

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

1. *Address of the Southern members of Congress to their constituents, Washington City, Jan. 1849.*
2. *Lecture on the North and the South, delivered before the Young Men's Mercantile Library Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, January 16th, 1849: by ELWOOD FISHER. 8vo. pp. 24.*
3. *Mussey's review of Fisher, on the North and the South. Cincinnati: 1849. 8vo. pp. 98.*
4. *Practical Hints on the comparative cost and productiveness of the culture of Cotton, and the cost and productiveness of its manufacture. Addressed to the Cotton planters and capitalists of the South. By CHAS. T. JAMES. Providence: 1849. 12mo. pp. 68.*

We cannot repress a sigh from our very heart, as we take up the pen to discuss the subject of these publications. Its magnitude and difficulties are enough to make any mind serious and even sad. We are almost ready to despair, too, of a satisfactory and peaceful settlement of the questions it involves. The conviction that the season for discussion has passed, and the time for action come, is also growing upon us. We have scarcely a hope that aught we shall say, will influence the result so much as a

alectic variations.* Yet a part of these nations were descended from Shem, and another part from Ham. Indeed the argument which proves our race to have a common origin and parentage, is one of vast variety and strength. Like those fibres in some objects of nature, which, crossing each other like a net work in every direction, hold together in one body the mass they interpenetrate and enclose, so this many sided argument, these physiological, linguistic, antiquarian, and historic proofs, show the family of man to be one, and though separate in themselves, mutually confirm and sustain each other.

The opinions in reference to which we have thus briefly expressed our dissent, are no otherwise injurious than as they present an unsound basis on which to rest the Scripture defence of slavery. They imply no disrespect to the sacred volume, but the reverse. Some of the remarks, therefore, with which this brief article is prefaced, are unsuitable if applied to them. They were designed to refer rather to a third hypothesis, which will be considered in the following article, to which this may be regarded, if the reader will, as introductory, an hypothesis which we are obliged to reject, if we continue to receive the Scriptures as the oracles of God.

ARTICLE V.

Two Lectures on the Connection between the Biblical and Physical History of Man. Delivered by invitation, from the Chair of Political Economy, etc. of the Louisiana University, in December, 1848. By JOSIAH C. NOTT, M. D. of Mobile, Alabama. New York, 1849.

The closing words of the preceding article, have spoken of it as originally designed to be introductory to the one upon which we now enter. We, therefore, ad-

* See Gesen. Monumenta Phœnicia.

vance without further preface, to consider another theory concerning the race of man, which the Lectures, the title of which is given at the head of our article, bring before us. This is the theory which we suppose, from various expressions, is adopted by Dr. Nott: *that the Bible gives us an account of the Caucasian race only*, which he says "is probably the true Adamic race, whose history is so dimly shadowed forth in the Pentateuch." He quotes Lanci, "the first philologist of our day," to prove that Adam must be literally translated THE RED, from the Arabian *Dem* (?) "to be red," whence *Adama*, red-earth. DEM, also means *blood*, and the sense of the word Adam is the "red man," or "il rossicante," the *blusher*. Now, since it is only the Caucasian race that can blush, it is probably only the Caucasian race that the Hebrews meant by Adam.* Dr. Nott further says, that "it is to the pure Caucasian we must turn, as, probably, the last and most perfect work of the Almighty. The latter is probably the true Adamic race, whose history is so dimly shadowed forth in the Pentateuch." "No one, informed on the subject, can affirm that man did not exist ages prior to the six days of *our* creation."

We need not inform our readers how *contrary* this hypothesis is to every declaration of the Scriptures, and how impossible it is, they being true, that the other varieties of men should have been created before Adam, always represented as the first man, and the first human occupant of the new formed earth; and how impossible it is, in accordance with the whole tenor of their teachings, that other races should have been created since,

* It is no proof of the scholarship of Lanci, which, however, we do not mean to question, that he could trace the resemblance between the name of Adam and words of the same ultimate root which signify *to be red*. The same could easily be done by the merest smatterer in Hebrew. We know not why an argument might not be made out of the same philological material, to prove that Adam was an Indian, and that Moses gives an account of the *homo Americanus*. A more probable reason for the name is found in the fact that Adam was formed of dust taken *Min-Adama*, 'from the ground,' and that the name was designed to remind him of his origin, in contrast with that of the second Adam, the Saviour of men. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy. Comp. Joseph Ant. i. 1, 2; and Rosenmueller on Gen. i. 26. If there is any allusion to the complexion of the first man in the name, there is abundant evidence that men of other complexions have, nevertheless, descended from him.

either before the flood or after, having no connection of consanguinity with him. He is represented as existing at first alone, and exercising lordship over the inferior creation, as the representative of his entire race; as receiving a help-meet for him, at the hand of the Creator, whom he calls prophetically Eve, *the mother of all living*. To them, and only to them, was the command given, "Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it." On him, as the representative of mankind, were privileges conferred. With him was a covenant made, the provisions of which affected the entire race. The early chapters of Genesis represent the whole Antediluvian world as descended from him. At length, for their sin, this world was destroyed, "and only Noah remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark." From these "were the nations divided," or *dispersed abroad*, "after the flood."* Of Shem, Ham, and Japheth "was the whole earth overspread."†

It is vain to conjure into existence difficulties respecting the Book of Genesis, to set aside its patent testimony as to the derivation of the nations, and the unity of the race. The Bible stands or falls *as a whole*. Every succeeding part implies the existence of this, and of the facts it records. Our Saviour alludes to the Mosaic record of the creation of man. "Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning, made them a male and a female?"‡ "The first man," says Paul, "is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven." "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit" "As by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death hath passed upon all"—"as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."§ The history of the creation of Adam is represented by Christ and the Apostle Paul, as being precisely that which is found in the first chapters of Genesis, and the liability to death of the whole race, and their unholy nature, is directly traced to the sin of Adam, their progenitor, as its cause. In like manner is the history of Noah and of the flood, and of the times preceding it, refer-

* Gen. x. 32.

† ix. 19.

‡ Matth. xix. 4.

§ 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47; Rom. v. 12, 19.

red to by Christ, by Paul, and by Peter who speaks of Noah and the eight souls that were with him in the Ark, as being saved by water, when God brought the flood upon the world of the ungodly.* It is plain that Christ, Paul, and Peter received the Book of Genesis, and the early part of it just as it is, though Dr. Nott, in his wisdom, finds in it nothing but "positive contradictions," "ignorance of facts," "palpable inconsistencies," "unhistoric" statements, "inconsistent facts," "irreconcilable" assertions, and "confusions worse confounded."

We freely accord to Dr. Nott all those private virtues, and that eminence in his honourable profession, which we doubt not he possesses, and we would earnestly desire to separate between the character which belongs to him as a citizen and a man, and that which he assumes as an assailant of the religion we are bound to defend. If we speak of him in this light, it is because he has placed himself, of his own accord, in antagonism to the truth of God, to whom we hold a higher allegiance than any we acknowledge on earth. If we speak freely of the book he has sent into the world, it is not in any spirit of enmity to him. For this freedom of speech he is doubtless prepared. "We have determined," says he, "to start the ball," "and we stand prepared to meet any issue."

We must say, then, that we have read this book with painful astonishment. And we know not which most excites it, the respect he seems in some sentences to manifest for revealed religion, or the air of boldness with which he attacks the Scriptures in every thing which makes them of the least value to man. Our amazement is not diminished when we consider the trifling cause of all this outcry against the Scriptures. He imagines the Ethiopian to be of a different race from ourselves. He cannot account for his colour and conformation from natural causes. He *wishes* that he may not be of the same race. He does not want to view him as even a remote descendant from the same stock with himself. There are certain political and certain physiological reasons why he should not. The Scriptures, however, affirm that God hath made of one blood all nations of the earth. The

* Matth. xxiv. 38; Heb. xi. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 5.

Scriptures, then, as an infallible rule of faith, shall bow their head. Their doom is sealed. Their reign is over. They are weighed in the balances, and found wanting.

The language of respect for the Scriptures, to which we have alluded, is as follows :

“ If there be a future existence in store for us, certainly the subject of all others, which should engage our serious attention, is religion.” “ The unity of the race can only be deduced from forced constructions of the Old and New Testaments (!) and a persistence in this error is calculated to subvert and not uphold our religion.” “ We beg leave, at the outset, to disclaim any intention to call in question the well authenticated and important portions of the Scriptures, or to deny their inestimable value to man.” “ Our object is not to war against genuine revelation.” “ Jerusalem was the centre of a bright light to a dark world, and in this faith the *younger* (?) Isaiah closed his magnificent strains.” The inspired writers placed themselves above all philosophers of antiquity, and looked to God alone for the physical as well as the *moral* laws of the universe.”

Notwithstanding the intimation respecting “ the younger Isaiah,” which is a sufficient hint, as to the type of theology embraced by the writer,* it might be supposed, from these expressions, that he was a believer in revealed religion and had its interest at heart. But it is not long before he undeceives us. It is very plain that the only religion he admits is the religion of nature, and that the inspiration of the sacred writers he alludes to, is an inspiration which does not secure them from error ; that it is an inspiration which leaves them to commit the most egregious blunders of statement, and to produce writings the most confused and contradictory. Though he disclaims any intention of calling into question the well authenticated portions of the Scriptures, the very disclaimer implies that there are portions which are not well authenticated and important. But these very portions were received by Christ and the Apostles as parts of that Scripture written by men moved by the Holy Ghost, and the most important conclusions both as to doctrine and duty were based upon them.

The objections of Dr. Nott are so miscellaneous, embrace so many minute particulars, and are so devoid of a

* *Fenum habet in cornu.*

just arrangement ; as to leave us at a loss where to commence our reply, or how to confine it within proper limits. One remark, however, we premise, as to the authorities on which he relies. "So far from appealing to infidel writers," says he, "we shall advance no opinion in relation to the *texts* or interpretation of the Old and New Testaments, which is not based upon the most learned and authoritative theologians of the present century." But who are the most learned divines? Certain divines of Germany.

"The father land of Luther, Gesenius, Ewald, Eichorn, Hartman, Gabler, the Rosenmuellers, De Wette, Strauss, and other commentators, who have no equals in England or America." The divines of "New England, the land of such Theologians as Channing, Norton, Palfrey, etc." "It is men," he adds, "of this stamp—men who alone possess the knowledge requisite for deciding such questions—that dare 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."

These, with Munk, Pauthier, Burke of the *Ethnological Journal*, and Mr. Gliddon, are the *Dii Majores* of Dr. Nott's *Mythology*.

As to one of them, the noble reformer Martin Luther, we know not by what right he is canonized in this catalogue of saints. We cannot say how he would handle these lectures. Whether he would say as did of Tetzal, "I will soon make a hole in his drum," we know not, but of this we are certain, the Dr. would find him a rough assailant, and might wish he had kept his lucubrations by his side nine years longer, doubling the Horatian maxim. As to the others, we are willing to admit the genius and eloquence of Eichorn, the Hebrew learning of Gesenius, the linguistic ability of Ewald, the poetic taste of De Wette, and the useful industry especially of the younger Rosenmueller ; but as authorities in matters of doctrine, and especially, as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, any one who knows them, at once perceives that they cannot be relied on for a moment. As to Strauss, who left his country *per force* for his country's good, his system utterly subverts all revealed religion ; it varies not essentially from that of

Woolston and Collins. So loose have been the German notions for many years, the most decent of the English Deists, had they resided in that country, might have been installed as professors of Theology, without producing any great commotion. Rosseau, Hobbes, Gibbon, and even Paine and Voltaire, had they been only a little more decent, and wrapt their opinions in transcendental mist, might bring forth from the professor's chair, their objections to the historic truth and genuineness of the Scriptures, without danger of being called to account. It is surprising how those hypotheses which were deemed rank infidelity in them, how the same arguments they suggested, are received by a large portion of the German neologists, as ingenious and solid. But it is remarkable that only those scholars of Germany should be mentioned who in one form or the other are of the latitudinarian stamp; that the Dr's. ear refused to hear or his eye to see the names of Hengstenberg, Olshausen, Luecke, Havernick, and Tholuck; and that on the long roll of New England theologians, only Channing, Norton, Parker and Palfrey could attract his notice. These are men to whose authority either as unbiassed scholars or divines we do not defer. We believe their influence to be subversive, not only of the true teachings of the Bible, but of the Bible itself as the inspired and authoritative revelation of God to man. It is marvellous that he should say that "it is men of this stamp alone who possess the knowledge requisite for deciding such questions," when there are men equally learned in Germany with those he has mentioned, who adhere to the faith of Luther; and when in New England and out of it, there are theologians in abundance, in comparison with whom Channing, Parker and Palfrey, are mere sciolists in 'philology and archaeology.' These "men alone dare to teach that the Bible manuscripts have not come down to us untarnished by human hands!" In what dark corner of the earth has Dr. Nott been hidden? Where are the men, orthodox or heterodox, who, since the days of Owen, have contended for the immaculate purity of the Greek and Hebrew Manuscripts? It requires no great daring to affirm that they exhibit errors of transcription, as without perpetual miracle they must. But that "the Pentateuch is an anonymous writing of unknown

origin, compiled many centuries after the time of Moses," by no means all these men would *dare* affirm. When did Luther attack the Pentateuch? And how can Eichorn and Rosenmueler, both of whom wrote expressly in defence of its genuineness as a writing of Moses, be brought forth as impugning that genuineness, and assigning it to a later age? It would astonish Jahn, whom Dr. Nott ranks on another page* with the "great philologists and theologians of the continent," if he could now rise from the dead, to learn that he had been quoted in connection with those who have "made the composition of the Pentateuch gradually descend to a *thousand years after Moses.*"† Would that there were a tythe of the candour and fairness of mind in the writers on whom Dr. Nott relies, which there was in this judicious and able divine of the Romish Church.

Dr. Nott's objections to the Scriptures are very numerous. Some are more formally stated, others are 'flings' *against the sacred text*, with a view apparently of discrediting it. Speaking of "the pages of the physical world," he says, quoting from another, "no transcribers or ignorant translators have been able to erase or interpolate its texts; they stand before us in the same genuineness as when first written." This disparaging of the sacred volume, and giving the precedence to science and human reason, besides the spirit it indicates, betrays a want of acquaintance with the true facts in the case. "Of the 100,000 various readings in the text of the New Testament," says Taylor, "it would be hard to select 100 which an English reader, would deem important to the text where they occur. And of that hundred there would not be more than one or two which could in any way affect questions of fact, of doctrine or practice."‡ And professor Stuart, an authority which Dr. Nott seems to respect, says that "not the hundredth part of the mass of various readings amounts to any thing more than the question whether the word honour shall be spelled without the *u* or with it." The same is the testimony of Andrews Norton, whom Dr.

* p. 114.

† See his laboured and successful answer to this theory in his Introduction to the Old Testament.

‡ On the Transmission of Ancient Books.

Nott, for other purposes, freely quotes. "Of the various readings of the New Testament," says he, "nineteen out of twenty, at least, are to be dismissed at once from consideration." "Of those which remain a very great majority are entirely unimportant. They consist in different modes of spelling;" "in the insertion or omission of particles, such as *av* and *de*, not affecting the sense.*

To remove all doubt, however, we give from De Rossi,† all the various readings in the more than 800 MSS. and editions collated by himself, so far as the ten first chapters of Genesis are concerned, which the Dr. finds so confused and contradictory.

