

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, 1851.

ARTICLE I.

EDUCATION.

Inaugural Address, delivered in the Hall of the House of Representatives, Columbia, before the Teachers' Association of South Carolina, December 3d, 1850. By THOMAS CURTIS, D. D., President.

Gentlemen and Fellow-Teachers:

IN preparing, as you have desired me, something in the nature of an Inaugural, on assuming your Chair, I have found myself in the common difficulties of a small mind handling a large subject. By leaving me the whole field of our common pursuits, as Teachers, to explore, you have given one portion of my poor faculties an unusual chance of chasing others of them to death: or, at the best, you have placed me in the old logical position of a certain animal, which no man would wish to connect, *eo nomine*, with himself,—and the two bundles of hay. So that if I nibble right and left, with little profit to any one but myself—here at the Science and there at the Art of Education; sometimes at Education at large, and sometimes at the discipline of our schools; now at the minds we have to direct, and now at the difficulty of engaging them to mind us, or how *we* shall direct them—you, gentlemen, must share with me, at least, the responsibility of an ill-spent hour! I shall only demonstrate to you that of which I am well convinced,—how much abler a President you may at any time find among yourselves.

VOL. IV.—No. 3.

on the various forms of speech he uses in his delineation. Our readers can do that for themselves. Suffice it to say he has used the whole diapason of the heart, in his solemn dirge "of wrath and woe and punishment."

One would think that a mind so full of all that is terrible in this faculty would have no room for any other than a serious view of it. This mistake, however, will be corrected by a reference to the serio-comic dialogue of the two murderers, in Act 1, Scene 4, of *Richard III.* And true to his custom of giving every view of a theme—Shakspeare furnishes us the broad farce of the subject in *Launcelot Gobbo's dilemma* in the merchant of Venice, Act 2, Sc. 2.

ARTICLE IV.

THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

1. *The Unity of the Human Races.* By the Rev. THOMAS SMYTH, DD.; pp. 404, 12mo. New York, GEORGE P. PUTNAM, 1850.
2. *The doctrine of the Unity of the Human Race, Examined on the Principles of Science.* By JOHN BACHMAN, DD., Charleston, S. C., 1850.
3. *The Charleston Medical Journal*, March, 1850, Art. 7; May, Art. 10; July, Art. 9; September, Art. 6; *Letters between JOHN BACHMAN, DD. and SAMUEL GEORGE MORTON, M. D., on the hybridity of animals.*
4. *The Races of Eden, and their Geographical distribution.* By CHARLES PICKERING, M. D.
5. *The Races of Men: A Fragment*, by ROBERT KNOX, M. D.
6. *The Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany.* March, 1850, and July, 1850; on *the Geographical Distribution of Animals and The Diversity of Origin of the Human Races.* By Prof. LOUIS AGASSIZ.
7. *The New Englander.* Nov. 1850, Art. 5. New Haven, Connecticut.

8. *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, Oct., 1850, Art. 6. *Philadelphia.*

We would be very much pleased to see, by some competent hand, a complete history of the controversies which have been had between science and religion. As friends of the Bible, we would have no fears for the results of a full and candid narrative of its conflicts with those who, in every age, have assailed it with the weapons of human philosophies. In such a history we would, of course, expect to find that its advocates had sometimes been guilty of grievous errors, and even egregious follies; but much oftener would it be seen that its enemies had covered themselves with shame; while in every case the final glory would evidently rest upon the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. One consequence of such a narrative would probably be to prevent hereafter the frequent resurrection of Galileo's ghost to frighten away profane and meddling theologians from the purlieus of laboratories and lecture rooms. This, it is true, would deprive some sciolists, and even some *savans*, of a convenient resource when fact and argument fail them; but we cannot say we would be sorry for this. The poor priests who persecuted that famous astronomer, doubtless made a great blunder; but we think they have sufficiently atoned for it in the derision and rebukes which the scientific world has been careful, with untiring diligence, for two centuries, to inflict upon them. It is rather too much to hold the theologians of every church, of every age, of every country, through all coming time, responsible for the folly of ignorant Roman priests, in an ignorant age. To conjure up the shade of the dead philosopher establishes no fact of science, substantiates no crude induction, answers no opposing argument. To remind us of the bigotry of popish monks in the early dawn of science is no reply to the reasoning of enlightened men, taught from the cradle to think for themselves, and to love all truth as they love its glorious Author, God himself. It would amount to just as much to refer to the opposition of a "medicine man" among the savages to the propagation of knowledge among the victims of his jugglery.—And yet, no minister of religion, any where, can venture to subject the hasty hypotheses of scientific inquirers to the

tests of a rigid examination, but the name of Galileo will be invoked to shame or alarm him into silence. From the grave professor in his lecture room, to the village sciolist scribbling for a country newspaper, it will be used to rebuke his presumption, or to foil the power of his argument. Distinguished men, like Prof. Agassiz, will recall it, and it will be spouted in his face by the green graduates of the Academy.

If there is any force in an appeal to the ignorance and bigotry of past ages, a complete history of the conflicts between religion and pretended science would turn it with overwhelming power against the latter; and the Italian priests who proclaimed it heresy to affirm the revolution of the earth, would be forgotten amid the crowd of more stupid, more fanatical, more enormous bigots in the ranks of infidelity. Galileo would be left to rest in peace, and theologians be permitted freely to investigate the claims of scientific inductions on the world's belief.

