

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER IV.

APRIL, 1852.

ARTICLE I. *Rev. L. M. Green*

THE HARMONY OF REVELATION AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

NUMBER III.

THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 315.]

It is a remarkable fact, that wherever the assaults of infidelity have been most confident and most contemptuous, with the loudest flourish of trumpets, and the boldest tones of defiance, *there* the progress of scientific enquiry has most completely unmasked her pretensions. and confirmed the credibility of the Sacred Scriptures. Especially is this true, in regard to that permanent topic of Infidel derision,

“THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION.”

Whatever may be our theory of the earth's “Internal Heat,” whether we believe in a great ocean of central fire, increasing, as we descend, to an intensity of heat far surpassing that of melted iron, with Sir W. Herschell, and all the bolder theorists; or attribute all the phenomena, with Lyell and Sir Humphrey Davy, to the influence of chemical agencies, to the combination and decomposition of various elements, beneath the constant play of

the dimness and obscurity of the past. Had not history taught us to whom the Peninsula is indebted for the greatest part of its civilization, the philologist, by comparing its vocabulary with those of other nations, would find the great influence which the Mohomedans exercised over that country, by noticing that the Arabic words preserved in the Spanish, designate civil and municipal offices, and military grades; or refer to chemistry, botany, agriculture, weights and measures, navigation, machinery, arts and sciences.

We fear very much, that our article has been very uninteresting to many of our readers, on account of the grammatical form which we were obliged to give to it, as our only object was to show the analogy of the languages of Southern Europe with the Latin. Dry and imperfect as it is, we hope that it may prove acceptable and useful to some of our readers who may be fond of languages.

Rev. S. J. Anderson

ARTICLE VI.

THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

By REV. THOS. SMYTH, D.D. *New York: George P. Putnam: 1850.*

The Unity of the Human Race. By JOHN BACHMAN, D. D., *Charleston, S. C. C. Canning: 1850.*

Natural History of the varieties of Man. By ROBERT GORDAN LATHAM, M. D. F. R. S. *London: 1850.*

In recurring to this vexed question, we design to give as far as the limits of a review will allow, a resumé of the argument as it now stands. In doing so, we will make free and frequent use of the information derived from the learned and able works whose titles head our page. We cheerfully acknowledge our special indebtedness to the two American authors, Drs. Smyth and Bachman. Our country may well be proud of such contributors to the cause of true science and revelation. Dr. Latham's work

is able and scientific, and to it we are indebted for some valuable thoughts and illustrations.

But it should be remembered, that any discussion connected with the science of Ethnology should be conducted with great diffidence, and with the utmost readiness to receive light from any quarter. This department of human knowledge is yet in its infancy. Ethnology cannot claim a higher place than a seat among the younger members of the great sisterhood of sciences. It becomes us especially to speak with exemplary modesty, as the study of this subject has been incidental rather than direct, and its claims have by necessity, been subordinated to the demands of a higher and holier, and far more important field of inquiry. We shall, therefore, be anxious to put facts forward, and take our humble position in the rear. No originality is claimed. The facts are common to all who have investigated the subject. And these shall be gathered from, and the use made of them be confirmed, by the very foremost men in almost every department of science. The arrangement and illustration of these facts, is all we claim. We shall thus avoid the infraction of that sound maxim of argumentation, *ne sutor ultra crepidem*.

The great reason why this subject is attracting so much attention, is found not in its scientific importance, though that is confessedly great, but in the opinion of a few of its advocates, who think that its developements are unfavorable to the integrity of divine revelation. But this is neither new nor startling. It was so with astronomy and geology. The zodiac of Dendera, the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the investigation into the buried cities of the great Assyrian plain, have all been expected by some to overturn and overturn, till nothing of revelation, that deserves the name, should remain. But when these and other investigations have reached a respectable degree of maturity, it has been found uniformly, that they have come over from the opposition, and ranged themselves as stalwart and true hearted warriors under the banners of revelation. The Bible then can afford to wait; it bides its time; it is based on the rock of ages, and its deep laid foundations do not even feel the tremor of these transient agitations. Its friends need look with no anxious or jealous eye on the infantile and wayward gambols of science

falsely so called. Christianity does now come out to plead for credence. Her existence and truthfulness have long been fixed facts—like the sun in heaven—and this great luminary that pours the light of salvation on a lost world, shines on, far above the clouds and darkness of crude and wild speculation.