CHAP. I.

vs. 11, tree	and tree,
12. after his kind	after his kind upon the earth,
14. in the firmament of heaven	in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth.
26. after our likeness	in our likeness,
<i>ibid.</i> and over all the earth,	over all the earth,
30. every herb,	and every herb.

CHAP. II.

vs. 12. good	very good
19. called every living creature,	called the name of every living creature,
24. and they shall be one flesh	and they two shall be one flesh.

CHAP. III.

vs. 7. fig leaf	fig leaves,
10. and said	and said to him
16. Unto the woman thy sorrow	But unto the woman thy sorrows
19. shalt thou eat bread	shalt thou eat thy bread
20. the Man [or the Adam.]	Adam.

CHAP. IV.

vs. 8, and Cain talked with Abel his brother,	and Cain said to Abel his brother. Let us go into the field. [This reading exhibited only in the ancient versions.]
11. from thy hand	from thy hands
17. after the name of his son,	by the name &c.
25. and called	and he called

CHAP. V.

vs. 2. and blessed them	and God blessed them,
3. in his own likeness, after his own image	after his own likeness, in his image
18. And Jared lived a hundred and sixty-two years	and Jared lived sixty-two years
23. was	were
25. a hundred eighty and seven years	eighty and seven years

* Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I. Additional notes, p. 38.

† Kennicott's would also be given, if at hand, but would not materially change the sense.

29. concerning our work and toil our works and toil of our hand
 of our hands
31. was were
32. and Noah was the son of 500 and Noah lived 500 years
 years
 and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and begat Shem and Ham.
- CHAP. VI.
- vs. 7. from man, unto beast,
 unto the fowl from men, and unto beast,
 and unto the fowl
10. Shem, Ham, Shem and Ham.
11. and the earth was filled and was filled
19. of all flesh and of all flesh
20. of every creeping thing and of every creeping thing.
- CHAP. VII.
- vs. 1. And Jehovah said And God said
 2. of every beast of the beast
 9. As God had commanded as Jehovah commanded
 11. the same day *wanting*
 19. under the whole heaven under heaven.
- CHAP. VIII.
- vs. 8. from off the face of the earth from the earth,
 11. an olive leaf olive leaves
 15. God Jehovah
 16. and thy wife and thy sons and thy sons and thy wife
 19. every beast,
 every creeping thing,
 whatsoever creepeth and every beast,
 and every creeping thing,
 or whatsoever creepeth.
- CHAP. IX.
- vs. 2. upon all that moveth and upon all that moveth
 5, at the hand of every man's and at the hands &c.
 brother
7. bring forth abundantly and bring forth abundantly
10. of the cattle and of the cattle
29. was were
- CHAP. X.
- vs. 1. Ham and Ham
 3. and Riphath and Diphath
 4. and Dodanim and Rodanim
 5. in their nations after their nations
 19. and Admah Admah
 20. in their nations after their nations.

These are absolutely the whole results of the laborious collation by De Rossi of the Hebrew MSS, for these first ten chapters. Not more than two or three of them are of the least importance, except for the confirmation they afford to the text; the proof they give, that in the innumerable transcriptions through which this text has passed for 3000 years, it has suffered so little. What right then has Dr. Nott to say that the "original Hebrew text has come down to us in so many mutilated forms, differing widely from the long lost original." It is an assertion which no true scholar, who is not swayed by some amazing prejudice, and

does not rush impetuously on to some foregone conclusion, would dare to hazard. Every one who has examined the subject knows that if all the various readings most divergent from the truth were incorporated into the text, and the true readings thrown away, neither the system of doctrines which the Scriptures should then deliver, nor the moral precepts they should exhibit, nor the series of historic facts which they should present, would be for substance different from those now found in the sacred pages. The various readings in the manuscripts of profane writings, which are equally numerous with those of the sacred Scriptures, have not impaired them.* They have not quenched the poetic fire of Homer, nor the eloquence of Demosthenes, nor the historic truth of Herodotus and Thucydides. And none but a pretender to scholarship would say that they have materially affected the verity of the Scriptures.

Dr. Nott again speaks, disrespectfully, of the ENGLISH VERSION of the Scriptures. He makes the astonishing assertion that "the Hebrew language may be said only to have been recovered within the last century by modern orientalists." Most surprising is it that any one could believe that the Jews should have wholly lost a knowledge of their ancient and sacred tongue. A nation of men that, in their better days, have had among them a numerous class of scholars belonging to every tribe, besides the sacerdotal order, while this was maintained,—pursuing with indefatigable zeal the study of their sacred books, under advantages such as Christian scholars in these days can scarcely ever hope to obtain; that these men should have known nothing of their ancient tongue; that the schools of Alexandria in Egypt, of Tiberias and Jabneh in Palestine, of Naardea, Pompeditha, and Sora in Babylonia, and of Cordova and Seville in Spain, at a later period, with all the cognate dialects, the Arabic, Chaldee, and Syriac, sounding daily in their ears, should have known nothing of the Hebrew, and that a

* See Bentley's "Remarks on Free Thinking." He says "Wakefield has collected about 12,000 various readings of Lucretius (exclusive of mere differences of orthography) from five *printed* copies only, and Bekker has published more than 60,000 variations from his text of Plato, the MSS. used on each of the different writings being on an average about thirteen."

knowledge of it should only have been recovered by modern orientalists, displays an amazing want of reading, of scholarlike accuracy, and a credulity exceedingly rare except in an unbeliever. There never has been an age of the world, when it was impossible to obtain a knowledge of the Hebrew tongue; and many were the Jews in Egypt before Christ, of literary habits and acute minds, who could decypher her hieroglyphics, if *they* could shed any light on the Scriptures, tenfold better than Mr. Gliddon, "who has bestowed immense labour on Biblical criticism," and "has collected no less than 500 false renderings," &c.

Let us now look at Dr. Nott's proof of "the ignorance of the *authorized* translators of the pious King James and the British Parliament." We do not see that our translators were unacquainted with the fact that the root *a-dam* means *to be red*, or that they were guilty of any error in translating the word, when a noun, as the proper name of the first man in one case, as equivalent to "a man" in another, as signifying "mankind," being "remarkably applied in Numbers xxxi. 35, to *female* persons." Why does not Dr. Nott administer the calomel of criticism to speakers of the English tongue around him, and retrieve the King's English from confusion.—They speak continually of *Mr. Mann* and *Mrs. Mann*, of *a man*, of *man*, meaning *mankind*, "remarkably including female persons;" of *Mr. Good*, of *a good*, of *good*, and *goods*. If the English translators had not translated the word *Adam* as they have done, they would indeed have been guilty of egregious blundering.

Another proof of ignorance and incompetency is found in Leviticus xi. 20: "All *fowls* that *creep*, going on *all* fours, shall be an abomination unto you." "Were this version correct," says he, "it would prove the existence, in the days of Moses, of *four legged birds*!" Is Dr. Nott sure in what sense the word *fowl* was used in 1611?—Dr. Johnson defines it to be "a winged animal." Are there not winged creatures that also have four feet? Is there not the *vespertilio*, of which the common bat is but a single specimen? and if this be not intended, and the more probable opinion is adopted, that the reference is to insects which have both wings and feet, are *they* not flying crea-

tures? Were the six learned men who translated this portion of the Scriptures, and the learned critics from both universities appointed to review their work, and Bishop Bilson and Dr. Smith appointed to publish it, unacquainted with the *English* language? Mistranslation of the *Hebrew* there is not. It matters not whether the passage be translated creeping things that fly, or flying things that creep.

His example from Job xix. 23: "Oh that my words were now written! Oh, that they were *printed* in a *book*," which he regards as an "anachronism," is alike discreditable to him. Were these translators, does Dr. Nott, suppose, fools? Did they not know as well as he, that printing was not invented, at least in Europe, till 150 years before their own day? The translation was the nearest to the original, in their judgment, which would be intelligible to the common reader. The Hebrew word translated "book," usually signifies *a book*. The word translated "printed" means *engraved*; and "inscribed in a register," may be but little nearer the original than *printed in a book*. Neither ignorance nor blundering can be argued from this example merely. All that can be said is, that the words in one language do not exactly answer to words in another. The other example, with which Dr. Nott and H. Smith make merry, is at least as much misunderstood by themselves as it ever could have been by the translators. "Oh that one would hear me! behold, my desire is that the Almighty should answer me, and that mine adversary had written a book." Job xxxi. 35. "This," says Dr. Nott, is "authorized version"—"with a vengeance!" Mr. Gliddon's *Tau*, the symbol of Osiris, is as much out of place here as 'a pig in a parlour.' The *Tav* is the sign manual of the party accused, put in this case, by Synecdoche, for his bill in plea.

Oh that there were one [as a judge] to hear me!—
Behold my authenticated plea—
That the Almighty would reply as accuser!
That my opponent would write down the charge!—
Would I not wear it on my shoulder?
I would bind it on me as my crown.

The opponent or adversary is probably no other than God himself. And if there is a degree of boldness and audacity in Job, in this poetic language, what shall be

said of the ridicule which Dr. Nott appears to quote from some of those on whom he leans, when he represents Job as longing "with a refinement of vindictiveness, as the most terrible retribution he could inflict on an adversary, that the latter should actually write a *book*, in order that he might review him, as H. Smith has conjectured, in the *Jerusalem Quarterly*. "Review the Almighty!" Here is criticism "with a vengeance."

We do not deny that there are passages in our version which have been elucidated by later scholars, and are better understood than in a former age, and perhaps this, among others, is one. But it is not true that "this old translation is acknowledged by all who know any thing about it to be *very bad*." How different has been the judgment of other and the most learned men concerning it. John Selden speaks of it as "the best translation in the world." Bishop Horsely praises it as having "enriched and adorned our language." Dr. White, Professor of Arabic at Oxford, commends its "general fidelity," and says "the English language has acquired new dignity by it." Dr. Geddes affirms that "this of all versions must, in general, be accounted the most excellent." Professor Stuart represents it as the best effort at translation among the English divines, with the exception of Lowth's classic work on Isaiah, and J. W. Whitaker, speaking of it in the highest terms, says "it has occasionally happened that an individual, as inferior to them (the translators) in condition as in talents and integrity, is found questioning their motives, or denying their qualifications for the task which they so well performed."

But read the Scriptures in any translation, even the most imperfect, and you will find the same facts, the same doctrines, the same revealed truths. In spite of the religious bias of translators, the same doctrines, on the whole, gleam through the imperfect version, and the same historic facts. And may we not, without offence, ask the doctor, if he has himself mastered the Hebrew of the original text? And before he ventured his assertion, did he compare the Greek, the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Latin, the German, French, and English translations with it, and with each other? or has he taken his opinions at second hand? If he possesses the varied

learning of John Mason Goode, and some others, who have adorned his own profession, we will gladly listen to him.

Dr. Nott, however, is not satisfied with attacking the integrity of the sacred text, and the competency and fidelity of the English Bible. *He attacks the INSPIRATION of the book itself.* In the writing of the Scriptures there were two agents employed, the Spirit of God, the true Author of the whole; and man acted upon by the Spirit, and speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost. All Scripture, therefore, is given by inspiration of God. The men acted on by the Spirit, were acted upon as free and intelligent agents, and not as unconscious and senseless tools, and the peculiarities of their genius and previous culture were not lost from the writings which, under this celestial impulse, they produced. Yet might they not, at all times, at once perceive the full extent of meaning in that which the Spirit prompted them to write. Their knowledge might therefore be defective, as men, in reference to many points of science and learning. But the Spirit who inspired them, knows "all things, even the deep things of God." He brooded on the chaotic deep at the first creation, informed with vital energy the primaeval matter, was the Maker of all things, and all men and nations, and must understand all. His knowledge is not bounded by the confines of Palestine, nor the red shading of Dr. Nott's map, which so ostentatiously, as you open the book, flaunts forth its impious reproaches, if not expressly, yet by obvious inference, against the perfection of the Scriptures. The sacred writers "were ignorant, says Dr. Nott, of Astronomy, Geology, Natural History, Geography," &c. knew "nothing of the Americans, Chinese, Hindoos, Australians, Polynesians, and other races." "Who will question the fact that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were as ignorant of the north of Europe, the north and east of Asia, southern Africa, Australia, America, and Oceania, as we are of the geography of the Moon?" But was the great and Heavenly Author of these writings ignorant of them? the Maker of all ignorant of what he had made? the Ruler of all of the extent of his earthly domain? Whatever is written in the Scripture, must be consistent with truth, and consistent with science itself.

And such it manifestly is. There has never yet been discovered, in the whole compass of the Bible, a single statement irreconcilable with true science. In its entire compass, then, is not a scientific, geographic, nor historic error. Dr. Nott's exclamations respecting "the extraordinary account of the Garden of Eden," and the Mosaic cosmogony, do but betray his own want of research, or a determination to do what he may to discredit the Scriptures.

"We freely admit," says Gaussen, "that if there are any physical errors, fully proved, in the Scriptures, the Scriptures could not be from God. But we mean to show that there are none; and we shall dare to challenge the adversaries to produce one from the entire Bible. We are going still farther; and we shall show, on the contrary, how much latent science is concealed under the simplicity of its language.

"These two facts are analogous to that which you may observe in the words of a learned astronomer, conversing with his young children, and showing them with his finger, the earth and the heavens. If you followed him in these interviews, when his tenderness, stooping to their level, presents to their new-born intelligence, images and words which it can comprehend, you would then quickly remark his respect for truth, by a two-fold sign. First, he would never tell them any thing that was not true; and secondly, there would be in his words many indications that he knows more than he sees fit to communicate to them. He doubtless would not pretend to teach them science; but on the one hand, nothing in his discourse would contradict its principles; and on the other, many of his words would already indicate, that although silent upon them, he comprehended them. Afterward, when his children, having become men, shall review his words; not only will they find them exempt from all error, but they will also recognize that, skilfully chosen, they were already in pre-established harmony with science, and presented it to them in its germ, although they could not comprehend it. In proportion as their own knowledge shall increase they will see with admiration, under the reserve and the simplicity of his language, concealed wisdom, learned exactness, turns of phraseology, and forms of expression, which were in harmony with facts, then unknown to them, but long known by him."—*Theopneusty*, pp. 131, 136.

We are not informed in the Scriptures what the intelligent men of the Jewish nation knew and what they did not know, by those merely human means of knowledge

which were common to men. This, however, is true. Dr. Nott takes pleasure in understating the knowledge they actually had. *The Scriptures are fuller in their statements even in Geography, than any other ancient writings* which precede the days of the Greek Geographers, who, in comparison with the Old Testament, are but modern. They are so accurate as to constitute the best guide books to travellers in the countries in which the occurrences of the Scriptures took place. In their allusions to the more distant lands to which reference is made they exhibit no error. Where they speak of the distant West, they use the phrase which is translated in our version "the isles of the sea," or "of the Gentiles." *The habitable places of the sea* would be more in accordance with the original, and will include all countries which must be reached by navigating the sea. India is expressly mentioned in Esther i. i. and viii. 7, and 1. Mac. viii. 8, and if it did not embrace in their geography the whole of Hindostan, it extended far north of it, over a considerable portion of Tartary into the desert of Cobi. China is evidently intended by the land of Sinim, Is. xlix. 14, and has been called, from an unknown antiquity, throughout southern and western Asia, by the name Sin, Chin, or Jin. Porcelain vessels with Chinese inscriptions have been found in the monuments of Thebes. The Magog of Ezekiel is the country of the Mongolians. The Phœnicians were a bordering and friendly people, and Tyre was not further from Jerusalem, than Augusta in Georgia, from Charleston, or Montgomery from Mobile. The nearest inhabitants of Galilee might have gone down of a pleasant morning to market. All the knowledge of the Tyrian and Phœnician navigators, pouring in from Carthage, and their numerous colonies, scattered over the islands of the Mediterranean, on either side of it, and beyond the pillars of Hercules on the African and European coast, was easily accessible to the Jews.