We have not been surprised at all by the clamor and complaint which have been raised in various quarters, against the participation of theologians in the recent discussion of the origin and unity of the human races. They are used to such things, however; and they know how to treat them, as christians and as scholars. Insinuations are made against their competency to discuss the question, and it is plainly hinted that any thing they may have to say is not worth the trouble of hearing. As to their ability to investigate this subject, they are willing to let the world judge; but they are not to be hushed into silence by a sneer, and the vain assumption of superiority. It is their privilege, if they choose, to discuss any and all subjects, and their own risk, if they do so unworthily. The logic and learning they may display in the discussion, if deficient, is a fair subject for exposure by their opponents; but they cannot be swept from the field of debate by a proud look of contempt. And their antagonists may find to their cost, that they are too well practised in dialectics, to venture upon the contest without knowing the metal of their weapons, and having well measured the resources of their opponents.

The advocates of a diversity of origin of the human race complain also, that "the insulting epithet of infidel," is ap-

plied to them "by certain divines." It is much when that epithet is regarded by the world as insulting. It argues a prevailing reverence for the precious Bible, which is truly gratifying, and a promising advance on the times when men gloried in that name. But we question very much whether some who repel it, know exactly what constitutes an infidel. We do not doubt Prof. Agassiz, or any other, believes in the religion of the Bible, *as he understands it*. Let him extract a system from the Bible for himself, and call that Christianity, and doubtless he is not an infidel. In the same way Thomas Paine was a good believer, a sincere christian. Now the "divines" claim to know what is the religion of the Bible, what are infidel views, and what constitutes an infidel, and they will not hesitate to declare the fact, if any man betrays his ignorance in these respects. If the prince of science adopts theories which impugn the essential tenets of the Bible, it will not do for him to say he understands it better than the "divines," or to be offended if they tell him his views are infidel. They may use his own language and tell him, if the Gospel contradicts his theories they cannot help it. It is not their business to reconcile them; they must not be required to modify the truth of God to make it square with his hypothesis, and to avoid convicting him of infidelity. It is too late to say that amid the conflicting doctrines of theologians on the subject, there is no received system which constitutes Christianity, the rejection of which is infidelity. There is such a system, admitted and well defined, which has been received in all ages by those who have embraced the Gospel, experienced its power, enjoyed its hopes, lived by its precepts, and exhibited its fruits. And if any man not knowing what that system is, adopts views incompatible with it, we cannot help it, he is an infidel.

It is also charged against the theologians that they are opposed to free inquiry, and unwilling to have the question fully and fairly investigated, lest their craft should be in danger. It is pretty plainly hinted, that having a secret suspicion the result would be against them, they are afraid to have the matter sifted to the bottom; and hence endeavor, by the charge of infidelity, to put down a free discussion. This accusation is usually vented with a bitterness which betrays its source. It is doubtless a very

unpleasant thing to many, that the citadel of truth is guarded by watchful protectors who stand prepared to defend it against any and every aggressor. Men who cordially hate the true system of Christianity, cordially hate all who repel their assaults upon it; and when argument cannot be met by argument, it is convenient, and not altogether unnatural, to meet it by some such murmur about free discussion. And there is nothing surprising in the fact that when the shallow and sophistical theories of vain and self-confident men are examined and exposed, they should be vexed into senseless complaints, and be tempted to opprobrious accusations. It is very annoying, after having spent time and labor in building up a favorite hypothesis, and with happy self-congratulation published it to the world, for stern and unsparing truth to pronounce and prove it vain and worthless. It would be extremely pleasant to range at will through the wilds of speculation, unchecked and unchastised, and to construct here, and there, and every where, fantastic and flimsy imaginations, and name them "truth." But if this is what is meant by "free inquiry," the "divines" avow themselves opposed to it.—Wherever they meet such free discussion they will put it down by whatever weapons of learning, and logic, and invincible, immortal truth, they may be able to command. If other men are free to publish and defend errors and false doctrines, they claim freedom to combat them by the legitimate instruments of better knowledge, and stronger arguments; and if they use the sword of the Spirit, the eternal word of God, let their opponents turn its edge if they can, but let them not weakly cry out "persecution." Every man who loves truth and loves his kind, if he finds a dangerous error running loose about the world will strangle it if he can, as he would a mad-dog, no matter whose name is written on its collar. We subscribe to the sentiment of Coleridge: "as far as opinions and not motives are concerned, principles and not men, I am neither tolerant, nor wish to be regarded as such. As much as I love my fellowmen, so much and no more, will I be intolerant of their heresies and unbelief. And I will honor and hold out the hand of fellowship to every individual who is equally intolerant of what he conceives as such in me."

It is an unjust and unfounded insinuation, to intimate

that our Protestant theologians are opposed to or afraid of free, and full, and fair inquiry on any or all subjects.—They wish it, they invite it, they demand it, they will assist in it. This is just what they are doing on this subject. The right and duty of free inquiry is one of the distinctive principles of Protestantism. We vindicate a religion of conviction against a religion of authority; and it is to the everlasting honor of theologians that they were the first to break the shackles from the human mind, and make good its right to think, to examine, to believe for itself, as God alone may give it light. They themselves unbound the spirit of philosophy, and bade it walk the earth free as the angels of heaven. But while they cheerfully accord free discussion to the opponents of revelation, they claim it for its friends. They will never surrender the privilege of subjecting the theories of science to the severest scrutiny of truth, and they will fearlessly announce the fact if that scrutiny discover them to be fallacious and unfounded.—They are not afraid of inquiry. There is nothing in their own convictions to make them shrink from it. There is nothing in the experience of the past to cause them to fear it. If the philosophers can prove the Bible false, let them do it. None will accept the demonstration more promptly than theologians themselves. They will welcome *truth*, come whence, or where, or how it may—only this every true man will insist upon, that not heated sciolists and heady empirics, no, nor gray haired masters in science, nor sage and honored Professors, shall impose on us their crude and hasty deductions, or their old dogmata, because they are clear affirmations of *their* wisdom. We will question their teachings until they are *proved*. We will take the web of their philosophy to pieces, and try every thread of it, and if we find it rotten we will break it; or if we detect the filling in of human folly, we will take it out; or if we find knots tied by the cunning hand of man, we will loose them, and tell the world of it.