We might safely take this stand now. We might call on Ethnographers to tarry at Jericho till their beards be grown—to settle their own principles, and agree upon a system among themselves—before they assume to unsettle the faith of millions, a faith that is hoary with the venerable moss of ages, and radiant with the hopes and joys of an “innumerable company.” They should have well tempered instruments who “beat upon the anvil that has broken many a hammer.” But we waive this high vantage ground, and cheerfully come down into the arena in the present stage of the conflict. The reader will perceive, that in these remarks it is taken for granted, that the Bible teaches the unity of the races of men; that proposition lies on its face. It calls all men the children of Adam—the first man; Eve is the “mother of all living.” It tells us that “in Adam all die,” and that God has “made of one blood all the nations of men that do dwell on all the face of the earth.” We shall not pause here to prove that such is the doctrine of Scripture; we reserve this part of the argument, for an examination of the new and strange theory of Prof. Agazziz, which wonderfully enough attempts and stakes its claim to acceptance, on its success in reconciling the doctrine of an indefinite plurality of origins, with the teachings of that book which, he confesses, contains the oracles of truth. For the present, however, we voluntarily divest ourselves of the tried and heaven-tempered panoply that God has given, and come to discuss the question on scientific principles.

But here we should by no means forget to give due attention to the fact, that the overwhelming mass of testimony given by men of science, is on the side of the unity of the races. The whole current flows in that direction, with scarcely obstruction enough to produce a ripple on the tide. Let any one curious to know the state of the case, turn to Dr. Smyth's work, and read from the 125th to the 135th page, and he will doubtless be surprised as

we have been, at the number, variety and weight of the names that are enrolled, on what we do not hesitate to say, is the christian side of the question. Among them will be found the names of Lawrence, and Pritchard, and Carpenter, and Mitchel, and Prescott, and a host of others too numerous to mention. It is no assumption then to say, that after all the discussion that has been had, that the unity of the races of men is the established law of science, and nothing short of a revolution in science can disturb its claim to universal acceptance. The history of the opposition is significant. It was introduced by Voltaire, Rousseau and Peyrere, for the purpose of disparaging revelation, and consequently takes on the suspicious garb of special pleading. But on this we will not dwell, but turn to the roll of those who, themselves famous, have given their testimony on the side of diversity of origins. And as this roll is so short, one can afford the space to copy it. Rousseau, Voltaire, Peyrere, Virey, Boyle, St. Vincent, Barton, J. C. Warren, Gibson, Coates, Desmoulin, Broc, Kaimes, Thos. Paine and Prof. Agazziz. These are all, at least if there are others known to fame, we must confess ourselves unknown, by protesting that we are not acquainted with them. We enter the discussion then with history, tradition and authority on our side. Well may the Ethnological Journal admit, that in maintaining the diversity of races, it stands "in open opposition to the Bible and to all philosophy, and to all science as now established," and yet it very modestly says, that these new "facts and principles will ultimately change the face of the world."

There are several remarks of a preliminary character that we want to make, and which we flatter ourselves will at once commend themselves to the judgments of our readers; and if so, they ought to have an important influence on the whole discussion. It will not be denied, that the simplest explanation of any given facts will always be the true one, provided it meets all the requirements of the case. "No more causes of things are to be admitted, than are both true and sufficient to explain the phenomena," is a maxim as old as Newton. To suggest other causes is unphilosophical, and offends against the acknowledged simplicity of nature. Hence, if we can assign

causes which seem to be adequate to produce the varieties manifested among men there will no necessity for the doctrine of various origins.

Again, varieties are easily accounted for. When they occur accidentally, there is a strong tendency to perpetuate them rather than return to the original type. Agreements when they are at all frequent and striking, cannot be accounted for so readily, except on the supposition of oneness of origin. Now let it be remembered, that the entire force of the argument generally adduced by the opposition, consists in diversities of form, colour, language, intellect and position. If these can be explained, then there is no reason for adopting the diversity theory which is designed professedly only to remove the difficulties created by them; any other reason for adopting it would be a discreditable one. We will then look at well known varieties arising among animals, remembering that man is an animal, and that his physical economy is governed by the same principles with that of the lower orders of creation. Take the horse. The wild Mexican mustang is the lineal descendent of the war horse of the Spanish invaders, and this too without any mingling of blood. Nothing like a horse was known to the Mexicans before this period. When the cavalry of Cortez charged upon their ranks, they supposed horse and rider to be one animal—a terrible and invincible centaur, dealing destruction among them. Then we have the Shetland pony, the fleet Arabian, and the enormous Flanders dray-horse, and yet all of the same stock. The same remark may be made of the dog, wolf, bear, hog and sheep. Abundant examples may be found in the volumes of Drs. Bachman and Smyth, either of which is a great thesaurus of facts and arguments on this question. Two cases are remarkable enough to demand special notice. They enable us to lay our hands on the point of departure from the normal type, for the transformation goes on under our eyes. The Otter sheep have been originated in New England and Great Britain, from the common stock, and that very recently. Col. Humphrey's account in the philosophical transactions for 1813, tells us that they are small, weighing about 45 lbs, loose jointed and with the fore legs crooked like those of an otter. Varieties of cows are propagated as a speculation. In Opelousas Co.,