They had resided in Babylon, the great centre of oriental commerce, had lived in Media under Darius the Mede, and in Persia under Cyrus the Great; many had served in the army of Alexander the Macedonian, and were probably among the invaders of India. They had occupied the central ground passed over by the caravan trade between

Persia and India on the one side, and Phœnicia and Egypt on the other. Before Paul and the New Testament writers lived, Africa had been circumnavigated by Tyrian sailors under Pharaoh Necho.* Hanno the Carthaginian had explored the coast of Western Africa, Arrian made the Periplus of the Erythrean sea, sailing around the coast of India on the east of the Indian Ocean, and down Africa on the west, a voyage which had probably also been often made before by the allied fleets of Solomon and Hiram king of Tyre. The voyage of Pytheas to the North Sea had taken place, and of Nearchus down the Indus and up the Persian Gulf to the mouth of the Tigris. The Jews had long been familiar with Egypt. It was no wonderful feat to go there. They had never from Abraham to Paul lost their connection with it. From 301 to 180 B. C. the period of the Ptolomies, it was a place of shelter to them. In 153 B. C. Onias built a temple at Leontopolis which was long the rival of that at Jerusalem. At Alexandria they had the most splendid synagogue, with its accompaniment of schools, which existed in the whole world. The geographers Eratosthenes, Hipparchus and Strabo had already gathered from different sources a very considerable knowledge of the earth and its principal nations. Melas and Pliny were the cotemporaries of the writers of the New Testament. It is impossible that men, living as these writers did, in the very central parts of the civilised world, should be so extremely ignorant of the inhabitants of different countries as Dr. Nott alleges. Especially may we suppose the Apostle Paul, a man of no mean condition, born in a city which according to Strabo excelled even Corinth and Athens and all other cities as a place of education, to have been acquainted with this knowledge then common to men of ordinary intelligence. Now these countries which they actually did know, are inhabited by the principal varieties of the human race. The Caucasian, Mongolian, and negro could not be unknown to them. The Mongolian they had seen in their wanderings towards central Asia, and the negro must have attracted their attention in Egypt. The Scythians, the pro-

* 616 B. C. This voyage was 2100 years before the Portuguese under the lead of Vaquez de Gama doubled the cape of Good Hope.

totypes of the modern Tartars, seven centuries before Christ, had invaded south western Asia, pushed their inroads as far as Egypt, and left their name in Scythopolis, in the valley of the Jordan. Dr. Nott does indeed struggle hard to show that the word Cush is wrongly translated in our English Bible by the word Ethiopia. And we are willing to admit that the one word is not the etymological equivalent of the other, and that in these modern times the word Ethiopian is not by usage applied to all the descendants of Cush, or Ethiopia to all the countries they inhabit. But it is true that by the ancients, Ethiopia was applied to both Asiatic and African nations. They used the term according to its sense, of nations "burnt black in the face," *αιθος την οψιν*.

In like manner the name Cush, for which in the translation Ethiopia is substituted, is used in the Scriptures for Asiatic and for African countries. The Cush, in the description of the Garden of Eden, is probably the country east of the Tigris, and north of the Persian Gulf. Chusistan, a portion of Persia, bears the name, and Jonathan, the Targumist, on Gen. x. 6, evidently understands by Cush, an Asiatic people. But it is equally plain that the name Cush is also applied to an African country and people. Indeed so clear is this that Gesenius and Shulthess have wrongly contended that, in the Scriptures, it is applied to no other. It was a country which lay south of Egypt above Syene, the Meroe of the ancients, and the Abyssinia of the moderns. The Chub of Ezek. 29,* is either the Nubia of modern Geography, or a district called Chuba, still further south. The land of rustling, or clanging wings of Is. xviii, 1, beyond the rivers of Cush, is evidently the African Ethiopia, including Nubia, Kordofan, and Abyssinia.† Over this country, in the days of Hezekiah, reigned Tirhaka, a King of great renown, who also had obtained the dominion of upper Egypt. When Hezekiah was threatened by Senacherib, knowing that the Assyrian army was on the way to Egypt,‡ he marched to the relief of the Jewish monarch. He is the *Ταρακος* of Manetho, and the *Τερακων* of Strabo, and his figure, name, and the expedition he undertook,

* Ezek. xxix. 10; xxx. 6, 9

† Strabo, 15, 6.

‡ Herodotus.

and the prisoners he captured, are recorded on the walls of a Theban temple at Medinath Abu, and on the mountain Barkal in Abyssinia.* And in spite of Dr. Nott's contemptuous questioning of the truth of 2 Chron. xiv. 9, it is very evident that Zerah, the Ethiopian, did come down with a "thousand thousand," *i. e.* many thousands, on "so insignificant a King as Asa." He came from Africa, not Arabia; among his soldiers were Lubim, an African people,† and he had 300 chariots, which were not used by the Arabs in their warfare.‡ The name Cush, too, has been found on the monuments as referring to an African people, as Dr. Nott, with a facility fatal to his argument, p. 140, allows. Indeed we find it used of the Prince of Ethiopia on a Temple at Beit-é-wellee in Nubia, where the conquests of Rameses the Second are found portrayed, under circumstances in which there can be no mistake, for the Ethiopian army, composed of negroes, is represented as routed before the chariot of the victor, and negro captives are led bound beside the conqueror. He is then exhibited, in another compartment, as receiving the tribute of the conquered nations, consisting of gold, panther's skins, tusks of ivory, logs of ebony, long horned oxen, bears, lions, giraffes, elephants, brought by a numerous procession of negroes; Egyptian Scribes are taking an account of the tribute: then he is pictured as investing "the royal son of Kush" with the vice-regal power over this subjugated country, his name and title being written in hieroglyphics over his head.§ On the

* Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, i. pp. 140, 387; Roscellini *Mon.* ii. tab. 8.

† 2 Chron. xvi. 8; *Comp.* 12: 4.

‡ In the invasion of Judah in the days of Rehoboam, by Shishak, [Sheshonk,] King of Egypt, in which he took Jerusalem and the "fenced cities of Judah," a vast army of Lubim, Sukkiims, and Cushites followed him. These Sukkiim are in the lxx. the Troglydytes, whom Strabo, L. xvii. 1, and Pliny *Hist. Nat.* vi. 29, 34, place in Meroe, and Rosenmueller,* identifies with the Shangalla, a negro race in Abyssinia. The victories of Shiskah, over Judah-melek-kah, "*King of the country of Judah*," are sculptured on the monuments at Karnak.

§ "The royal son of Kush, or Ethiopia, Amounemape-t, son of Poeri, the truth speaking." Gallery of Antiqu. from the British Museum, by S. Birch, part ii. p. 96. "*Kush*, barbarian country, perverse race, being," says Mr. Gliddon, "the Egyptian designatory name and title of Negroes prior to B. C. 1600." *Anc. Egypt.* p. 24, 26, 27, 59; *Comp.* Roscellini iii. 1, 277; Champollion *Eg. et Nub.* i. Planch. xi. xv. xvi.

* *Alterthumskunde*, iii. 353.

same is an address to the conqueror, "Beneath thy sandals is *Kol*, the barbarian land, *Kush* (Nigritia) is in thy grasp." Mr. Gliddon informs us that by the name *Kush* "the Egyptians exclusively designated the negro and Berber race in hieroglyphics," and though he denies that this name can be identified with the Cush of Scripture we beg leave to differ from him. We have traced the Scripture use of the word to the country south of Egypt, inhabited in part by the Berber and negro varieties of men. We have now monumental evidence, by his own admission, that the same word is applied to the full negro of Nigritia, thus connecting him with other Cushites, with Ham and with Noah. If the *KHEM* of the monuments is the Ham of the Scriptures, and the *Kanana* of the monuments is the Canaan of the Scriptures, why is not the monumental *Cush*, also the *Cush* of the Bible, extending westward over central Africa and including the negro race!

Thus signally does the effort to prove the *Cush* of Scripture, always to refer to a Caucasian race, fail of any solid foundation. Thus impossible is it to prove, in the face of facts, that the sacred writers were unacquainted with the negro variety of man. Josephus knew something of this country of Ethiopia, for he represents Moses, while yet in Egypt, making war, as a general serving under the Egyptian rule, upon Ethiopia, and subduing the people. The negro, too, had been fully described by Herodotus nearly five centuries before Christ, who became acquainted with him in Egypt, and afterwards found a colony of the same black skinned and woolly haired people in Colchis, on the shores of the Euxine.—When Jeremiah then asks, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" he as truly referred to the negro as a well known variety of men, as he did to the leopard as a well known variety of the feline race. That he should be ignorant of them, when they constituted to some extent the armies of Egypt, which were often contending with their natural enemies, the Babylonians, on the territories of the Hebrews, is beyond belief. So numerous were the negroes in the armies of Sesostris, that Herodotus seems to infer that the Egyptians themselves were *μελαχροες*, "a black skinned," and *ουλοτριχες*, a

woolly haired people.* It will be remembered too that Jeremiah spent the last days of his life in Egypt, whither he fled after the fall of Jerusalem, with the miserable remnant of his people.

In the original migration of nations, intercourse must have been kept up for a length of time between the migrating hordes and the parent stock, even as it is now. Commerce was rife over nearly the whole of the ancient world, as it is at this day. Many a Jew had seen the negro in Egypt. His ancestors had seen the temple at Karnac, perhaps, when it was building, and he had stood wondering in the Ramesium ages before Champollion was born. In countless things in which the moderns are ignorant, the ancients were wise. The sacred writers, then, did know the principal varieties of the human race, were acquainted with the Mongul, the Caucasian, and the negro, the varieties of men most unlike each other, and did notwithstanding affirm all nations of the earth to be of one blood, and to have descended from Noah, the second founder of the family of men, and from Adam, the first progenitor. Dr. Nott knows that this is the representation of the Scriptures, hence his inconsistent zeal, on the one hand, to destroy the belief of men in the integrity and inspiration of the word of God; and on the other hand, to force upon the divine word an interpretation, on the supposition that its declarations are true, which will suit his preconceived theories. A sad addition to the numerous proofs literature contains of the unhistoric spirit and easy faith which skepticism inspires.

The difficulties found by Dr. Nott with the ETHNOGRAPHY of the Bible fill us with increased amazement. The book of Genesis gives us a

“Fragmentary and confused sketch of a race descended from

* Herod. Euterpe S. 104. The passage of Herodotus is curious, and has been the *crux* of ethnological speculators: “The Egyptians were of opinion that the Colchians were descended from part of the troops of Sesostris. To this I, myself, was also inclined, because they are black, and have short hair and curling, which latter circumstances may not, however, be insisted on as evidence, because it is common to many other nations.” From this many, as Volney and others, have concluded that the ancient Egyptians were real negroes; and that their complexion was afterwards changed by intermixture with the Asiatics, Greeks, and Romans. But monumental evidence is against this. On these the negroes do not usually appear, except in the pomp of a conquering monarch, as defeated enemies or prisoners of war.

Adam and Eve." "To show in what confusion and contradiction the Mosaic account of the Adamic race is involved we quote a few examples." "The opinion of the learned and *pious* De-Wette, that the book of Genesis simply recorded the uncertain and mythical history of the *Hebrew race*." "The only rational explanation which can be offered for these discrepancies," (between Gen. i. and ii. as to the creation of man,) is that assigned by the most competent theologians of the present day, viz: that the book of Genesis is nothing more than an assemblage of very ancient fragments, (or traditions,) of unknown origin, put together without order, and consequently of no historic value." Again the Dr. says, "there were no human beings on the face of the earth, but Adam and Eve, and Cain; and who, we ask, was there to slay him?" [Cain.] "How did Cain get out of the presence of the Lord by going to the land of Nod? Where did he find his wife before there were any women of the Adamic stock? How did he build a city for himself and for what purpose?" "Is it possible any one can regard this as a part of genuine revelation?" "I should be glad if those who regard the book of Genesis as an essential part of Holy Writ would explain these palpable inconsistencies."

We pity Dr. Nott in his deep bewilderment. On the dark mountains where he is wandering we would fain reach him a helping hand. Our want of space to answer this avalanche of questions, in part prevents us, and in part the recollection that they have been answered many thousand times, and that if he had but sought in the right direction with a mind open to conviction his difficulties would have been removed. To our minds, there is a perfect unity of design pervading the book of Genesis, no undue repetition and no confusion. Viewed in a merely literary aspect, it is the most venerable monument of antiquity; in a historic or ethnographic light, the most valuable and satisfactory document in existence; and as a portion of the infallible rule of faith and practice for man, the foundation stone on which the whole edifice of revelation is built. Truly a writer may retrace his steps and enlarge his description, for important reasons, without being charged with discrepancy. He is little versed in classic literature, whose mind does not recur to similar instances in the most trustworthy and polished writers of antiquity. And the oriental style resumes and repeats

more than that of the west. If it could be *proved* that Genesis has in part been compiled from pre-existing documents, its inspiration would not fall away. These may have been written by patriarchs before Moses to whom God revealed his will; or if the inspired Moses incorporated them into his writings, they have received, in each word and letter, the sanction of the Spirit of God speaking in him.

As to the other points, we can but say that we felt ourselves, as we read them, in the society of Thomas Paine, Rosseau, and Voltaire. In the genealogy of Adam but three of his children, Cain, Abel, and Seth are mentioned by name, and few only of his remoter descendants appear in the record. In the 930 years he walked upon the earth, his family must have been far more numerous than this, and his other children are expressly alluded to in the words "and he begat sons and *daughters*." "The mother of all living" was doubtless "a fruitful vine," and both she and Adam were in the vigour of their lives for a length of years which the post-diluvians knew nothing of. Cain was a married man when he slew Abel, and was then not less, probably, than 129 years of age. Seth, who was appointed by God to occupy the place of Abel whom Cain slew, was born to Adam when he was 130 years old.* The natural increase of the race of man is extremely rapid when no hindrance is interposed. "An island first occupied by a few ship-wrecked English in 1589, and discovered by a Dutch vessel in 1667, is said to have been found peopled after 80 years by 12,000 souls, all the descendants of four mothers."† When the Creator undertook to people a world, we may suppose that his providence arranged for this end, and no hindrance was allowed to interpose. It is believed that the death of Abel was the first which occurred in the family of man. It is not an unreasonable supposition, therefore, as figures will demonstrate, that the family of Adam embraced from 191,000 to 200,000 people at the banishment of Cain. How many of these adhered to the fortunes of Cain, from whom a large share descended, or whether any, we are not informed, nor are we told when he built his *city*. If he liv-

* Comp. iv. 17, 25. v. 3.
VOL. III.—No. 3.