If there is any truth which Science itself teaches us, it is that we should distrust the conclusions of its students, and beware how we rashly accept their hasty, confident and dogmatic assertions. Its history is full of exploded theories and interminable mistakes. In fact the great labor

of each generation of philosophers, is to overthrow the doctrines of the one before it. Some new fact is now and then discovered which upsets the received theory, and requires another to be constructed, to be in its turn, in like manner, demolished. (The origin of geological science has been traced to the discovery at Verona, of a large number of shells embedded in the earth. They attracted the notice of the learned men of the times, and gave rise to discussions of such warmth and interest that the subject has never been laid aside, and has grown up to the modern Geology. But what puerile conceits were defended by the philosophers of that day, respecting those shells! Some maintained they were the result of certain fatty matter, set in fermentation by the natural heat of the earth. Others insisted they were nothing but stones which had received a peculiar form from the stars. The celebrated anatomist, Fallopio, taught that they were produced by "the tumultuary movements of the Earth;" that the elephant tusks were only earthly concretions, and the vases and other pottery of the Monte Testaceo were "sports of nature to mock the works of man." A Professor of Anatomy, at Basil, pronounced the bones of an elephant to have been those of a giant, nineteen feet high; and in England similar bones were regarded as those of the fallen angels. These examples teach us, not that the wise men of the past were fools,—they were not,—he who thinks them so, convicts himself of the charge,—but the uncertainty of scientific theories, the inherent fallibility of the human mind, and the necessity of caution how we assert or accept the hypotheses of philosophers. We laugh at the past; The future may laugh at us. And many conclusions of science now affirmed with heat and violence, may, in after times, be discarded as the assertions of ignorance and folly. In every generation, the world has to throw aside as false and worthless, what a former age taught and believed as true and good. Even within the compass of every few years, some grand discovery is announced to the world, and a brilliant theory built upon it, which, before the world has well heard of it, some rival philosopher proves a fancy and a falsehood. A few years ago a naturalist announced the discovery of a fossil serpent, near a hundred feet long. The crumbling bones were carefully collected and arranged, and

there lay, evidently, the monster skeleton snake, head, vertebræ, tail, complete. Another naturalist stepped into the exhibition room, scrutinized the nicely fitted fossils, (as the divines do the theories of the philosophers,) declared it was no snake at all, and proved it.—Not long since, a human bone was found, under peculiar circumstances, near the Mississippi river. It was paraded as proof that men have existed on the Earth for tens of thousands of years. That old bone became far more famous than its original owner ever was. It was known and talked about by all the *savants* of Europe and America. After awhile an English Geologist came over, hunted it up, went to the place of discovery, examined carefully the facts, and pronounced it the bone of an Indian, who died not more than a few hundred years ago. But this same Englishman cannot return without giving, himself, an illustration of the ridiculous premises from which many of his profession derive the most important conclusions. Having ascertained the quantity of earthy matter in a gallon of water from the Mississippi river, and estimated the amount of water discharged in a given time by that stream, he constructed, on these data, an immense theory as to the time required to form the delta at its mouth, how long the great river had been flowing there, and the age of this continent. It requires no scientific study to see the fallacy of such reasoning. We know that no ingenuity can make a pyramid stand upon its apex.

Take another example of the way in which the wise men delude themselves, and try to delude others, from another department of learned research : We extract it from the proceedings of the New York Historical Society.

“The celebrated *Ruin*, at Newport, R. I., has been the subject of much speculation at home and abroad ; and the traveller, on his first visit to that delightful watering place, looks down upon it with no little interest from the windows of the Atlantic Hotel, as it stands alone in the midst of the enclosed park or paddock, in front of that edifice. Among the common people it is spoken of familiarly as the “old wind-mill,” and certainly to the outward view it has, in every respect, the appearance of a stone wind-mill. It is built of the stone found on the spot, of a circular form, and of the same altitude with the (wooden) wind-mills still frequent in and around Newport. The Island, as is well known, has no streams affording water power. The only point in the structure which

could give rise to a question, is the fact that it rests upon eight rude pillars or abutments, connected by arches.

"It is, perhaps, this circumstance that has given rise to so much learned speculation among the scholars of Denmark, who have had faith to see in this structure the remains of a settlement or post of the Northmen, who (as they suppose) must have visited the spot long before the discovery of America by Columbus.

"The architecture of the Scandinavian regions has been investigated in search of parallel structures, but without much success. It certainly strikes one as singular that, if it belonged to the Northmen, there should be no other traces of them on all our coasts.—And further, if the structure were a fortified dwelling, it is too small to accommodate more than a very few persons, and yet too massive for so few persons to build; and if (as some say) it was for religious purposes, this is contradicted by the fireplace and other conveniences of a partial dwelling.—But to apply here the similar remarks of the poet Gray, a single line of historic record is worth a whole cart-load of speculation. Such a record exists. In the will of Governor Benedict Arnold, which was executed in 1676, in speaking of his burial, he directs that his body shall be buried in a certain plat of ground, "on the line or path leading from my house to my stone-built wind-mill." From this it follows, that the structure was then a wind-mill belonging to the Governor; and was distinguished from surrounding wind-mills, by being built of stone. No other one of stone now exists, or is known to have existed."

This interesting statement makes havoc of the pleasant speculations of the Denmark scholars. But it does not reach to them alone. It begets suspicion of the truth of many other theories, and shows us how other important conclusions may owe all their force to our ignorance of some very simple fact. It proves not only the value of historic records, but teaches that the traditions of the common people are entitled to more respect than the learned are accustomed to show them.

