History cannot be ruled out, in the settlement of this question, except on principles that involve blank deism. And why should it? We have said before, that next to the religious bearings of the point in dispute, the question is a historical one rather than a question in science. And for antiquity and authenticity, it is hardly necessary to add, that there is no historical authority comparable with the Bible.

But it may be impatiently demanded whether science has nothing to do with the question? Whether we are to accept the teaching of the scriptures, on a point involving the natural history of man, even if the human structure, examined in the light of science, should contradict that teaching. This suggests the second leading remark, in regard to the state of this question; viz: the true relation which science holds to this controversy.

It should be remembered, then, that the doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race, has been universally received, on the evidence of the inspired history of the Bible, the only positive authority we have upon the subject. Recently, however, a question has been raised—by whom or for what purpose, it might seem invidious to specify—whether the doctrine is compatible with the differences observed in the anatomical and physiological characteristics of the several races, or varieties of men. Now it is evident that the sole question for the naturalist to determine, is that of this alleged incompatibility. It is not whether, in the absence of all knowledge on the subject, we might not suppose the different varieties of the race, to constitute different original species; or whether that would not be, on the whole, and in the absence of such knowledge, the most satisfactory hypothesis—but whether it is impossible that the doctrine of the Bible, which alleges a common parentage, should be true. Is it so clearly impossible on scientific grounds, that we are compelled to reject the scriptures as false, because they affirm it? It is not as Dr. Backman intimates, a curious point in natural history, about which we are to examine patiently the probabilities, and so determine whe-

ther a given variety is a separate species or not; just as we would undertake to decide whether the China and the common Goose, belong to the same or to separate species, merely on the ground of a slight anatomical difference in the structure of the larynx. But supposing we had a clear, unquestioned and continuous history, established by an indefinite amount of evidence, of the origin of these different varieties from a single stock, the question is, whether the anatomical difference is such, as to compel us to set aside that history as false, on the ground that it cannot be true.

With this state of the question let any one look into the uncertainty, under which naturalists labour, in determining the question of distinct species, and the obscurity and difficulty which hang over the origin of different and permanent varieties, springing from the same species; and the notion of overthrowing the foundations of divine Revelation, by any such methods, would resemble that of forcing a walled and well armed fortress, to surrender, by levelling against it a child's popgun.

We own that there are few things which more provoke, we can hardly say our disapprobation, but our absolute contempt, than most of the reasonings we have seen upon the negative of this question. It is notorious that vastly greater diversities, in every particular, are found among animals that are known to be derived from a single original source. In proof of this we have only to cite the difference in form, size, colour, covering, conformation and size of the cranium, disposition and habits exemplified in the case of the Arabian courser, the Shetland poney, and the massive draught-horse, all of which are known to be varieties of the same species (*Eguus Caballus*.) Similar differences are exhibited in almost every species of domesticated animals,—the cow, the sheep, the swine, the cat, the dog. Every one is familiar with the contrast presented, for example, between the St. Bernard and the lap-dog,—the New-foundland web-footed water dog, and the Italian grey-hound,—the bull-dog and the terrier or setter. In view of such diversities as are springing up and becoming permanent varieties under our very eyes, to concede, as the facts require, that the anatomical structure in all the

varieties of the Human race is the same, bone for bone, muscle for muscle, nerve for nerve, organ for organ and function for function, and then attempt to degrade a portion of the race to a level with the brute, and to set aside the Bible, freighted with the happiness and hopes of the race, and supported by a multiplicity and amount of evidence, that produces not only conviction but certainty, because, forsooth, the heel, (os calcis) of the African, happens to average a line or two more in length than that of the Caucasian, or because there are a few more fibres in the muscles of his lips, accompanied in general by a feebler degree of cerebral development and a deposit of a different hue, in the *rete mucosum* of the skin, is to move our scorn, to a degree that few human follies are capable of doing.