† Wiseman's Lects. p. 145.
57

ed as long as his father Adam, and built it in the closing period of his life, his own descendants born in the land of *Nod*, i. e. in the land of his *flight*, which the name denotes, were far more numerous than the numbers above mentioned would indicate. The same remarks will also apply to Nimrod. Though he may be, as is said in these Lectures, but of "the second generation from Ham," there was abundant time for a population to have arisen on the earth, after the flood, sufficiently numerous to build cities and found kingdoms.* The city Cain built was not probably extraordinary for size, but at first, at least, a mere *stockade*, "*earth-work*," or *fortress*.† Rome was not built in a day. It was once a hamlet or *blockhouse* on the Capitoline Mount. It was only the "beginning" of the kingdom founded by Nimrod, and the first foundations of Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah, and Resen, of which the historian speaks. With Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Louisville, Lowell, Buffalo and San Francisco before him, the growth of the present generation, it is surprising that Dr. Nott cannot see that it requires but a brief time for places to which emigration tends, to rise to sudden wealth and eminence. Kingdoms, too, are often small in their beginning, which afterwards fill half the world with their arts and arms. Nor was it any more difficult for Cain to "get out of the presence of the Lord" than it is for unbelieving men to do so now. They now absent themselves voluntarily from the house and worship of God and the society of his people, or, having once been numbered among them, may be forcibly expelled. Had Dr. Nott been better acquainted with the phraseology of Scripture, he could have had no trouble in understanding what is said concerning the sons of God and the daughters of men in Gen. vi., nor have found any resemblance in this to the "ancient mythologies of India and Egypt."

These objections, and others which time does not allow us to touch, are brought forward to show that the book of

* See Bedford's Scripture Chronology, and his calculation of the population of the earth in each year from Noah to Abraham.

† "*Hir*, translated city," says Gesenius, is properly "*a place of watch or guard*," built with a wall or tower as a refuge of the keepers of flocks, an enclosure surrounded by a mound or wall, a nomadic *hamlet*, a *town*, a *city*, often not large, as there were 31 royal cities in Canaan, and 124 in the single tribe of Judah.

Genesis is unworthy of credit, and that therefore its Ethnology is to be rejected. "Its ethnological details" he says, "are devoid of all harmony, are inconsistent with each other, and contradicted by the early history of Egypt, China, India and America." To this we can only say, "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" The xth and xith chapters of Genesis are unquestionably the most satisfactory ethnographical document on the face of the earth. It more clearly explains the origin of the various important nations of the old continent, than all the writings of antiquity besides. From Josephus down, there has been great uniformity in its explanation, and all soberly conducted antiquarian research, and almost every spade full of earth thrown out of the buried catacombs and palaces of Egypt and Nineveh, do but tend to confirm it.

Dr. Nott next proceeds to attack THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE. "We shall first take up the chronology of Genesis alone, and show that it is destroyed by its own inconsistencies; and we shall then, by a comparison of the monuments of Egypt, China, India, America, &c. show that it has no historical ground work whatever." This is assuredly a large and boastful promise. We see him, a very Goliath, flourishing his spear like a weaver's beam, and defying the armies of Israel. Where are these monuments of INDIA? Are they of paper, earth, or stone? Does the Dr. refer to the Puranas and their Yugs, covering a period of 4,320,000 years? And where are his monuments of CHINA. Does he then believe that one emperor reigned 18,000 years, another 18,000, and another 45,600 years? Does he not know that the Chinese themselves regard their high chronology as fabulous, that their respectable historians do not venture to allude to it, except to call it in question? Says the Chinese historian Fung-chow,

"How is it credible that more than 10,000 years elapsed before the yang, or 'superior principle' was produced, and the heavens spread; and that 10,000 more elapsed before the yin, or 'secondary principle' was produced, and the earth formed; that 10,000 more passed away, before the yin and yang united to produce the various material existences; and, further, that 40 or 50,000 years more passed away, before the process of the two principles was finished, and the sages appeared! Such a tale is

contrary to all sense and reason. From the time of the sages Yaou and Shun, to the present age, is not more than 3000 and odd years. How can it be believed that 40 or 50,000 years elapsed after the formation of the heavens and the earth, before man appeared, or the earth and water were adjusted, and food supplied to human beings? or that, if the world had existed so long, these things should not have been arranged before Fuh-he and his successors? It is evident that Pawn-koo, the first man, according to the fabulous records of the Chinese, who acted at the separation of heaven and earth, could not have been long before Fuh-he, perhaps a thousand years, certainly not ten thousand; and the time of Fuh-he must have been very near Yaou and Shun, perhaps a hundred years, certainly not a thousand. No scholar should decline a thorough inquiry.*

Choo-foo-tze and Sze-ma-tzeen, two very celebrated historians of China, says Medhurst, pass these fabulous periods by as unworthy of notice. The traditionary period has much in it which coincides with antediluvian history. Yet Choo-foo-tze himself says, that "several things affirmed of this epoch were all pushed up by the people who lived in subsequent ages." Even Dr. Nott's authority, Pauthier, whom he pronounces "the greatest Chinese scholar of the age," who represents the Chinese records as giving evidence of a succession of emperors from 2637 B. C. down to the present day, does not in this statement ascend nearer than 609 years to the Deluge, according to the chronology of the Septuagint, or than 518 years, according to the chronology of Hales. "The great Fou-hi" of Pauthier, was, according to Medhurst, the patriarch Adam. He is represented as the founder of marriage, and was assisted by a woman named *Wa*, answering to the Hebrew *Chawah* or *Eve*. In the days of Yaou, their first king, answering perhaps to Noah, a great inundation occurred, the sky falling on the earth and destroying the race of men. The date of this inundation is fixed by Medhurst, from native documents, at 2296 B. C. and the beginning of Yaou's reign at B. C. 2356. These dates accord with those of the Hebrew text. If we assume the Septuagint chronology and Pauthier's statement, 5 or 600 years is no brief period. What might not the early population of a country have accomplished immediately after the flood,

* Medhurst's China, p. 15.

proceeding as they did from an intelligent ancestry, possessed of the arts of civilization, and taking possession of an unoccupied country under favourable auspices? The state of China can only be erected into an argument against revelation by a prejudiced or unreflecting mind.*

Most surprising of all is Dr. Nott's declaration that probably AMERICA contained an immense population, with an organized government, and an advanced civilization "as far back as the spurious Septuagint date for the deluge." The proof, which the researches of Squier and Davis in the Mississippi valley afford that America was peopled "*several thousand* years before the conquest," is to us exceedingly meagre, and "the extreme antiquity of the *mound-builders* of America," which looms so largely in the intellectual horizon of Dr. Nott, bears no proportion, as set forth in their interesting work, to the antiquity of the chosen people of God. We can discover no trace of an opinion in the book in question, that the authors had any idea of so high an antiquity in reference to the mound builders as the one asserted. They speak indeed of a chestnut and an oak growing upon certain of these ancient works, the one 21 and the other 23 feet in diameter, the last having 400 concentric circles to a foot, which would make the tree nearly 600 years old. To this they add, from the time the work was abandoned to the time when it was erected, a probable period of 400 years, which we think a *very* liberal addition, and the whole will barely make a period of 1000 years.† Towards the close of the ninth century then these works were constructed. It is very probable, we think, that they were not constructed so early by 300 years. But even if the forests covering them are of the second growth, as Gen. Harrison suggested, these earth works will fall short of the vulgar era, or certainly will not much transcend it. Nor do we see any thing so very wonderful in the works in the way of art. They certainly do not equal those found in Mexico and

* "Leaving out of the question the intelligent class of unbelievers in Christendom," says Dr. Nott, "imagine what a figure a Missionary must make in China, preaching the chronology and ethnology of Genesis, when the records of their own nation positively disprove every word he utters!!" We hope the extracts we have given from Chinese writers will aid the Dr. in *imagining*.

† Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi valley, pp. 14—16. 304 et seq.

South America, to which Stephens ascribes no very high antiquity, since he does not regard them as the works of a people who have passed away, and whose history has become unknown, but of the races found in the country by the Spaniards when they invaded it, or of some of their not very distant progenitors.* With these concur the dates given by Clavigero, which he professes to have drawn from native authorities.

The Toltecs arrived in Anahuac, or the country now called Mexico, migrating from the North.	A. D.	648
They abandoned the country,	" "	1051
The Chichimecs arrived,	" "	1170
The Acholhuans arrived about	" "	1200
The Mexicans reached Tula,	" "	1196
They founded Mexico,	" "	1325

These dates, Prescott, in his classical volumes on the conquest of Mexico, follows as the most likely to be true.† The Septuagint date of the deluge, "as far back as which the civilization of America probably extends," is 3246 B. C. The American monuments can hardly have been constructed till 648 years after Christ. They do not reach, therefore, the date in question, by nearly 3900 years.—Thus does the strange fancy of Dr. Nott, as to the age of the mound builders, and other antiquities of America, melt like frost work before the probabilities of history.

The last and most considerable objection for the defenders of Divine Revelation to meet, is that arising from the EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY. The objection is thus presented by Dr. Nott :

"And first, of Egypt, the land of mystery and wonders; not only the tattered fragments of her history, which have been handed down to us by the Hebrews, Herodotus, Manetho, Eratosthenes, Eusebius, Diodorus, Josephus, etc.; but her Pyramids of five thousand years, her massy and gorgeous temples, her obelisks, her stone tablets, her sepulchres of the dead, her numerous papyri, all with their countless inscriptions, and even the mummied skulls of primeval races found in her catacombs, bear witness that Egypt was old, populous and civilized, one thousand

* Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan, by John L. Stephens, II. pp. 442, 443.

† Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, i. p. 17, and iii. p. 411 and note, and p. 414.

years before God made his covenant with Abraham. Fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ, when Pharaoh's daughter rescued the infant Moses in his little ark of bulrushes on the banks of the Nile; nay, even five hundred years earlier, when Abraham and Sarah, driven from the land of Canaan by famine, went, as supplicants, to the mighty Pharaoh's court, Egypt already must have contained some seven or eight millions of inhabitants; for the Pyramids were built, and great cities, temples, and monuments of art met Abraham's view in every direction. Egypt, too, must once have been an uninhabited wilderness, like other countries; and who can approximate the time required for populating, civilizing, and uniting into one great kingdom all the parts of this vast country, and thus laying the groundwork of that advance which we see so early recorded in her monumental history? The chronology of Egypt, even for some centuries beyond Abraham, is no longer a matter of speculation, while that of Genesis vanishes before it." p. 79.

In relation to the Egyptian Chronology every one remarks, who has attempted its resolution, the extreme difficulty of reconciling the inconsistencies of the old Egyptian Chronicle, of Manetho, of Eratosthenes, Eusebius, Josephus, Syncellus, Diodorus, and others, who have attempted to give the succession of Egyptian Kings.—Most explorers, as e. g. Ideler and Fabricius, have relinquished the attempt in despair, or have broken out in the most unmeasured condemnation of these "lying" chroniclers. Of late, however, these researches have been resumed with some more prospect of success, by the aid of the royal shields or *cartouches* which are found in Egypt. The first series of these, is the tablet of Karnac, found on the walls of a Theban temple, near the village of that name, and containing 61 names. The second is the tablet of Abydos, containing, when whole, 52 royal cartouches with names inscribed. The third is the Papyrus roll, in the museum at Turin, containing 200 names, and perhaps embracing 250 when the roll was perfect.* The discovery of these monuments of antiquity has renewed the zeal of the Egyptologists, the lists of Manetho, and others have been anew collated, and a considerable number of the names, in these numerous cartouches, have been, with more or less certainty, decyphered. Besides

* Another source is mentioned by Mr. Gliddon. Ancient Egypt, p. 64. The tomb of Gurnah.

the numerous confirmations of Scripture, which the manners and customs of Egypt, as depicted on the monuments, afford, several of the Kings, named in the sacred records, are found, e. g. Sheshonk, the Shishak of Scripture, with his Asiatic captives, among whom is one bearing a turreted oval, with the inscription Judah-melek-kah, "King of the country of Judah;" Sevechus, Shabatok, or So, Tirhaka, Pharaoh Necho, Pharaoh Hophra, and Artaxerxes. The portraits of the three first of these are also found depicted. "No less than 84 Canaanitish names, mentioned in Sacred Scripture, are found at Aboosimbal, Thebes, &c. written in the hieroglyphics."* And, as to chronological agreement, Champollion Figeac, Rossellini, Leemans, and Mr. Gliddon bring the Era of Menes within the limits of the Septuagint chronology. Mr. Gliddon makes the Era of Menes, the first historic King in the Egyptian records, to be 2750 B. C. 496 years after the Septuagint date of the deluge, and 576 years before Abraham. Sir J. G. Wilkinson, on the contrary, fixes it at 2201 years B. C. or 147 years after the deluge, according to the chronology of *Usher*.

It is well known to all who have turned their attention to this subject, that there is a great difference between the chronology of the Hebrew Bible, of the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. The deluge happened according to the Septuagint, B. C. 3246; according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, 2998; according to the Hebrew, 2288; according to the English Bible, 2348. The difference between the two extremes is 958 years. The creation of the world took place according to the Lxx. B. C. 5886; according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, 4304; according to the Hebrew Text, 4101; according to Archbishop Usher and the English Bible, 4004; making a difference, between extremes, of 1882 years.

This difference appears to be the result, not of accident, but of design, to have arisen not from the casual errors of transcribers, but from studied alteration or adaptation in the Samaritan and Hebrew computation, or in that of the Lxx. an adaptation which has occurred long subsequent to the time when the original Scriptures were written.

* Dr. Hawks's Egypt and its Monuments, p. 249.

Between Josephus and the Lxx. there is a substantial agreement. Demetrius and Eupolemus, as preserved by Eusebius, Theophilus of Antioch, Julius Africanus, Eusebius, Philo-Judaeus, and Epiphanius, also adopted the long chronology. The same was the case with Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Cyprian; with Hesychius, Timotheus, Theophilus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Ambrose, and Lactantius. The same computation was adopted by the Synodus in *Trullo*, at the close of the 7th century. Eusebius did indeed reduce it by the sum of 300 years, and was followed by Jerome. Augustin added 130 years, and was followed by Paul Orosius, and Prosper Aquitanus. But the long chronology continues in use among the Greeks, Copts, Abyssinians, Armenians, Ethiopians, and Georgians, till the present day. The Russian church has, at least till a recent period, also retained it. The venerable Bede, in the 8th century, vainly endeavoured to conform the chronology to the Masoretic text. The Septuagint chronology reigned in the Latin church till the Reformation, after which time the Protestants exerted all their powers to overthrow this system, and to introduce that of the Hebrew Bible. Among them, however, Vossius, Pezron, Hayes, Jackson, Hales, and Russell, have contended, with great force of argument, for the longer computation of the Lxx. or one approximating to it. And we have long perceived a disposition in modern writers, to return to this chronology, independent of any reference to Egyptian matters. Russell has maintained that this was the chronology also of the Hebrew Scriptures, at the time of the Greek translation, and continued to be the universal chronology of the Jews for near 400 years after the Septuagint version was completed, until they were induced to alter the dates of their ancient chronicles, in order to weaken the arguments of their Christian opponents.*

Now within this larger chronology, as we have before said, the earlier Egyptologists, for the most part, including Mr. Gliddon, have brought the entire series of the Pharaonic Kings. The Chevalier Bunsen, however, now comes out with a chronology which transcends that of

* See Russell, Connection of Sacred and Profane Hist. vol. 1, Prel. Diss.

the Lxx. The Era of Menes, the first historic King of Egypt, he places at 3643 years before Christ, which carries it up 397 years beyond the Septuagint date of the deluge. "There exist," says he, "Egyptian monuments, the date of which can be accurately fixed, above 5000 years old." Again he says, that "Egypt is not the most ancient nation of the earth. They belong to the great middle ages of mankind."* Dr. Nott informs us that Lepsius has accumulated data by which the date of Menes is thrown back to 3900 B. C. We shall know better respecting these researches when they are fully published to the world. We see, however, no reason to doubt that such may be the conclusion to which this learned scholar has arrived.