But our scientific men not only eat up one another, but often devour themselves. As an instance, we will only refer to the recent case of Mr. Gliddon and his *mummy*. It would be cruel to press it. We cannot forbear, however, from quoting the following extract from the November No. of the *Southern Quarterly Review*, written by a friend and admirer of Mr. Gliddon. The writer is reviewing an Article which appeared in this Review on the Scripture Chro-

nology, and after quoting from it a paragraph in which reference is made to the works of Champollion, Figeac, Rossellini, Leemans and Mr. Gliddon, goes on to say :

“ This paragraph would certainly create an innocent smile, in the year 1850, should it meet the eye of any one of the authorities alluded to. The reader is doubtless aware, that it is only about twenty-five years since Champollion and his school had made sufficient advance in Egyptian hieroglyphics to *commence* decyphering the monuments in which chronology had been so long locked up ; that every year has been adding important facts to our knowledge ; and that it is only *five* years since the celebrated Prussian Commission, with Lepsius at its head, returned from Egypt, with some three thousand new inscriptions. Is it not extraordinary that the reviewer, in the face of such notorious facts, has had the boldness to go back to *old books and old editions*, published *ten or fifteen years ago*, which are now *entirely superseded* ? ”

We wish the Article from which this extract is taken, had a name to it which would give it force. But we doubt not the most distinguished “ Egyptologists ” would subscribe to it. If these authors themselves repudiate the positions they took a few years ago, and would indulge an innocent smile at the simplicity of the man who should dare to refer to them, no one else will probably sustain them. And we would ask, “ is it not extraordinary ” that we should be required to place any confidence in the results of scientific enquiry, when in the course of “ ten or fifteen years,” they become old, entirely superseded, and rejected by their own authors ? Grand discoveries and most important conclusions founded on them, are announced to the world, affecting long established opinions, and before we are well advised what they are, we are told they are worthless, and called on to receive new facts and another theory. Our answer is, we will wait ten or fifteen years longer. If we accept what you offer us to-day, to-morrow you may put on an innocent smile at our weakness, and we prefer not to be laughed at. While your opinions are afflicted with a St. Vitus’s dance we beg to be excused from following their motions.

If this is the way things go, the friends of revelation might rest from their labors to defend the Bible against the attacks of pretended learning and science. Its impugnors would do the work for them. We would be justified in

quietly waiting until the scholars and philosophers had completed their investigations, were it not for the mischief their errors might effect in the meantime, and for the danger lest they might stick fast and finally in some pernicious mistake, did not the meddlesome "divines" drive them out of it.

It should not be forgotten that no *fact* in any department of human knowledge has yet been discovered even in appearance contradictory of the statements of the Bible. It is the *reasoning* of men on facts which conflicts with it—the theories and hypotheses which they adopt to explain the facts. So far as *descriptive* science is concerned, it has presented nothing at variance with the holy scriptures. It is *speculative* science which has ventured on this daring enterprise. For instance, there is nothing in the mere facts of the various strata and fossils of the earth described in Geology, which contradicts the inspired statements of the Bible. It is the inferences and deductions of men from these facts, as to the age of the world, which seemed to contradict them. Again, there is nothing in the actual diversity of the human races contrary to the assertions of the scriptures. It notices and affirms this diversity. But when men *infer* from this diversity a separate origin for the different races, and adopt this as their *theory* to account for it, then they, and not the facts,—their inference—their theory, come in collision with the sacred record.—We would be the last to say aught against the value of the inductive philosophy, but we must insist on having its rules and principles most rigidly adhered to. It is the great instrument of thought and of progress in knowledge. But it is not to be denied that it often betrays its followers into hasty and erroneous conclusions. We can never be confident and certain of its results until we are certain our induction is derived from a full view of *all* the facts connected with the subject. If there is one fact unknown or overlooked, our reasoning, though apparently just, may be in truth, grossly false and erroneous. It has been well said, by, we believe, a distinguished man of this State, that ninety-nine facts may make a lie, and we may need the hundredth to arrive at the truth. Now when all the facts bearing on Geology, Ethnography, and "Egyptology," and their related sciences, are collected and digested, it is possible we may ar-

rive at some sure and stable conclusions. And even then, there may have been facts obliterated by the hand of time, or of man, which if known would entirely change our inductions. But while every year is bringing to light new facts of the most important character, and all these sciences are yet in the embryonic state, and the theories of the most learned investigators become old and exploded in ten or fifteen years, we shall hold our faith in suspense. We will accept all well authenticated facts most implicitly: all inferences and reasonings from them, we will endeavor to treat as they deserve.

There is a most important distinction to be made among the various departments of scientific research, which is too often forgotten. In some of the sciences it is practicable to subject a theory to the test of experiment, and to verify it or refute it by actual experience. Thus it is in Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and Mathematics. If any rash speculator hazards a wild hypothesis in these subjects, his folly can be immediately exposed. Or if a probable theory cannot, from the state of the science, be at once tested, it is held only as an hypothesis which is not believed, but used only as a guide to further investigation. Hence these branches of learning have made the most wonderful and certain progress. But it is not so in Geology, Pæleontology, Ethnology, and "Egyptology," but to a very limited extent. In these the most venturesome speculation may be indulged, and there is no means of testing its value by any actual experiment. The wildest fancy may expatiate at large, with no fear of ignominious exposure. A few observations are made, over a limited field, a few facts ascertained, and straightway the mind, "fancy free," penetrates the profound mysteries of nature, and imagination, having "ample room and verge enough," creates causes by which every effect is explained. Many inquirers, ignorant of the first principles of logic, knowing nothing of the laws which govern the processes of truth and safe investigation, and having none of the requisites for an observer, boldly draw deductions which are untenable, and think they have explained a phenomenon, given to the world a truth—when they have merely vented an unsubstantial speculation. It is of this evil Bacon speaks, in his "Advancement of learning;" the root of this evil, as of all oth-

ers, is this—that men, in their contemplations of nature, are accustomed to make too timely a departure and too remote a recess from experience and particulars, and have yielded and resigned themselves over to the fumes of their own fancies and popular argumentations.”