Dr. Bachman, following almost the entire corps of scientific naturalists, maintains that if there were no certain knowledge on the subject, the unity of the race would unquestionably result, from the mere application of the acknowledged principles of science. And we think he establishes the point by overwhelming evidence, drawn from a vast variety of sources. But whether he does or not, surely the bare fact that such an argument can be constructed by such men, is evidence that the hypothesis which it assumes, is not so clearly absurd and contradictory, that the Christian must cast away his Bible, because it teaches that hypothesis. Let the naturalists remember that the Bible solves this question historically; and let them accept its solution, unless it is manifestly impossible.

We should be exceedingly glad to present to our readers an analysis of the able, cumulative argument of Dr. Bachman, together with some thoughts of our own, suggested by the masterly works of Prichard, Balbi, Adelung, and the concurrent testimony of the later comparative anatomists—especially Mr. Owen, of the British Museum; but our crowded space forbids. We heartily recommend the work before us, as a thorough and candid examination of the scientific questions involved in the controversy. We believe few ordinary readers can rise from its perusal, without perfect satisfaction, as to

the only point, about which the Christian feels satisfaction to be needed.

We may say in a word, that the author demonstrates from a very large, laborious, in great part original and careful induction of facts, that the law of propagation in the organic world, excludes the origination of new species, by the mixture of existing species; and hence the capability of permanent reproduction, is the characteristic test of a species. The fact, therefore, that all the varieties of men reproduce indefinitely, and permanently, proves that they all belong to one species. To this law there is no known exception, in the entire kingdom of nature, either animal or vegetable.

The author next undertakes to show that the hypothesis of different human species, even if it were possible, is wholly unnecessary and unphilosophical; because changes fully equal and even much greater, extending to important anatomical and physiological differences, are known to have originated, and often become permanent as varieties, as the result of accident, association or culture; and that this is especially true among domesticated animals, or in other words among those which are most closely allied with man. The truth of this conclusion, of course, excludes the scientific argument, so far as it impeaches the express teaching of the Bible. If all those diversities from which a separate origin of the races of men is argued on scientific grounds, are paralleled, and even surpassed, in every particular, in ascertained cases of common origin, then the argument is answered, and the revealed historic record stands untouched.

In the Second Part of his work, Dr. B. goes into a scientific exposition of the various causes tending to produce the several varieties of the human species, in their relations and correspondencies with inferior, and especially domesticated, animals: thus concluding his proof that they are mere varieties, springing from a common source, and not separate species, by pointing out the causes, and the mode and progressive action of the causes, which have resulted in the change in question. The argument is thus comprehensive and complete; and while we are not prepared to endorse the analysis and inferences of the author, in all the numerous cases submitted to examina-

tion, we are prepared to express our full conviction that he has made good all the important points of his argument.

ART. VI.—*The Rise, Progress and Structure of the English Language.* By the Rev. Matthew Harrison, A. M., Rector of Church Oakley, Hants; and late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle, No. 6, South Fifth St. 1850. 12 mo. pp. 393.

We have often wondered that the field of research and discussion covered in this volume has been left so long unoccupied; and had at last begun to hope, that an American scholar, who is understood to be devoting considerable attention to the Anglo Saxon and its relations to our tongue, would have the honour of supplying the desideratum in Literature, which the author of this treatise has essayed to furnish. Although this is an essay in the right direction, there is still scope enough for other labourers in the same wide and rich field of authorship.

We have in the first place a very compact history of the origin and formation of the English Language, and the changes it has undergone; in which the several sources contributing both to its vocabulary and its grammatical forms, are brought into view, as well as the nature and extent of the contribution from each. In this there is very little that is new to any one conversant with the learned labours of Bosworth, Thorpe, Turner, Prichard, Kemble and Percy. The summary, however, is well done, and adequate acknowledgments are made in general, to his predecessors in the historical department; except in the case of Bishop Percy, whose classification of the Celtic and Gothic affiliated tongues, is too important a contribution to the literature of a difficult and previously very confused subject, to be adopted entire, without some special acknowledgment.

The second part of the work is Philological, consisting of a dissertation on the principles of the formation of Languages,