Our enquiry is, have these gentlemen reached these conclusions by *certain steps*, and are they such as may not be set aside by future and more thorough search?—After considerable attention to this subject, we are by no means satisfied of their soundness. How can they be solid when they are built on a doubtful and sinking foundation? With the dynasties of Manetho, they all have infinite trouble. Of the interpretation of the Tablets of Abydos and Karnac, and of the Papyrus roll of Turin, they are by no means certain. Dr. Nott's own admissions vitiate the whole conclusion. "The last sixteen of these dynasties (Manetho's) have been fully confirmed by the researches of modern hierologists; and the first of them is established in the year 2272 B. C."

"The chronology of Egypt, up to this point, is well ascertained, but beyond this there is much uncertainty and confusion, arising from the unfortunate mutilation of her monuments by her selfish and barbarous conquerors.

"The principal difficulty in fixing the epoch of Menes, the first king or Pharaoh of the first dynasty, arises from the difficulty in deciding whether Egypt, previous to the sixteenth dynasty, was united during the whole time in one kingdom, and governed by one series of kings, or whether upper and lower Egypt, during a part of the time, may not have existed as separate kingdoms, governed by cotemporaneous monarchs. The monuments of many of these early kings have been verified but

* Egypten's Stelle, T. I. Einleit. s. 11. ii. p. 123.

the chronology is confused by the difficulty of determining which were and which were not cotemporary."—pp. 79, 80.

Mr. Gliddon also holds the same language concerning Manetho:*

"We have now," says he "reached a point of darkness, so dense, that a few observations will suffice to explain the difficulties of our position; on the one hand stands Scriptural chronology limiting us to a given period, between the Flood and Abraham; on the other we have the very *doubtful number of Manetho's kings and reigns*. A few years ago no one pretended to consider Manetho's first fifteen dynasties as worthy of notice, and even at the present day, there is *no reason* for accepting *the number of his kings*, or *the length of their reigns*, such as have been transmitted by his copyists. Therefore Manetho's period from the 4th to the end of the 15th dynasty is considered as improbable by me." "Making due allowance for *the possible repetition* of the same king's names in variations of cantouches or otherwise." "The number of 350 kings is far from being a *mere fable*, *without some foundation in fact*; and it is positively not *an exaggeration in toto*."†

We see in these words important admissions of the uncertainty of these testimonies, on which the conclusions of the decypherers of the hieroglyphics are built. The partisan aspect of Mr. Gliddon's work has called forth the comments of others. His residence in Egypt has made him an enthusiast, as was natural, in these studies, and given him an exalted idea of the antiquity of her people. The admissions which proceed from him are thus the more worthy of notice. In reference to the Tablet of Abydos he says:

"The mutilated condition of the Tablet itself adds to our difficulties." Of the Pyramids of Meroe he says, "They were all built, and were ancient in the days of Tirhaka, B. C. 700. 139 pyramids, at $22\frac{1}{2}$ years for a kingly generation, would be $3027\frac{1}{2}$ years; which is incompatible with all Scripture chronology. I am therefore inclined to consider the pyramids of Meroe to be the tombs of kings, *queens* and *princes*."

If *these*, then we ask, why not others?

The same admissions are made by Bunsen.

"The Egyptians" says he, "in early times, exaggerated the dates of their history." Of the tablet of Abydos he enquires, "were these,

* Ancient Egypt, p. 70.

† Egypten's Stelle, T. I. B. 1s. 78, 133, 135.

and those which are wanting all kings? and if so, of what dynasties? does it represent a pedigree or a series of reigning kings? and is it continuous, or does it merely comprise a selection of kings or princes chronologically arranged?" These questions he answers in a subsequent page. "The royal lines are in part lines of reigning Pharaohs, in part royal pedigrees, which are carried through with sons of kings not reigning." The reigns follow not all in immediate succession, but some of them must have been cotemporary." "Besides it is very doubtful if the sum of the reigns of one dynasty, represent the duration of the same, and do not rather merely express the total of the reigns contained in this dynasty, whether the kings were cotemporary or successive." "In this case Manetho must have found and given a key or chronological canon," (viz. in his three books of history to which his lists were originally appended,) "which is lost to us."

In his preliminary discourse to the second volume, Bunsen says:

"We found traces which rendered it probable that the lists of the old kingdom were not chronological but historical. It was probable to us, that the Egyptians, who generally appear to have been proud of the large number of royal names introduced into such lists the names of those prince who only as coregents, and for a short time, bore in the family the title Pharaoh. Every such king retains in the lists necessarily the full number of years which he reigned. When several reigned together, as for example brothers, or father and son, forming a common government, then a section e. g. of three reigns and 60 years, would embrace easily twice the number of royal names, and of years of reigning monarchs, if they reckoned all the numbers together. The chronological object in this case is kept in the back ground." "That this did happen is shewn by Manetho's own reckoning of the duration of the old and middle kingdom.*

We say nothing here of the question as to whether this Manetho were a real or a fictitious character, or whether his statements are in any one respect worthy of credence. Hengstenberg maintains *the whole work to be spurious, and the writing of a later age.*†

These very admissions show how much uncertainty attends the whole subject of Egyptian chronology, and how much is left to be supplied by the imagination of the enquirer himself. The different opinions arrived at by the

* Egypten's Stelle, in der Weltgeschichte, I, s. 78, 133, 135, II. s. 3.

† Egypt and the Books of Moses. Appendix.

different hierologists are themselves proof of the uncertainty attendant upon these investigations in their present state of progress. Further researches may lead to the discovery of further names, and also to a decision as to which of them reigned as sole sovereigns, and for how long a period. We have no fear that when the truth is ascertained it will be found to militate against the Scriptures. It is possible that when all things are adjusted, if they ever can be by this kind of research, the Hebrew chronology will be found to be substantiated, rather than the longer chronology of the LXX. If otherwise, the chronology of the LXX. will receive a confirmation which it now seems to require. Certainly there is no book which, like the Bible, has stood the test of every kind of research; and Wilkinson and Champollion Figeac have both borne their testimony that, as far as their investigations go, there is nothing on the Egyptian monuments which so much as tends to contradict it. And here we take occasion to say, in the words of another, that we are no more bound to reconcile the chronology of the Scriptures with that of the Egyptians, than these gentlemen are to reconcile the chronology of the Egyptians with that of the Scriptures. When they have completed their learned researches, and have come to some definite conclusion among themselves, and have fixed the chronology of the Egyptians upon *indisputable* evidence, then, if their chronology conflicts with that of the Scriptures we shall feel bound to enter the lists fairly against them, and not until then. Meanwhile we shall hold "Moses and the Prophets" to be as veritable historians as Manetho and all the Hierophants of Egypt, and the records of the Holy Scriptures as reliable documents as all the lists of royal lines, and as all the cartouches to be found on all the stones from the mouths to the cataracts of the Nile.*

A knowledge of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, it must also

Dr. Nolan, who has bestowed much study on these subjects, concludes that the tablet of Abydos is wholly genealogical, and that the lists of Manetho and the Turin Papyrus contain not a single monarchical succession, but the names, in numerous instances, of local and cotemporary sovereigns. He fixes the era of Menes at B. C. 2673, which while it is 385 years beyond the Hebrew computation of the Deluge, is 573 years later than that of the LXX.

* Egyptian Cronology analysed, Oxford, 1848.

be remembered, has not so long ceased from the world. They were not disused till the reign of Caracalla, 215 years after the Christian era. They were known alike to the Greeks and Romans. The very first names read in the hieroglyphics by Dr. Young and Champollion, were the Greek names of Berenice, Ptolemy, and Cleopatra. At Dendera and Esneh are the names, surnames, and cartouches of Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, Domitian, Trajan and Antoninus Pius. The Pamphylian obelisk standing in Rome, was cut in Egypt in honour of Domitian, about 80 years after Christ, and bears the inscription in hieroglyphics, "*Son of the sun, Lord of the diadems, Autocrator Cæsar Domitian Augustus.*"

Now what we affirm in relation to these things is that it was impossible that what was known to the Greeks and the Romans, should not also be known to the Jews. If the temple of Karnac was built as Bunsen affirms, 1000 years before Moses, (in which chronology we can by no means concur,) if, as he says, there were wealthy Jews in Alexandria in the times of the Ptolemies, who were men of learning, influence and power, they must have been fully aware of the chronology of Egyptian history. They were infinitely more capable of knowing these things than all the Champollions and Bunsens of the present day, and this knowledge was probably imparted to their countrymen elsewhere. If Moses was learned in all the wisdom of Egypt, and if Josephus was aware of the testimony of these monuments, they never would have willingly used a chronology which there was every thing around them to contradict. And as to God's inspiring Moses to give wrong dates, this is what no one, even of our opposers, would say. The difficulty which is made about the early Egyptian civilization, disappears when we dismiss the absurd theory that the first man was an infant in mind and a savage in refinement, and when we remember that the first progenitors of mankind, after the flood, were men acquainted with the arts of civilized life; that the deluge, though it swept away the works of man, swept not away the culture of man, but that this culture passed through the Ark and the family of Noah to the post-diluvian ages. It still further disappears when we recognize the special intervention of Deity

in the flood itself, the miraculous nature, or if this be foolishly denied, then the special providence of this event; when we consider how fast, under favourable circumstances, population multiplies, the mind is developed, and civilization shoots forward; and when we further consider that the plans of God, since unfolded, reveal in him a purpose, all along entertained, which pledged him to interfere for man's preservation, for the rapid re-peopling of the globe, and the formation of those communities which were to bear so important a part in the history of the world. With a genial clime, a soil rendered surpassingly fertile by the rich water of the Nile, and occupying a central point between three continents, and before commerce unfurled her sail so widely as now, a point which was the highway of nations, Egypt was bound to shoot upward in a luxuriant growth. To so young a people as we are, the early civilization and power of Egypt should be no miracle. Look at the almost miracle of less than three centuries, the wide diffusion of new races of men over the two Americas. Count their population, their ships, their inventions, and their cities. Were our own country denuded of forest to the degree Egypt was, and filled every where with granite, porphyry, and marble, as portions of it are, would *we* not now be building *our* habitation of the everlasting rock? and were our religion one of outward and symbolic forms, would we not be rearing our temples of granite and marble, in those massive proportions which the material itself suggests, and in a grandeur which would throw into the shade the temples of Thebes, Karnac, Dendera, and Esneh?

We say to Dr. Nott and all others who may homologize with him, that these attacks on the Scriptures, on the side of its chronology, do not alarm us. Thanks to the ingenuity and vigilance of the skeptical world, we are now used to them. The Bible, like most historical writings of an early age, is a historical treatise in part, as it describes events, gives the biographies or public acts of distinguished men, but is no otherwise a chronological treatise than as it gives occasionally the length of a patriarch's life, or of the reign of a king; justly regarding the events themselves, as connected in some way with the great scheme of redemption, and the circumstances

in the lives of these men as illustrating religious and moral truth, to be infinitely more important than chronological epochs. Yet where the Bible has casually given fixed dates, it has not been in the power of man to impugn them. The Indian chronology, the Chinese, and the Egyptian, have alike been sprung upon the theologian, but have vanished away when the torch of truth has been advanced into their caverns of darkness. The earlier Egyptian chronology, even Dr. Nott himself will not regard a whit more worthy of reliance than that of Chaldea, China, and India. The 30,000 years of Helius, son of Vulcan, the 3984 years of Saturn and the rest of the gods, and the 217 of the demigods, he will regard as fabulous as the Cali Yuga of the Hindoos and its period of 4,320,000 years, or the indefinite periods of the Chinese, exceeding 83,000 years. We are not ignorant of the Astronomical tables of the Hindoos, calculated backwards, as La Place has shown, nor of the Sinya-Sidhanta, their most ancient astronomical treatise, which they say was given by revelation to their nation more than two millions of years ago, but which must have been composed within the last 800 years. We well remember the story of Brydone as to the Sicilian pit, piercing through seven distinct lava beds, between which were layers of vegetable mould; and the reasoning he puts into the mouth of the canon Recupero, who concluded that the lowest of these beds, allowing 2000 years each for the strata of vegetable mould to form, must have flowed from Etna at least 14,000 years ago,—and we well remember that it was found on examination, that the intervening strata were not of vegetable mould, that the canon Recupero did not put forth any such conclusions, and that it does not require 200 years to form a stratum of good earth, under favourable circumstances, over lava. It was in reference, probably, to this effort of skeptical men, that Cowper wrote

“ Some drill and bore
The solid earth, and from its strata there,
Extract a register, by which we learn,
That He who made it, and revealed its date
To Moses, was mistaken in its age.”

We well remember the excitement which the discovery of the Zodiac of Dendera produced when it was conveyed in triumph to Paris in the years 1820 and 21. The whole

tribe of Deists and Atheists were filled with exultation. M. Dupuis had already commented on it and given his opinion as to its great antiquity. Burkhardt had attributed to it an antiquity of 4000, and to that of Esneh 7000 years, and it had been contended that the Zodiacal system to which these Zodiacs belong, dated back 15,000 years. If the comparatively modern temples of Dendera and Esneh were so old, how great was the antiquity of those of Thebes and Karnac! how ancient the civilization of Egypt! how utterly irreconcilable with the chronology of the Scriptures! Infidel exultation had now reached its acme. *Ecce nodus dignus deo vindice!* Champollion the younger comes forward armed with his discovery, reads on the planisphere of Dendera ΑΟΤΚΡΤΡ, Αυτοκρατωρ, emperor, and on the ceiling whence the planisphere had been detached, the names, titles and surnames of Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, and Domitian. M. Letronne, applying his vast erudition in the same direction, demonstrated that all so called Egyptian Zodiacs date from the Roman domination, that they in no respect relate to Astronomy, but belong to the phantasies of judicial astrology, and are mere *themes* of *nativity*.*

Sic transit gloria mundi! So bursts the more than South Sea bubble of modern infidelity! So melted the wings of many an Icarus, who thought himself soaring to the sun on this discovery! A pregnant warning to the author before us, who turns aside from a noble and honourable profession to do battle in a cause which must always be covered with defeat. On all such attempts He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord will hold them in derision.

We have been drawn into such extended remarks already that we know not if the patience of our readers will allow us to trespass yet further upon them. It is not the intrinsic merit of Dr. Nott's performance, nor the difficulty of meeting his declarations, which justify it. On the contrary, we are obliged to say, there is any thing but scholar-like accuracy in them, and of independent investigation, scarcely the trace. He leans upon others, and appears in a bravery of learning which costs him but the double

* Greppo.

process of copying into his note book, and copying from it. That note book must be a curious congeries of all the skepticism which he has been able to bring together for the last twenty years. Much of it is extremely familiar to us. We well remember the time when the High Priest of modern skeptics, some 18 or 20 years ago, was accustomed to shed his portentous light around us, to disturb the minds and unsettle the faith of men. He, too, though learned and ingenious elsewhere, like all infidels was shallow and credulous on these subjects, an unbeliever and yet a powerfully strong believer, having a faith extremely feeble in reference to revelation, straining at the gnat here, and swallowing the camel of infidelity there. The same doctrines appear to flourish luxuriantly now, when transplanted to Mobile.

The Dr. thinks himself very safe so long as he can lean upon Mr. George R. Gliddon.