No man the sun shines upon, “yield and resign themselves over to the fumes of their own fancies,” with more alacrity and resolution than those who reject the statements of the Bible on account of pretended demonstrations of reason and science. Men, in whom the mere mention of that holy book “creates an innocent smile,” believed in the nonsense of mesmerism, swallowed the famous moon hoax, revered phrenology, and applauded the “vestiges of creation.” They often remind us of the remark of Charles II. on the learned skeptic, Vossius. The celebrated freethinker was repeating some incredible stories of the Chinese, when the king, turning to those about him, said—“this learned man is a very strange person—he believes every thing but the Bible.” This marvellous facility of faith, which infidels exhibit about every thing except the word of God, is aptly illustrated in the following remarks, by an anonymous writer. Some skeptical writer had used the following language respecting the various explanations of the notorious Rochester “knockings:”

“‘Toe joints’ and inanimate ‘water falls’ may sufficiently account for this intelligence to satisfy that class of minds who will greedily swallow monstrous fish stories, and tales involving the suspension of nature’s unchangeable laws, said to have occurred some two thousand years ago; but stronger minds require stronger mental food. I want a better explanation.”

“Now here is a man whose mind is, in his own conceit, so ‘strong’ that he cannot believe the miracles of Jesus Christ; and yet he seems to have no difficulty in believing in the Rochester knockings: who cannot admit the explanations which resolve these knockings into the ordinary operation of ‘nature’s unchangeable laws,’ or into sheer imposture, and yet has no difficulty in explaining in these ways the miracles of Christ. This is but one of the numberless instances of the credulity of unbelievers. Their minds are too ‘strong’ to believe a miracle possible on the banks of the Jordan; but any nine days’ wonder may pass for a miracle on the banks of the Genesee. They are quite too philosophical to admit the inspiration of Isaiah and Paul; but they gulp down with all greediness the revelations of Davis.”

“Lord Herbert presents a striking example of this usual credulity of unbelievers. After he had written his famous work against revelation, he was doubtful as to the propriety of publishing it. ‘I took,’ says he, ‘my book in my hand, and kneeling devoutly on my knees, said these words: ‘O, thou eternal God, author of the light which now shines upon me, and giver of all inward illuminations, I do beseech thee, of thy infinite goodness, to pardon a greater request than a sinner ought to make. I am not satisfied enough whether I shall publish this book. If it be for thy glory, I beseech thee to give me some sign from heaven; if not, I shall suppress it.’ I had no sooner spoken these words, but a loud, though yet gentle noise came from the heavens, (for it was like nothing on earth,) which did so comfort and cheer me, that I took my petition as granted, and that I had the sign demanded.” Here is a man publishing a book denying miracles, and yet in his inmost heart unquestionably believing that he had, for its publication, the sanction of a miracle; publishing a book against revelation, the main argument of which is founded on the alleged improbability of God’s revealing himself to some of his creatures, and not to all, and yet believing that God had made a special revelation to himself; denying all miracles, and yet believing that in the year of our Lord 1624, and the year of the world 5628, God did for the first time reveal himself by miracle to Edward, Lord Herbert; and the grand crisis in the world’s affairs which demanded this unprecedented intervention of God’s miraculous power, was the publication of his treatise on “*Truth*, as distinguished from *Divine Revelation*.”

The spirit and tactics of skeptical science have received many rich illustrations in the discussions which have been held on the subject of the publications mentioned at the head of this article. But we do not wish to convey the impression that the controversy respecting the origin of the human races is between infidels and believers alone. On the Christian side of the argument is the vast majority of naturalists and scientific men of all countries and classes. It is only a few persons at the present time who openly maintain the diversity of the origin of men. None of them are of any high reputation in the world of science except Professor Agassiz; and his distinction has been acquired chiefly in the lower departments of animal life, and most of all, we believe, in investigations of fossil fishes. We think it will be admitted on all hands that, so far, the friends of the Bible doctrine have nothing to regret in this

discussion. This is plainly confirmed by the fact that their opponents have shifted their attack so often from one position to another, and are now evidently on the last ground they can find to stand upon. The question is simply whether all the varieties of men have descended from one original pair, or from several—whether God created in the beginning only one man and one woman, or more. The holy Scriptures unequivocally teach that all the diversified varieties of the human family have descended from one pair, created by the power of the Almighty. Against this truth was first opposed the so-called theory of developement, first brought into notice, we believe, by Oken and Geoffroy, on the continent of Europe, and afterwards made conspicuous in England and the United States, by a work with the title “*Vestiges of Creation.*” This monstrous speculation supposed the material elements of the world existed from eternity, or were created by God, endued with certain inherent laws and forces. In the natural operation of these laws and forces, they produced vegetable life, plants and trees. From vegetable life was developed animal life in its lowest and most imperfect forms. From these last, in the course of natural progress, fishes were produced; fishes produced birds; birds produced quadrupeds; and quadrupeds produced *men!* This stupendous absurdity, this colossal folly, was defended with a wonderful array of facts and science and argument, and was of course heartily welcomed by skeptical sciolists. It was scarcely put to silence by the power of the truth, when the opponents of the Bible doctrine assumed the ground that the different races of men are separate and distinct species. And in order to prove this position, they maintained that the offspring of the white and black races are *hybrids*. To sustain this, “they first endeavored to show that mulattoes are sterile; then that they are prolific only with one or the other of the original species; and finally, that the hybrid race soon died out.” (Dr. Bachman.) Driven by the stress of facts from each of these positions in succession, they next attempted to prove that hybrids between other species of animals are prolific, and can perpetuate their kind. Dr. Morton, who had attained distinction in other branches of scientific inquiry, maintained this ground with zeal and industry, if not with ability. But