“Owing to his great intimacy and extensive correspondence with the leading authorities of Europe, and his unrivalled opportunities for studying Eastern languages, he has been enabled to collect a most curious and interesting mass of material. To him are we greatly indebted for facilitating our labors, for he has not only directed our attention to the best printed authorities, but has, with his characteristic kindness, put at our disposal his manuscript notes. We claim the authority of Mr. Gliddon for almost every fact stated.”—pp. 107, 108.

Mr. Gliddon is entitled to deserved praise for his efforts to popularize and make accessible Egyptian studies. We would not say a word to diminish his well earned reputation. But, if we mistake not, he makes no claim to original research, and though he may have heard the Arabic spoken no small part of his life, we much question the extent and accuracy of his oriental studies, or the soundness of his judgment, in applying the knowledge he really has, to the interpretation of Scripture. We suppose he would not claim to be a practised critic here, and judging from his published lectures he would shrink from attacking revealed religion in any way. And as to others whose names sound well, we would say: If Dr. Nott chooses to walk on trembling and quaking bogs, rather than on firm soil, and requires support, let him take something to lean on of broad base, and not the slender reed.

Most men are fond of the support of great names. It is pleasant when on an uncertain expedition to feel that we are in a strong company. If we are attacked, we can make the better resistance. If we are defeated there are others to share the shame of defeat. A long list of names, too, has, in certain connections, an imposing array. "Luther, Gesenius, Ewald, Eichorn, Hartmann, Gabler, the Rosenmuellers, DeWette, Strauss; such Theologians as Channing, Norton, Parker, Palfrey; such *savans* as Charles Hamilton Smith, Burke of the Ethnological Journal, and Dr. Morton, Pickering, Bartlett, Caldwell, Gliddon, Squire and Davis, Pauthier, De Lanci, Bunsen, Lepsius, De Saulcy, Letronne, Vies, Birch, Jahn, Professor Stuart, and above all, Munk. It matters not if some of these gentlemen may think that they have fallen in "with strange bed fellows." No matter if some of them may refuse to be yoked to this chariot. Praise for this one, exceeding praise for this, the height of eulogium for this, just in proportion as he runs counter to Moses and the Apostles, and studied depreciation of those who believe the Scriptures, and adhere to their testimony; exhibit the well known tactics of Rosseau and Voltaire, Thomas Paine and the whole troop of infidelity, and fully marks Dr. Nott as the present Hierophant of its mysteries.

We are prepared to join issue with Dr. Nott as to the antiquity of alphabetic writing and the genuineness of the Pentateuch. On the former point we can only say that there is evidence of its existence before Moses, our limits not allowing us to enter upon the proof. On the latter, a brief remark or two is all which the patience of our readers will now permit. Quoting from Munk, who says criticism has gradually made the composition of the Pentateuch descend to a *thousand years* after Moses, and ended by transforming into mysteries most of the historical events therein recounted,—“Such,” says Dr. Nott, “is the language of Munk—such is the language of wisdom and truth, and such are the wide spread opinions of the theologians of the continent of Europe.” He then breaks forth into a wail over the poverty of our language in names which can rank with such great philologists and theologians as Gesenius, Eichorn, Ewald, De Wette, Hartman, Jahn, Bohlen, Munk, Gabler, Strauss, &c. &c.

Most of these men are doubtless men of true learning. But a wrong principle in the outset may vitiate the whole of the most learned effort, and make it irrelevant trifling. The man who can take Strauss for a leader, or pin his faith on De Wette's sleeve, is enamoured of whatever is wide from sobriety and truth in religion. We beg leave, however, to remove from their proximity to these views respecting the Pentateuch, two of these names, which Dr. Nott may seem to have marshalled, though perhaps he has not really done so, with those who have opposed the genuineness of the Pentateuch, as a writing of Moses.—Eichorn, with all his faults on other points, has laboured strenuously and successfully in its defence, and Jahn is also one of the ablest maintainers of its Mosaic origin.

We recognize the argument of Dr. Nott against Moses, resting, though it does, like a tripod, on three feet, Munk, Norton, and himself, as an old acquaintance. It used to greet us some twenty years ago from the walls of our State College. The doctor seems to have thought it expedient to give the same argument an inauguration into the State College of Louisiana. The star of empire westward wends its way, and while these lands are in some measure escaping from its malign influence, this baleful meteor would seem to be in the ascendant there. We do not see, however, in all the efforts which have been made to keep up with the age, that the argument has been one whit improved in the twenty years service it has seen on the field of contest. It seems not to have gained many accessions from the labours of its learned fautors. It is the same round of oft refuted objections. We have seriously thought of constructing an argument on the same plan, to prove that Dr. Cooper did not write the treatise on political economy, once issued in his name, and it has even occurred to us to attempt one on these two lectures ascribed to Dr. Nott. Archbishop Whately's historic doubts, relative to Napoleon Buonaparte; Dr. Casuar's, as to Martin Luther; Schmucker's, as to William Shakespear; the Wolfian argument against the writings of the blind old Homer; and Father Harduin's argument to show that nearly all the books ascribed to the classic authors of Greece and Rome, those of Cicero, and the elder Pliny, the Satires of Horace and the Geor-

gics, alone excepted, were forged in the 13th century, encourage us to believe that the attempt would not be regarded as wholly a failure. With a reasonable degree of ingenuity, and a small share of effrontery, we do not deem it very difficult to construct an argument against the existence of almost any personage, or, judging by the stuff such reasonings are usually made of, against the genuineness of almost any writing. The argument of Berkeley against the reality of the material world, is well nigh irresistible; and Dr. Lardner has *demonstrated*, some years ago, that the Atlantic cannot be crossed by steam.

It is indeed the case that the book before us is not so well suited to such a purpose as some other document would be. A constitution professedly emanating from some high authority, and appealed to through a series of ages, for the regulation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs, would afford a greater number of real parallels with the Pentateuch. But if Dr. Nott were an ancient instead of a living author, if his lectures were an ancient instead of a modern book, if they came down to us the sole literary relick of a remote antiquity, if they were followed immediately, as the Pentateuch is, by but a single writing, and this of no great volume; if the next literary composition, now extant, were not written till 500 years after their production, and the next not till nearly 600 years; if these lectures were found written compactly, when first brought to the knowledge of the moderns, with no spaces between words, no punctuation, no sections, no paragraphs; and if now, under these circumstances, they should have been re-edited, divided into sections, the words separated from each other, and in this form published to the world, how many objections might an over critical man raise to their genuineness as the production of Dr. Nott? In the first place it might be doubted if the author were indeed a historical personage. Then, if this were admitted, and also that he wrote something, and that something were perhaps embodied *in* this book, it might be questioned whether the lectures, *as we now have them*, proceeded from his pen. 1. "They are evidently of a fragmentary character; the different fragments of which, some form separate little works apart, and are put together and united in a disconnected manner, &c. as any attentive rea.

der may judge." 2. "They show too many repetitions." 3. "The contradictions contained in these lectures, too, show that they cannot have proceeded from one author." Our space alone prevents the insertion of these repetitions and seeming contradictions, which we have drawn out at full length. But the conclusions to which this argument would lead is, that these contradictions are such as no one man, in his sober senses, can be believed to be guilty of, especially one claiming to belong to a profession, for countless ages, honoured for acuteness and close observation.

We mention these things as a specimen of what might be done with Dr. Nott's lectures, if they should be in existence 3000 years hence. If the world shall stand as long, cotemporary literature may be no more. Some of the least valuable writings of the old Romans are found preserved among the charred MSS. of Herculaneum. It is a bare chance, though not at all probable, that this book may be in existence. Other men may occupy this soil. The cities we now inhabit may be in ruins, or wholly obliterated from the earth. Convulsions, or the wear of elemental nature, may change the form of our coasts and continents, and the direction of our streams.—The Isthmus may be worn through, North be entirely dissevered from South America, and the Delta of the Mississippi be wholly changed, as it doubtless has been before, since the world was created. Some gloss may first be inscribed on the margin of these pages, and afterwards creep into the text. How easy, under these circumstances, to argue against the genuineness of this book, to imagine differences in style, the traces of a later hand; that the title page and other notes of identification, satisfactory now, did not proceed from the original writer, but are the conjectures of some subsequent age; that the book, which bears every appearance of being fragmentary, is a compilation thrown together from many ancient documents, by a later hand; the existence of civilization and of alphabetic characters, at so remote an age as the year 1849, might be questioned, and, as we have before said, even the enquiry raised whether Josiah C. Nott were a historic personage at all.

The positive argument, for the genuineness of the Pen-

tateuch, is a subject on which we cannot now enter. We indicate only the absurdity of this whole method of the higher criticism. It has been tested oftentimes, and found wanting. Books have been rejected which ought to have been received, and manifest forgeries have obtained the sanction of men, the most skilled in critical tact.

One thing, however, we cannot withhold, and this is our abhorrence of the levity and irreverence of this whole performance. "Does it not shock our ears and understandings," says this writer, "when we read in the 4th chap. of Exodus, after Moses had been solemnly commissioned, and sent by Jehovah to the Israelites, that while he was on his way, at a lodging place, Jehovah met him and sought to slay him? and many other passages quite as much out of character." What these many other passages are, Dr. Nott does not inform us. But he evidently is too superficial a reader of the Holy Scriptures to understand the solemnity and spirituality of their import. To him, doubtless, the covenant made with Abraham, in which the true believer discovers that plan of salvation which is the central truth of Divine revelation, and the only sufficient reason why there is a revelation at all, is a mere historic or moral myth, and those theophanies, so often spoken of in the Old Testament, and not unknown in the New, of no higher nature than the *machine** of a heathen mythologist. And he can see in the arrest, on the part of God, of Moses, his servant, by the way, as he was hieing to Egypt to lead, in God's name, the chosen people, and his sudden prostration by fearful disease, for living in neglect of the rite of circumcision, nought but some childish, fabulous, or vindictive proceeding on the part of Jehovah. We are sorry that Dr. Nott is able to appeal, as he does, as encouragement to himself in these views, to any who have borne the name of theologians. But it is too true that those whom, if they are in France, we call infidels; if in England, deists; are in Germany sometimes dignified with the name of Theologians. De Wette has asserted that the Pentateuch has no historic character at all—contains no one fixed historic point—is altogether mythical—and needs but metrical arrangement

* "Deus in machina."

to give it that character of poetry to which it is really entitled. Even Spencer, living in common sense old England, speaks of the rites imposed, or, as he says, adopted by God, *as tolerable follies*. Clericus understands the shame which invaded the breasts of our first parents, and which is expressed by the words "and the eyes of them both were opened," of their perceiving too late the noxious nature of the fruit they had eaten, from the pain in their intestines. Michaelis says if Moses speaks as if the seething a kid in its mother's milk was a crime against religion, he only designs to induce the people to cook kids in olive oil instead of butter, because they would taste better. The shining of Moses's face, when he came down from Sinai, was but an electric phenomenon, according to Eichorn; and after Hobbes, the same writer represents the pillar of cloud and fire as merely the usual signal for marching, which was made by the smoke of the caravan fire. Goethe complains "of the disagreeable matter" of the Pentateuch, and represents Moses as the Robespierre of the old world. "The thought shocks him," too, that God sent out his destroying angel over Egypt. It was the Israelites, according to him, who, at the instigation of Moses, undertook the anticipation of the Sicilian vespers. Even the pretended 'judgments of God,' were executed by a band of Sicarii led on by Moses.—Aaron and Moses were not excluded from the promised land by the justice of God, but Aaron was secretly put out of the way by Moses, and Moses by Joshua and Caleb, who thought it well to bring to an end the regency of a narrow-gifted man, which they had borne for some years, and to send him after many unfortunates he had slaughtered."*

So have written so called theologians, critics, and men of taste respecting the Scriptures, in their utter blindness and ignorance of the God of Heaven, and in the same spirit writes the author of these lectures, following boldly in their footsteps.

As to the PHYSICAL HISTORY OF MAN, so far as touched upon by Dr. Nott, we must leave it chiefly in abler hands.

* See Hengstenberg *Authentic der Pentateuch*, Prolegomena Bd. 1, and Prof. Ballentine's Translation of the same, *Bib. Repos.* vols. xi. and xii. for several of the foregoing facts.

The biblical part of his lectures is that on which he has laid out his strength, and it falls more fully in the line of our own pursuits. He has added nothing new to the argument against the Unity of our race, nor diminished aught from the force of the argument in its favour. The simple truth of the case, according to the plain, unperverted sense of the Bible, is, that all men, whatever be their type and complexion, proceeded from one stock, from one and the same progenitors. It is not the declaration of Genesis alone, but of the whole Scriptures, and is interwoven with the whole moral government of God and the scheme of redemption. Dr. Nott knows this is the teaching of Scripture, and because this teaching stands in the way of his theory, he seeks to destroy the credit of the Scriptures themselves *as the book of God*. If the Bible is of divine authority, all the varieties of mankind did proceed from one and the same stock, and have been produced by natural causes under the special providence of God, or by direct miraculous intervention. That it was the latter is the short hypothesis which is adopted by many of our most esteemed divines, but which Dr. Nott rejects, and in relation to which we have expressed our doubts, principally for the reason that we find historic evidence that, of the race of Ham, upon whom this change is supposed to be produced, whole nations were of the Caucasian type, and devoid alike of the features and hue of the negro. The Hamites of southern latitudes alone appear to have attained his physical peculiarities. Even that portion of Ham's descendants peculiarly smitten with the curse, remained; as far as we can trace them, Caucasian in their conformation and physiognomy, though some of them may have acquired, at length, the African hue. The ancient kingdom of Nimrod, too, whose ruins Layard has lately reopened to the light of the sun, though of the stock of Ham, commingled perhaps with Assyrians of the race of Shem, was made up of nations of the so called Caucasian type, and of light complexion. The same general fact holds true of the Japetic race. A large portion are Caucasian, another portion, perhaps equally large, are of the Mongolian type. The complexion of these men is of various tinge, from the xanthous complexion of the ancient German, to the beautiful but dark haired Osmanli, and the

tawny inhabitant of China and Japan. The same is true of the Shemites. Of these are the noble Persians, who for finely formed heads and beautifully chiseled features, and fair complexion, dispute the palm with the Greeks. Next are the Jews with more retreating foreheads but still of the Caucasian type, then the Arab, finely featured, but darker, and even sometimes quite black, yet with a personal beauty which might vie with that of the Greek. Then come the red tribes of America, partly perhaps of Japetic and partly of Shemitish origin. Thus the three types of humanity, the three most strongly marked complexions of men, and the three families of man as descendants from the three sons of Noah, do not at all coincide. What conclusion can we arrive at, then, than that the same causes operating, have produced analogous changes in the different families of men? And, if these causes be natural and not supernatural, what are they, so far as traceable by man, but climate, food, mode of life, education, and congenital and accidental variations, springing up, as they do, even now, among men, to some little extent, and, by the isolation of those among whom they occurred from the rest of mankind, in the providence of God, becoming permanent in successive generations?

It is replied to all this, that none of these causes are seen to produce these effects now. The negro does not become a white man nor the black man white. But it must be admitted, there are changes somewhat analogous. Climate does produce an effect, even Dr. Nott allows, to some extent. The effect, when temporary, is on the same tissue of the human body in which the pigment of the Ethiop is found. Some white men are born with features approaching the African, and some with features approaching the Mongolian, without their hue. The only thing which this theory supposes is, that, in the early ages after the flood, and before the first monumental evidence of the existence of various types and complexions of men, causes operated, under a special providence, with a rapidity and power far beyond that which is ordinary now. We deceive ourselves by supposing that all things were, from the beginning, as they are observed to be in the limited experience of the present generations of men, in the limited circle of our personal observation, or of express historic re-

cord. There are facts which baffle all human calculations. It is the ordinary rule that a generation of men passes away in about 30 years. But epidemics rage and death does a speedy work. It is the law of population that under favourable circumstances it should constantly increase. But, in the Sandwich islands, there has long been observed a gradual diminution of the inhabitants, without any assignable cause, and there is reason to fear that in a few years more, that race of men will become wholly extinct. In the lapse of a few years, changes are produced in the earth itself in particular localities, and sometimes even in a few days, or even moments of time, which the geologist, after the facts are faded away from the memory of man, will insist it required myriads of years to accomplish. And why should it not have been so in the family of man?

“Besides the partial laws with which we are acquainted, that there have been others once most active, whose agency is now either suspended or concealed, the study of the world must easily convince us. There were times, within the verge of mythological history, when volcanoes raged in almost every chain of mountains, when lakes dried up, or suddenly appeared, in many valleys, when seas burst over their boundaries and created new islands, or retired from their beds and increased old continents; when, in fine, there was a power of production and arrangement on a great magnificent scale, when nature seemed employed not merely in the yearly renovation of plants and insects, but in the procreation from age to age of the vaster and more massive elements of her sphere; when her task was not confined to the embroidering meadows in the spring, or to the paring away of shores by the slow eating action of tides and currents, but when she toiled in the great laboratories of the earth, upheaving mountains, and displacing seas, and thus giving to the world its great indelible features. And how are we to account for this, but by supposing in nature a two-fold action, one regular from the beginning, and uniform to the end, the other a mysterious slow-moving power, which though revolving on the same plane, travels over it with an imperceptible motion, proportioned to the wants of the entire system.

“We must allow that in the world's infancy, besides the regular ordinances of constant and daily course, causes necessary to produce great and permanent effects may have had a power, now no longer wanted, and consequently no longer exercised; that

there was a tendency to stamp more marked features upon the earth and its inhabitants, to produce countries as well as their vegetation, races as much as individuals.

"Such examples, to which I might add many others, seem to show the existence of hidden resources in nature, never called forth, save in her infant state. And it surely cannot be unphilosophical to suppose that impressions, meant to be characteristic and permanent, were then more easily communicated, and more indelibly stamped."—*Wiseman's Lectt.* pp. 144, 145, 147.

These considerations diminish much the certainty of those conclusions in geology and natural history, which affirm the necessity of almost infinite cycles of time to produce those effects seen in the natural world. The God of nature can stir into quicker action, or give a new direction to the powers of nature, for man himself within his limited circle can do so, and make them accomplish his purposes. Electricity, Chemistry and Steam, are, in our day, accomplishing wonders,—incredible, ages ago, if made known to our fathers,—under the directing mind of man. What may not natural causes in like manner do, what have they not in past ages done, under the directing mind of God? If the fact then be "*certain*, that the white, mongol, and negro races existed at least 5000 years ago," an assertion which we will receive with some reasonable deduction* from an antiquity quite so high, there is in this fact nothing incredible, if we suppose but an action of natural causes more speedy than what now meets our eyes.†

Dr. Nott allows that "the Unity of the race once abandoned, no limit can be set to the number of species." He consoles us for the apparent opposition of this hypothesis to the divine word, by the suggestion that the Almighty who created them "can take care of them without regard to the *opinions* of men." The fertility of hybrids, he maintains, building upon the doctrine of Dr. Morton upon this point, and affirms "that not only many distinct species of animals, but even *genera*, produce together prolific offspring." The fertility of mules is a necessary part of his doctrine. "The mulatto and half Indian" he says, "are no more negroes or Indians than a mule is a horse." "The

* Say 1500 years.

† See also, Guyot, *Earth and Man*, pp. 242, 245.

mulattoes descended from the *pure* white and black races are true *hybrids*." Indeed, it must be that he believes, that *nearly all mankind are MULES*, for he says, "probably a perfectly pure race does not now exist on the face of the globe." Yet as mulattoes are prolific, and the half Indians are prolific, and all the mixed races are prolific, the doctrine of the fertility of hybrids is to him extremely convenient for the moment. We wonder that the advocates of this doctrine do not reduce it more to practice than is common. By universal consent, the mule between the horse and the ass is more useful for plantation purposes, more hardy, and more easily kept, than either of the parent stocks. Why not dismiss these stocks altogether, and let the hybrids perpetuate themselves? Beat and bang a mule as you will, the proverb says, "a mule never dies." We commend the doctrine of Charles Hamilton Smith, and Drs. Morton and Nott, to our Kentucky drovers, and all other breeders of stock. It will open to them mines of wealth more exhaustless than Potosi and California!

It suits the doctor's purpose, however, only partly to hold to the *fertility* of mules.

"It is, we think, capable of demonstration, that in all our Atlantic and Northwestern States, the mulattoes are less prolific, less hardy, shorter lived, more liable to premature births and are, in every respect, physically inferior to either the pure whites or blacks; and further, that the mulattoes descended from the *pure* white and black races are true *hybrids*, which would become extinct if left alone to propagate amongst themselves."—*p. 46.*

Yet, this *sterility* does not appertain to *all* mulatto hybrids!

"When we come further south, as at Pensacola, Mobile, and New Orleans, &c. this law becomes much modified, and we find a class of mulattoes who are long lived, more hardy, more prolific, and in every respect, much superior to those of the north. The explanation of this apparent contradiction, is perhaps not very easy, and we suggested that it might be accounted for on the supposition that a stronger affinity or aptitude for amalgamation existed between the Negro and Celtic blood. A large portion of the population of these towns is composed of dark-skinned Spanish and French settlers, who have extensively amalgamated with the negroes, and a mixed race has thus sprung

up of very different appearance from the mulattoes of the northern States."—*p.* 47.

The doctor does not explain whether these Celts have within them already, some mixture of the negro blood, and are 49th cousins of the Ethiop, or whether they are the descendants of an original stock, one of the hundred or more God originally created, and intermediate in their primitive constitution between the negro and the white man.

On this whole subject, and on the "fossilised human bones," which, according to Dr. Nott, show that 'men may have existed upon the earth, prior to the six days of *our* creation,' we are very kindly permitted to quote from the forthcoming work of Dr. Bachman, of Charleston, who holds a reputation as a naturalist, in some departments, second to none in the United States, and whose name is not unknown to fame among the scientific circles of the old continent.* Dr. Bachman proposes to examine the questions of the unity of the human race, solely on the principles of science, and draws from the ample resources of his own observation. Dr. Bachman finds no more reason to suppose different races of men, from differences of the skull, than of sheep, horses, and swine, from the different formation of the skull in them; and no more reason, from differences of colour, to suppose difference of origin, than to make the same violent supposition to account for difference of colour in the horse, hog, squirrel, rabbit, and mouse.

"The greatest naturalists in all ages," says Dr. Bachman, "however diversified may have been their views in regard to Christianity, regarded all the races of men as composed of one species. Among these were Linnæus, Leibnitz, Buffon, Schreber, Erxleben, Humboldt, Blumenbach, Cuvier, Owen, &c. the lights of the world, who studied all the departments of nature—formed our genera and species, and designated their characters. Our friend, Dr. Morton, whose superior qualifications are fully admitted, has not yet entered on the field of argument, and although he has intimated that his mind at present leans to the opposite side, yet, as he is still pursuing his researches, we still hope

* THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE, EXAMINED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF SCIENCE. BY JOHN BACHMAN. D. D. Charleston, S. C. Printed by C. Canning, 29 Pinckney-street. 1850.

to rank him as one of the advocates of the doctrine of the unity of the human race. In the last American work on Zoology, by Professor Agassiz, this eminent naturalist, after expressing an opinion that many animals must have been created at several points of the same zone,—proceeds to say:—“Even man, although a cosmopolite, is subject, in a certain sense, to this law of limitation. While he is everywhere the one identical species, yet several races, marked by certain peculiarities of features, are recognized, such as the Caucasian, Mongolian, and African races. And it is not a little remarkable that the abiding-places of these several races correspond very nearly with some of the great zoological regions.”*

“And who are on the opposite side? Virey, who pronounces the negro “undoubtedly a distinct species from the beginning of the world,”† and divides mankind into two species, the white and the black, and suspects a certain fraternity between the Hottentot and the Baboon. Desmoulin divided men into 11 species; Borey into 15, and Broc into several sub-genera, and an infinite number of species,—and finally an American,‡ who can see no reason why we should not make an hundred species of men. There are, no doubt, others who have more recently entered into the field, whose works we have not seen. The Frenchmen belonged to a school of skeptics, of which Voltaire was at the head, and we may be allowed to suspect, that their minds might have been biased by the cheerless doctrine which they had imbibed.

“The American,‡ who seems recently to have laboured rather to deny the historical veracity of the Scriptures, than to prove the diversity of the races, may perhaps claim the attention of the theologians; but having produced no new fact or argument to bear on the subject to which we are restricted in this purely scientific discussion, he requires no further notice. Be this as it may, the world of science has never admitted these gentlemen into their ranks as naturalists. Their names are utterly unknown among them—not one of them, that we are aware of, has ever described a single animal, and it is evident that they were unacquainted with those characteristics on which genera and species are formed; hence they all disagree among themselves.”
pp. 35, 36

Dr. Bachman ascribes the varieties of men, neither to new creations nor to miracle.

“It must be observed,” says he, “God might have created

* Principles of Zoology. Agassiz & Gould. 1848.

† Extracted from the French of Virey, by G. H. Guenebault, p. 35.

‡ Dr. Nott.

the first progenitors of our race, millions of ages earlier than at the time when they actually appeared, and if he so constructed the human constitution that it would, by its own organization, be capable of producing varieties that were to become permanent in their characters, the effect would be produced by a natural process—varieties of men would be formed without a miracle.—We all admit that the first pair of cow, of horse, of sheep, or of swine, was a miraculous creation. but if it was a part of their nature to produce the endless varieties which we daily meet with, then surely the production of these varieties is not miraculous, but a natural operation.

“The authorities mostly relied on for facts to prove the theory advocated by Dr. Morton, is ‘Griffith’s Animal Kingdom, by Cuvier,’ as the work is called, and the names of Griffith, Cuvier, and Col. J. Hamilton Smith, are so constantly quoted as authorities, that without careful examination the reader might be led to conclude that the facts were certified by several authors. Cuvier was not answerable for all the matter introduced into that production. Col. Smith prepared the synopsis on the species of mammalia, and affixed his name to many of the articles. He was also the author of the Natural History of the Equidæ, so frequently quoted by Dr. Morton: ‘The Natural History of the Dog;’ as also of an article in the Ethnological Journal, recently quoted by Dr. Nott, in which an attempt is made to show that ‘fossilized human bones are found in company with those of extinct species of animals under circumstances that render it extremely probable that they were cotemporary,’ and the writer remarks that he (Smith) ‘controverts the hasty opinions of Cuvier, and unsettles all previous conclusions on this point.’ and then adds that ‘the most important human fossil is that found by Mr. Dickeson, near Vicksburg.’ If this could be proved, then it would be seen that races of men had existed before the days of Adam, and hence the Mosaic chronology would evidently be false. We would, in this latter connection, digress for a moment, and briefly state the results to which all geologists of any reputation have arrived in regard to these pretended fossils.

1. “That there is not in any museum or any private collection in the world, a single human fossil that can be traced to any of the older formations.”

3. “That the specimen submitted to the American Association, and characterized as ‘what is perhaps the most important human fossil yet discovered,’ is of modern origin. We were present at one of the meetings where this pelvis was submitted to the society for examination. Dr. Dickeson, an intelligent young

geologist, simply presented the specimen, which had been discovered by another individual who had picked it up in a ravine about 6 miles from Natchez. In Lyell's *Second Visit to the United States*, p. 151, we have an account of this bone. He decided that "it was a portion of the skeleton of a modern Indian that had been dislodged from some old Indian grave from the cliffs above, and fallen into the ravine beneath. It was stained black, as if imbedded in a peat or vegetable soil." We cannot but conclude from hence that men must be strongly wedded to a theory, who, whilst they are in possession, as far as we are informed, of the unanimous opinion of the most learned geologists, deliberately again venture to reproduce these exploded errors."—*pp.* 37, 42, 43, 44.

We trust these views of one who can speak with authority, will produce a proper impression on all who have been disturbed on these interesting questions by the crudely formed opinions of certain popular writers of the day.

Much has been made in the argument against the unity of the race, from the alleged inferior capacity of the negro brain. Tiedeman was quoted in a former number of this Review, to show that the cranial capacity of the negro is not inferior to that of the other races of men. Dr. Nott affirms that "Dr. Morton has established the fact that the cranial capacity of the Mogul, Indian, and Negro, and all dark skinned men, is smaller than that of the pure white man."*

* This statement is made in such form that it cannot be gainsaid. Yet, if Dr. Nott had used the term *Caucasian* instead of "the pure white man," it would not have been impregnable. Tiedeman's testimony is entitled to as much weight as Dr. Morton's, and his measurements have every appearance of being perfectly accurate. § He adds to his own the testimony of Dr. Hamilton, who also instituted measurements to the same end. If Dr. Morton's collection is the largest of any individual in the world, Tiedeman had the public and private collections of Germany, England, Scotland, and Ireland before him. Only in the crania of the Aboriginal tribe of America, had Dr. Morton the advantage. Of the other varieties, Tiedeman's measurements were more than twice as numerous. The respective number of skulls measured, is as follows:

	TIEDEMAN.	MORTON.
Caucasian skulls,	117	52
Mongolian "	20	10
Malay "	43	18
American "	27	147
Ethiopian "	41	29
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	248	256

The following digest of Tiedeman's tables may be acceptable to those

§ Prof. Tiedeman of Heidelberg, on the brain of the negro, compared with the European and Orang-Outang, *Phil. Trans.* 1836, pp. 519, 520.

But it seems that this argument from the inferior size of the negro brain, is no longer insisted on by the advocates of diversity of race. Dr. Nott himself affirms that "absolute size of brain cannot be taken as an inevitable measure of intellect either in individuals or races;" that the "Hindoos and the Toltecs in America, are examples of small and active brains, while on both continents are found savage tribes with large ill-formed heads, utterly incapable (?) of civilization." Dr. Morton, too, while he re-

curious in such matters, and will be understood, if it is borne in mind that the weight is not of the actual brain itself, but of millet seed, with which various crania were filled to ascertain their relative capacity. Dr. Morton adopted the same method of filling the crania, but gives the measurement of the internal cavity in inches:

No. of Skulls.	Caucasian of Europe, Asia and Africa.	lb. oz. dr. gr.				Malay, American, Mongolian, and Ethiopian.	lb. oz. dr. gr.			
		lb.	oz.	dr.	gr.		lb.	oz.	dr.	gr.
77	European skulls, } Average weight, }	3	5	2	30					
38						Malay skulls,	3	4	6	21
4	Egyptian, "	3	4	4	56					
24						American, (Indian,)	3	3	7	12
18						Mongolian,	3	2	7	55
38						Ethiopian,	3	1	6	24
24	Asiatic "	3	0	0	36					

These were all skulls of males; the measurements of female skulls are not added. Omitting the Egyptian, which were but 4 in number, the average of the Caucasian is 3 2 5 33

Among the Ethiopian crania are those of natives of Congo, Madagascar, Loango, Guinea, Angola, Mozambique; Bushmen, Caffres, Hottentots, and Ashantees. His Asiatic embrace the crania of the following nations; one Russian from Orenburg, one Werschandier beyond Mount Taurus, one Armenian, one Arab, four Cingalese, eight Hindoos, one Birman, two Circasians, three Georgians, two Parsees. It thus appears that though the European Caucasians stand highest, the Asiatic Caucasians stand lowest for cranial capacity, and that if the average be taken of the *whole* Caucasian race, they will be inferior to all the rest, the Ethiopian excepted.