Dr. Bachman has met his arguments with an examination so particular, patient, and powerful, that they are no longer tenable. It would be infatuation to maintain any longer that the offspring of distinct species are prolific, and therefore that the white and black races of men are of different species. Hence the position is now taken that all the different varieties of men are *one* species, but having different origins and descending from various primeval pairs. Plainly, the argument is on its last legs. We hope soon to announce its final and utter prostration. The development theory may be considered as abandoned by all, except mere dreamers in science. The doctrine of distinct species among mankind is in like manner surrendered, except by those whose little notoriety has been acquired by maintaining it. Under this theory the sterility of the offspring of the different races was first maintained: that has been easily disproved. Then it was affirmed that such progeny is fertile only with one or other of the original races: that has been plainly refuted. Then it was asserted that the hybrid race, left to propagate among themselves, soon became extinct: that also has been shown to be a mistake. Then, the case being desperate, precisely opposite ground was taken, and it was contended that hybrids between different species of other animals are permanently prolific, and so may be between the asserted human species: this has been likewise utterly and most triumphantly confuted. And so the whole doctrine of specific differences in the races of men has gone by the board.

It should be kept in mind that the doctrine of the specific and original unity of the human races stands in this controversy in a strictly defensive position, and that therefore the *onus probandi* rests upon its opponents. It has occupied the position of an admitted and established truth, received by the almost unanimous consent of the religious and scientific world. It lies, therefore, with those who attack it, to show good cause why it should be rejected. All that can be required of its advocates, by the admitted laws of reasoning, is to show that the arguments offered for its rejection are not sufficient. He who calls on the world to discard a long established opinion, must make out the evidence of its error. The burden of proof rests on him, and he will be held to the duty of producing the most

satisfactory and irrefragable evidence. The world, whose opinions he attacks, are, on the other hand, bound only to show that the proofs he offers are not sufficient to require them to renounce their old belief. So the matter stands in this discussion. The admitted opinion is, that all the races of men are of one species and origin. If any deny this, they must produce such evidence of its untruth as shall necessarily constrain our submission. Now what is the evidence offered? The sum and substance of it is simply the great diversity which exists between the different races of men. This, it is argued, proves that these races *cannot possibly* have proceeded from the same primeval parentage. The argument must affirm an impossibility in the case. For if it is confessed that, notwithstanding these diversities, it is yet possible that they may have sprung up in the offspring of the same parents, the argument fails: there is no necessary reason why the world should abandon its old opinion. That impossibility, we may affirm with all confidence, has not been made out, and with equal assurance we say it cannot be, from any known laws of physiology. When it is attempted to be proved, by the general principle that "like begets like," the answer is, that is true as to *specific* resemblances; but within the limits of the species, if we may so speak, like begets endless varieties. Unless, therefore, these diversities prove the different races of men to be distinct species, which they do not, the impossibility of their appearing in the offspring of one original pair, fails to be established. On the other hand, if it is conceded that all the diversified races of mankind are of one species, as we hold it no assumption now to affirm has been demonstrated, then we maintain that the possibility of such physical varieties as exist having been developed in the descendants of the same primeval parents, necessarily follows. To admit the unity of species is to admit that there may have been a unity of origin. And if all the races of men *may* have sprung from one origin, the world is not required to discard its belief that they *did*, unless positive and direct testimony can be adduced that they did not. Is there any testimony to this effect? It is affirmed there is, and Prof. Agassiz undertakes to present it. He does not find it in history, or in monumental structures, or even in vague traditions. It

consists solely in an asserted analogy found in the distribution of the lower animal creation, and the present diffusion of the races of men. He says that if we take a view of the general surface of the earth, we will find it divided into certain circumscribed localities, each inhabited by a peculiar group of the lower animals, and by its peculiar race of men. Now the argument runs, that each group of animals must have been originally created within the locality where we find it; and therefore the presumption is, by analogy, that each race of men was, in like manner, originally created on the locality where it exists. This, if we understand it, is the sum and substance of his reasoning. It will be at once perceived that the analogy fails utterly, unless he can point to examples in which animals *of the same species* are found existing in separate localities, so disconnected that we cannot probably account for their transportation from one to the other, and are therefore obliged to suppose separate creations. For if it be admitted that all the races of men are of one species, the analogy will not hold, unless it can be established that animals of one and the same species must have been originally created in distinct and different local ranges. The Professor accordingly makes a feeble attempt to prove this, in which he has been most triumphantly answered. He has not pointed out one instance of the same species of animals existing in two distinct localities, in which it is not perfectly easy, by well-known and undeniable facts, to account for their transportation from one to the other. But as it is not our design to enter into the details of this discussion, we must refer our readers for the facts which illustrate this and other points, to the publications named at the head of our article. The general analogy, asserted by Professor A., breaks down most hopelessly in several other respects. Naturalists have found great difficulty in classifying the various races of men under any well marked divisions; and in defining with any accuracy the local limits of such races as are determined. There is no agreement among them as to the number of the distinct races, their specifications running from three up to eleven, and even more. It is, moreover, an unquestionable fact, that different races are found intermingled within the same zoological province. Tribes of men entirely distinct, again, occupy separate por-

tions of a locality which contains the same group of animals throughout. And the same race is found extended over several distinct zoological territories. A remarkable instance of this is seen in North and South America. Between the Arctic zone and Cape Horn, Professor A. himself enumerates four separate botanical and zoological provinces, each containing its peculiar species of plants and animals. And yet, over this whole extensive region, and through all these distinct provinces, one and the same race of men were found to exist. The American Indian is acknowledged to be the same from the Arctic circle to the southern extremity of the continent. The destructive bearing of this fact on his analogy, the Professor passes over with perfect silence. Did he really forget it, or was it convenient to ignore it? Another important fact is, that tribes of people are found in widely separated and unconnected, and unlike localities, having vast territories and other nations intervening between them, who are proved, by their form, feature, language, customs and traditions, to be of the same race. This is utterly at variance with the analogy, and would confound it, if it were not in confusion before. The truth is, that no race of men are indigenous in the localities where they now exist. The records of the historical races prove them immigrants into the regions they now occupy; and the traditions of all who are not too debased to have preserved memory of their origin, establish the same truth. The migratory character of man is entirely overlooked in Professor Agassiz's analogy; but being remembered, renders it null and void. However it may have been at first, the attempt to locate the human races as original and indigenous in the regions where they now exist, can appear only as the desperate effort of an advocate driven to extremity, or as the ill-considered speculation of a philosopher who has ventured beyond his sphere.

Prof. Agassiz, while controverting the identity of the origin of all men, strenuously maintains something which he calls the "essential unity of mankind." We have given particular attention to that part of his essay in which he discusses this unity: but can make nothing of it more than a similarity of nature, physical, intellectual, and moral. Indeed, he enumerates the two elements of it as consisting in, first, a similar physical constitution, and secondly, simi-

lar moral and mental endowments. He illustrates it by the general resemblances which exist among the different species of the beasts of prey, both in their physical constitution and in their natural dispositions, which clearly "show that they constitute a natural unity in creation, and distinguish them from any other division of the animal kingdom:—and again, by the similarities between the different species of the genus cat, of the deer, and in the vegetable world, of the pines, oaks, and birches. There is a certain unity subsisting between all the various kinds under these classes, binding them all together; and yet no one affirms that the panther and the tiger sprung from the same original. Hence it is argued that a community of origin for men may be denied, and their unity affirmed.—Now we submit that unity implies something more than resemblance, and that the marks which guide the naturalist in grouping together classes and genera of animals, do not contain the principles of that sublime thought—the oneness of mankind. The unity of a family, or of a nation, does not consist in any similarities between its individual members. Another element must be added before that idea is created. If unity is founded on resemblances, by widening or narrowing their extent, we may embrace in it any class of beings. We may have a unity between man and the beasts, of precisely the same sort, and we should like to know how far the similarity must extend to create the unity—*united* does not mean having a resemblance. Prof. A. illustrates his idea by the case of "individuals whose studies, whose calling in life, have developed in them the same faculties, the same feelings," between whom "relations spring up" which by far outweigh the natural bonds of a common parentage. If that be true, yet what are those relations? They may be of sympathy, affection, friendship, but not of *unity*. They are so many similar things brought together, and fitting closely and clingingly to one another, but they are not *one thing*. He lays great stress on the higher and far more important unity of a similar intellectual and moral nature. On this ground there would be a more perfect unity between a great good man and an angel, than between the same man and the most stupid and debased of his fellow men. But is it so? Does any man feel it to be so, unless he has first

adopted the opinion that his fellow man is of a different original race? However it may be with a few individuals, in whom natural sympathies have been smothered by education and habits, the truth is the instincts of nature demand a physical connection in order to the recognition of unity. The nearer that connection, the more strongly is the bond of unity felt. As it becomes more remote, the feeling is weakened. If it is entirely destroyed, the recognition of unity will perish. Let it become the sentiment of the masses, in whom natural instincts are strong and active, that all men are not of one blood, and men of another race will be to them men no longer—not of their kind, not one of them, not one with them.

It is often and over affirmed that the Bible was not intended to teach natural science, and this is thought sufficient reason that its statements should not be brought into scientific discussions. It must be entirely ignored until the question in debate is settled. Now it is true, that to teach natural science, is no part of its design, but is equally true, that in connection with its design, it affirms facts intimately connected with science. For example, it declares the world to have been created out of nothing by the power of God, and that it will be finally destroyed. And if scientific men should attempt to prove that the world has always existed, and will exist forever, it would not do to say the Bible has nothing to do with it. It cannot be denied that the Scriptures were intended to teach *the science of man's moral relations*. And it is equally true that they teach that his moral relations are intimately connected with his physical relations. One of the grandest and most difficult questions of religion, as to the introduction and universal prevalence of moral evil among men, they solve by the doctrine of their descent from one original pair.—The method of a sinner's salvation is intimately connected with the same truth, by the relations of the Saviour the Gospel proclaims to the same race who sprang from those primeval parents. It is not a mere isolated text here and there which affirms the one origin of the human races.—This doctrine underlies the entire system of religion taught in the Bible. It is assumed and taken for granted, through the whole of it. It enters into the very body of the scheme of truth it teaches; and to take it out, is to rend to pieces

the entire structure. It involves the introduction of sin and evil, the origin of depravity and death among men, the plan of redemption by Christ, the diffusion of christianity through the world, the dearest earthly blessings and the eternal hopes of the greater part of mankind, and the brotherhood, the sympathies, the reciprocal rights, duties and relations of humanity. It is therefore a contest for life with christianity. She must make good her ground here, or surrender at discretion. She has lost nothing yet, and, if we may judge from the past and present progress of this discussion, she may even now take up her song of triumph and celebrate her victory.

We have not attempted to enter into the merits of the question under discussion. We suppose those who feel a particular interest in it, will not fail to seek a fuller acquaintance with it than could be given in this article.—Our design is to call attention to the more recent publications on the subject, and to record the present progress of the discussion.