Dr. Morton tells us that he admitted but three Hindoo skulls into the number "because the skulls of these people are probably smaller than those of any other existing nation." But it obviously is improper to obtain the average of the Caucasian race from the skulls of the large headed nations. The 140,000,000 Hindoos are a full third, and the Asiatic Caucasians much more than half of the whole Caucasian variety of men the earth contains. Had the Caucasians of Asia been as fully represented in Dr. Morton's tables, as those of Europe and America, the relative proportions of the several varieties would, probably, have been changed. Dr. Bachman well says that the mensuration of Dr. Morton is but "the commencement of a long series of studies in reference to the Mammalians in general." It has not gone through, as it should do, the various races of men, nor is it, perhaps, possible that it should be completed by any one man.

presents the Hindoos as having the smallest brains, finds those of the Old Peruvians but a little larger; and shows that, of the Aboriginal Americans, the Peruvians had the smallest brains, the Mexicans brains a little more capacious, and the barbarian tribes the largest of all.

Tiedeman, as well as Dr. Morton, alludes to the smallness of the Hindoo brain. The male skull giving the smallest internal dimensions in Tiedeman's tables (excepting two of North American Indians) is the skull of a Hindoo Brahmin. The largest skull in Tiedeman's tables is that of a Botecudo Indian, the next largest is of a Don Cossack, and the next of a Congo negro. The average of seventeen Hindoo heads, measured by Dr. Morton, gives to them an internal capacity three cubics inches smaller than the average of his twenty nine African heads. But the Hindoos are reckoned by him, as well as by Tiedeman, under the Caucasian variety. It should follow, if dimension of brain is certain evidence of talent, that there are Caucasian nations beneath the African in the scale of native intellect.

But Dr. Nott thinks that "size and form of the anterior lobes (all things being equal,) may be taken as a measure of intellect, and as the negro is deficient here, his place in the scale of being must be very low. As the dimensions of the brain are unalterable by education, however continued through generations, the negro never can rise beyond the capacity he attains to in this country in the second generation." And yet again he holds that the head and brain are not unalterable, and that "it is an indisputable fact that all the negro tribes in the United States, are more perfect in their physical developements and have better formed heads (as well as bodies and limbs) and are more intellectual than their African ancestors." For the inconsistency of these views we are not responsible. With inconsistency of various kinds his pages abound in a most remarkable manner.

On the subject of phrenology it is not our province authoritatively to pronounce. We leave it to men of science to do this, a great share of whom are wholly unsatisfied with its doctrines and decisions. Anatomy has not been able to find its organs, so as to see why intelligence should be seated in one part of the brain more than another. The

posterior part of the brain, the supposed place of the animal propensities, is found to diminish as you descend to the lower animals, and in the salacious ape is extremely small. Prichard, Esquirol, Foville, and Carpenter, and professors Dunlison, Harrison and Sewall, in our own country, and innumerable others, have determined against the decisions of this, as it appears to us, fallacious science.*

We see, then, no physical reason, we see no conclusive one in history, and we find none in the word of God, why the barbarous nations may not be civilized and take their stand among enlightened nations and the worshippers of the true God. It may be true that some races of men disappear from the earth, in the mysterious providence of God, as the American Indians and some of the South Sea Islanders are now doing. But we believe not the testimony of men, however deserving of our confidence in other things, who tell us that the barbarous tribes are incapable, under any possible circumstances, of civilization. Facts disprove it, facts of the present century and of the past. The results of Missionary labour disprove it, unless the whole tribe of Missionaries, some of whom are distinguished for intelligence and education, are liars and deceivers. We ourselves disprove it. In the days of Jewish, Assyrian, Egyptian, and even of Grecian and Roman civilization, our ancestors were wild, cruel, painted savages. It is true, as Dr. Nott suggests, that the prognathous skull may not have been common among them. It is not common among the barbarians of America. It is exhibited by only a portion of the natives of Africa; some, even of the black nations have an erect face, prominent forehead and fine features. There was a time, long since the era of Menes and the pyramids; when the Britons "were as degraded as the most savage nations now existing;" when the ancient Sarmatians were as wild and untameable as the Indians of America; when the Slavonians were covered with squalid filth; and generally, the Northern nations of Europe were, in many things, not above the tribes of Dahomey and Ashanti, and in many, even below them.

* See this subject treated by Morell, *History of Philosophy*, I. 497, et seq. Carpenter's *Human Physiology*. Dr. Rice's *Phrenology and Mesmerism*.

While these arguments, then, all fail to prove a diversity of race, religion and humanity passionately exclaim against them as a wrong done to our brethren; to men who wear the form, and bear about within them the heart of our common nature; who fell in the first Adam, from whom, they, like ourselves, have descended, and are to be saved, if at all, through the second Adam, who, for this, took on himself our common flesh, and has left us his commission to go out into *all* the world and preach the gospel to every creature.*

We have thus followed Dr. Nott through these lectures of his, and have met, if not all, yet his principal objections against revealed religion. We do not profess to have treated them in full. This within such limits were impracticable. If we have been rambling in our review, it is because we were in chase of a rambler, and it is possible that what we have said is, in this respect, like what we have attempted to answer. We should not have thought these Lectures worthy of a reply, had they been likely to be read only by persons informed on the ordinary subjects of theological learning. Among such persons, we have heard but one expression of surprise, that such common and often answered objections against the Scriptures, should be brought forward in these times, as profound discoveries. A few only of these objections assume a new importance from the new researches in antiquities and science. We are convinced that neither geology, ethnology, chronology, phrenology, physiology nor Egyptology, have any well authenticated facts which militate in the least degree against the scripture doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race. Our faith is too weak to receive the doctrine of Pre-Adamic races of men, or to adopt the idea of Mr. Burke of the *Ethnological Journal*, with which Dr. Nott seems enamoured, "that all the civilization of antiquity sprung from a mighty race that once inhabited the island of Atlantis, which disappeared beneath the waters of the Atlantic, long before the names Hebrew or Chaldean were known."† Dr. Nott may in-

* In confirmation of the views we have expressed, see Alex. Von Humboldt. *Cosmos*. I. p. 361, et seq.

† The island of Atlantis, if it ever existed, may have formed a part of the highway by which America received a portion of its population, from the

deed deplore the fact that we are so far behind the age. But when we see new and frisky sciences, now just extricating themselves from the chaotic slime, leaping about hither and thither, and butting eastward, westward, northward, and southward against the old foundations, we have been disposed to wait till they have found out their real strength, and their proper province.

It may not please Dr. Nott that we have ranked him with those infidel writers of a former age who have sought to sap the foundations of revealed religion. But we really do not see how he could have expected otherwise. Do his speculations tend to build up the word of God or to overthrow? Does he really himself believe that these Scriptures have any other inspiration than appertained to Thucydides, Homer, and Cicero? If he answers in the affirmative, what can that inspiration be worth, whose product is so confused, defective, and erroneous a book as he represents the Scriptures to be. The only theory of inspiration a true and consistent believer in Christianity *can* adopt, is that which makes God himself the real author of this book, and its words the words of God. There can be, in such a book, no mistakes, no lapses of memory, no ignorant statements. We cannot consent that the Bible should be put on the same footing with the Koran, the Institutes of Menu, or the Maxims of Confucius. It is a mad attempt to falsify the Scriptures; and we would say to Dr. Nott, almost in the memorable words of an eminent servant of God to his rash and persecuting sovereign, "Sir, the word of God is an anvil that hath broken many a hammer." His occasional expressions of respect for Christianity stand in strange contrast with the difficulties which he seems to take pleasure in accumulating around the documents of our faith. If, as we fear, he has decided to make a common cause with the skeptic, to beat his head against the eternal ramparts, and roll the stone of Sisyphus, to him be the toil, the fruitless contest, and shameful defeat.

We regret to find that these Lectures were delivered

original seat of the human race; nothing more. Schlegel thinks it much more probable that the legend of Atlantis, is a vague tradition from primeval times, of the American continents, once known, but afterwards lost from the memory of the old world.—*Phil. of Life*, p. 81.

from the chair of political economy in the University of Louisiana; that they were addressed thus to the youth of the land, far too ready to throw off the restraints of religion; and glad to find countenance in disesteeming the word of God. Sad it is, inexpressibly sad, when the fountains of learning become corrupted, and the advantage the position of an instructor gives, is used to disseminate error, and to implant its seeds in the youthful mind to spring up in an abundant but noxious harvest.

But our greatest anxiety at present is, as to the effect these denials of the Unity of the Race, in the very face of the word of God, will have upon the institution of slavery, in which the entire prosperity of the Southern States is at present bound up. In a former number of the Review* we have endeavored to redeem the Scriptures from the perversions of Abolitionists, and to show that they recognise the relations of master and slave, and extend over it their protection. This we conceived, and do still conceive, to be the true and impregnable ground on which a Christian slaveholder may defend himself against the abolitionism of the whole world. The Bible is eminently a conservative book, and stands now, as in past ages it has often done, between us and wrong, holding its *Ægis* over our persons, property, and rights. Under it, the slave-holding patriarch, the slave-holding disciple of Moses, and the slaveholding Christian lived, protected and unrebuked. Disastrous will be the day, when we fling from us the shield which God has given us. It has been objected, though not by the author of these lectures, that the Scripture argument for slavery proves too much, for as the Hebrew slaves might be of any and every nation, their own excepted, it would authorize us to enslave men of other than African nations. But the argument from inferiority of race is open to an equal objection. The Caucasian proudly says, all others are beneath him; all others, then, may be made his slaves. And if it comes to measuring of heads, and examining the texture of hair, there are white men that should be slaves, and black men that should be freemen. The objection that the argument from Scripture proves too much, which we have elsewhere met with, is but the ar-

* Vol. I. p. 63.

gument of abolition itself. So Mr. Garrison and his coadjutors plead, and so plead, with suicidal zeal, some who would be most unwilling to be classed with these hated enemies.*

It is natural for those who occupy lofty stations in society to depreciate the native endowments of those beneath them. Kings and Princes believe that nobler blood flows in theirs than in plebeian veins, and that by necessity of nature, those whose station is below them, are of an inferior clod. We do not affirm that the endowments of all men are equal; and perhaps what is true of individuals is true of whole families, and may be presumed therefore true, to an extent, of whole varieties of mankind. Yet the outward circumstances are more influential, when you look at men in the mass, than inward organization. And we should guard against depreciating those whose social position is less exalted than ours.—Aristotle, 2200 years ago, was not free from this. “The slave,” says he, “is a living instrument, just as the instrument is an inanimate slave.” “To the Greeks,” says he, “belong dominion over the Barbarians; because the former have the understanding requisite to rule; the latter, the body only to obey.” The same views prevailed

* The latest exhibition of Garrisonism we have seen is the following resolution of the Abolitionists of Berlin Ohio.

“*Resolved*, That this Convention is full of joy at the declining state of American religion: as seen in the absence of revivals, the drooping condition of all the popular churches, and the utter extinction of many of them: the small number of candidates for the Ministry at the Theological Seminaries; and the frequency with which the Ministers escape from the sectarian pulpit into less mischievous and far more honest and laudable occupations. And we cannot but hope and pray that as it is terrible searments (?) on the hearts, the hopes and happiness of millions of slaves, whose enslavement it has so long sanctified by its fellowship, its sermons and prayers, shall end, and it shall sink to a speedy and ignominious grave, that then it shall be followed by the coming of the kingdom of righteousness and peace, when man shall no more lift up the sword or the shackle against his fellow man, when a slave or a slave holder shall no more be known; and when emphatically, every man in every face shall meet a brother and a friend.”

How remarkable the coincidence between the infidel opposers of Slavery, and its infidel defenders. Truly, we may stand awe-struck at the daring impiety, and exclaim with the dying Jacob:

Simeon and Levi are brethren,
Instruments of cruelty are in their habitations;
O my soul, come not thou into their secret,
Unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united.”

among the Romans. But who were these Barbarians who were slaves to the Greeks, especially who were they that were slaves to the Romans? A large portion doubtless came from Africa, though not of the negro variety, but they came also from Asia, from Thrace, and, to the Romans, from Greece, and from the conquered countries of the west. English slaves were carried to Rome, and the Anglo-Saxons, whom Gregory saw in the slave markets of Rome, had been conveyed there by slave dealers. The very Barbarians whom the Romans placed so low, were, to a great extent, the races which now have the sway in Europe and America. Let us not be guilty of the false reasoning of Aristotle. It is not because of inferior intellect and moral nature, that our law disfranchises the African. It disfranchises also the Indian; and both, because of the providential state in which, under the government of God, they are found in their connexion with us. They are in an actual state of servitude or inferiority, and our present law does but recognize and regulate this state in which it finds them.

We may do Dr. Nott a great injustice in supposing that he has been led into his argument against the unity of the race from a desire to find a new basis for slavery. He may have been influenced by philosophical reasons alone, which he has determined at all hazards to carry through, his mind not being rightly affected meanwhile towards the Sacred Scriptures. But, in doing so, he has attacked that citadel of our faith, in whose defence we are bound to imperil our lives. It is for this reason we have felt ourselves compelled to speak in language of plainness, and perhaps of unbecoming severity, while really desirous of according to him all the respect which is due to his private and professional character.

Our conviction strongly is, that the theory which seeks to defend this maligned institution on the supposition that our servants are of another than the Adamic race, and of an inferior and brutish rather than human nature, which *values not the countenance the Scriptures really give* to domestic slavery, but seeks to destroy their authority that it may weaken their testimony to the unity of the family of man, and which holds the declarations of the sacred writers as nothing worth,—is fraught with incalculable mischief to

the institution itself. If this is the only foot on which the argument in its favour can be made to walk, we hesitate not to say it is doomed shortly to end. It is cut off from the sympathies of the human heart, cut off from a hold on the common sense of men, cut off from the confidence of every Christian, as what he must abominate, renounce, and separate himself from, if he believes the Holy word of God, and the plan of redemption. It alienates from us the temperate and worthy citizens of other portions of our land, who, in some measure, appreciate our position, and have resisted, on their own ground, the raging tempest of abolition. It makes us despised and contemned abroad as savage barbarians, in whom humanity, morality, and religion have become utterly extinguished. It is now the policy of our enemies to "divide and conquer," to set the non-slaveholding white man against his slaveholding neighbour. It will be a policy equally suicidal to alienate the Christian. If the institution can only be maintained at the sacrifice of the historic verity and full inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, the Christian who, in past ages, has joyfully met the spoiling of his goods, and death itself for his religion, will again do so, and divorce himself forever from a cause which fears not God nor regards man. Where will this institution be when all Christian men shall be forced to turn against it? We denounce such views, therefore, as dangerous to religion, morality, and law; and as subversive of our whole legislation touching this subject, beyond any, within our knowledge, ever presented to the people of the South. We utter, in conclusion, these words of warning, and hope they may not be disregarded.