The work of Dr. Smyth has been received with high encomiums, both in this country and in Europe, where it is about to be republished. It cannot fail to enhance his well earned reputation for extensive research and varied reading. The reader will find in it a mass of novel and striking facts of the most interesting character, gathered out of the stores of a rich library, and from all departments of learning, and presented, not in the dry and heavy style usual in learned disquisitions, but in a clear, lively, and entertaining manner. We could have wished some alterations in the arrangements of the materials, and occasionally more compactness in the argumentation; but it furnishes the most ample means for the reader to construct an argument for himself, and directs him to the best sources for further investigations. Our pleasure in reading the volume has been diminished by the conviction that the labors of the author in its preparation were one chief means of inducing the malady which has for a time exiled him from his home, his friends, his church, and his indefatigable efforts in the cause of truth and righteousness.

Dr. Bachman's volume we have before introduced to our readers, but would again commend it to their attention, as a production of no ordinary interest and value. Rich in

the fruits of long and careful investigation of the subjects on which it treats, and abounding in new and important facts, gathered by personal observation and experiment, presented in a simple style, and with the utmost candor, it is as entertaining to the general reader as it is instructive to the scientific student. We have no hesitation in affirming that it will settle, to the satisfaction of every unbiassed mind, the specific unity of the human races, and answer all objections to that doctrine drawn from their physical varieties. We cannot help regarding it a special providence that Dr. Bachman's attention was so early and so long directed to the subjects on which he writes. During many years, he was being prepared for the service he has done the cause of truth, and now, just in the nick of time, he has come forth, fully equipped, for its defence. His example furnishes a powerful answer to the objections which have sometimes been made against such of our ministers as have inclination and opportunity for the purpose, devoting their attention to scientific inquiries. It is all important that some of them should do so, and where it can be done without neglecting more important duties, we would give them every encouragement. We understand that Dr. B. is preparing a new edition of his work, to be rendered more complete by further facts and arguments in his possession. We earnestly hope it may be so, in the sure expectation that another broadside from his "heavy artillery" will make final work of the remnants of arguments left by the first.

We would also invite particular attention to the pleasant discussion between Dr. Bachman and Dr. Morton, held in the Charleston Medical Journal. Were we not moved by a feeling of pity for the latter, we would say more of this than we intend. But if our readers would see a complete, utter and perfectly irretrievable demolition of an antagonist, accomplished in the most amiable spirit, and with consummate ease and skill, we commend them to a perusal of those papers. If Dr. Morton's reputation as a naturalist survives them, it is harder to kill characters of that species than we imagined.

Dr. Pickering's work we have not had time fully to examine. The author was one of the scientific corps, attached to our late National Exploring Expedition, for which he

was selected, on account of his high attainments in natural history. The course of that expedition afforded valuable opportunities for observation, and he has since extended and perfected his inquiries. The results are embodied in the volume before us, and cannot fail to be of very great value. He writes with the caution and moderation of true science, and his opinions will carry with them no little weight. So far as we have looked into his work, he expresses no final and decided opinion as to the unity of the human races. He says, however, "there is, I conceive, no middle ground between the admission of eleven distinct species in the human family, and their reduction to one." One view which he advances, is of the highest interest and importance. He identifies the American Indians with the Mongolian, and partly with the Malayan races, and observes, "I think it could be shown on zoological grounds alone, that the human family is foreign to the American continent."

The work of Dr. Knox, we hardly know how to characterize. He claims to be a descendant of John Knox, of holy and immortal memory. But if we might argue from moral and intellectual diversities, to those which are physical, he alone would prove that nature can produce the most monstrous deviations in the line of a progeny. Respect for his great kinsman would lead us to speak gently of him, but truth requires us to say he is a radical in politics, an infidel in religion, a smatterer in science, and a perfect simpleton in argument. He calls his production "a fragment"—he should have used the plural, for it certainly presents a most unparalleled collection of disjointed, jumbled, heterogeneous fractions. The text of his discourse, and the idea which seems to lead him through all his mad vagaries, is that "Race is every thing." And yet it is difficult to say what his doctrine is. He both advocates and opposes every one with which we are acquainted.—His hand is against every man, but most against himself. He controverts on one page what he affirms on another, and in the same sentence, furnishes material for his own refutation.

We have referred also, to two articles in contemporary Reviews, as both well written, and worthy the attention of the reader. They are particularly directed to an exam-

ination of Prof. Agassiz's views, and attacking them on different grounds for the most part, effect together their complete refutation. The article in the *New Englander* meets the Professor on the scientific platform, and in a clear, condensed, well arranged, and conclusive discussion, effects the annihilation of that fiction he called an analogy. We indulge a sanguine hope that if any one ventures to refer to that analogy, some ten or fifteen years hence, Prof. A. will put on an innocent smile.

ARTICLE V.

JOHN FOSTER.

The Life and Correspondence of John Foster : Edited by J. E. RYLAND. In Two Volumes. New York : Wiley & Putnam.

The early part of the present century was illustrated by the labors of several men of rare genius and excellence, amongst the Baptists of England. Ryland, Fuller, Carey, Hall, Hughes and Foster were cotemporaries. Though differing considerably in age, they were still at the same time on the stage of action ; and in intimately related ways, were co-operating in the great work of defending the principles, enforcing the claims and diffusing the influences of evangelical piety. While some of these eminent men shone with unrivalled lustre in the Pulpit, others were engaged with the consecration of great powers, in giving the Gospel to the destitute, or quietly striving to relieve the Christian Religion from the misconceptions and abuses under which it labored, through the opposition of malignant foes, or the mistaken zeal of indiscreet friends. It is not our design to institute comparisons amongst them, and seek to settle their respective claims to a pre-eminent admiration. Some of them excelled in intellect, others in goodness, others in active usefulness ; all are entitled to our high respect, and when contemplated together may justly excite emotions of