Louisiana, there has been produced in the last 30 years, without a mixture of blood, a race of cattle of enormous size, with a peculiar form and large horns, resembling those of Abyssinia. Similar variations occur among men. Specimens of the human family with redundant toes or fingers, or peculiar conformations of some of the parts, come within the notice of every attentive observer. Pliny mentions six fingered persons called *Sedigitus* or *Sedigica*, according to sex. We have ourselves seen a family of servants, in which there was a remarkable tendency to the perpetuation of this peculiarity. Indeed, the remark is just, that there is almost always a disposition to propagate peculiarities, even when they are so exaggerated as to become monstrosities. To confirm this position, we need only refer to the case of the Porcupine family, which preserved its character for three generations, though each intermarriage was with an individual of then ormal type. Mr. Poinsett affirms that he saw a regiment of spotted men in Mexico, specimens of a race which has sprung up in modern times.

Another class of variations of which the human race is capable, will be seen by any one who will compare an English nobleman with the equally English beggar, who crawls up his marble steps; or a hard handed, brawny field laborer, with his own sister shut up in a manufactory; or more remarkable still, a scion of the old Celtic nobility, with an Irish bog-trotter, (See *Dublin University Magazine*, No. 48, pages 658-675.) Ignorance and want have reduced these descendants of a noble race, well nigh to the negro type.

But it is time we turned our attention to the specific objections to the unity of the races, made by those who advocate the diversity theory. 1. The first and one of the strongest, is based on the striking dissimilarities of language, which exist among the tribes of men. At first sight, this seems to be an insuperable obstacle to the theory we advocate. Of the tongues of men it may well be said, their name is legion. The world seems one mighty Babel, where the confusion of tongues confounds the listener. But it is important to remark, that the mere possession of the faculty of speech—the power to communicate thoughts, by articulate sounds—places an impass-

ble barrier between man and the brute creation, and throws all the tribes of men into one great class, having agreements far more striking than their disagreements. Again, all languages are capable of indefinite developement—even that of the lowest tribes of savages. Of some of the American Indian languages, M. Duponceau (whose philosophical attainments generally, but especially his acquaintance with the dialects of the New World, have given him a high reputation,) observes that they “would appear rather, from their construction, to have been formed by philosophers in closets, than by savages in the wilderness.”

It is all important to observe, what no scholar will deny, that just in proportion to the advancement of comparative philology, the apparent diversities of language give place to striking indications of a common character and origin. It tells with great power on this question, that every movement has been towards unity. And these advances have been made generally, without the prejudice and suspicion of a desire to support a theory. These contributions have been made by travellers, officers of the navy, and missionaries, as well as by professed philologists. We are not therefore surprised to find Cardinal Wiseman announcing two grand principles as the result of all such inquiries: 1. that all language was originally one; 2. that the separation was by a violent and sudden cause. The truth of this conclusion is better understood now than when his able Lectures were published. It is a curious fact, that this disagreement in languages exists not so much in the principles of grammar, as in the vocabulary of words. This has led an ingenious writer to describe philosophically, the process of the division of tongues at Babel:

“Bring me, quoth one, a trowel quickly quick;
 One brings him up a hammer: hew this brick
 (Another bids,) and then they cleave a tree;
 Make fast this rope, and then they let it flee;
 One calls for planks; another mortar lacks,
 They bear the first a stone, the last an axe.
 One would have spikes, and him a spade they give;
 Another asks a saw and gets a sieve,
 Thus crossly crost, they pant and prate in vain,
 What one hath made, another mars again.”

[DU BARTAS.]

To give a clearer notion of this condensing process of which we have spoken, let us glance at the Indian lan-

guages of America. When the missionaries, sent by the king of Spain, at the instigation of the Pope, reached the New World, they were astounded at the multiplicity of tongues that greeted them. Abbe Gelei says that those he came in contact with, were "infinite and innumerable." Abbe Clavigno is more moderate, and tells of thirty five idioms spoken within the jurisdiction of Mexico. Father Kircher, after consulting with the Jesuits at their general convocation in Rome, in 1676, reached the conclusion, that in South America they had discovered five hundred languages ; but Father Royo insists, that on the whole continent there were spoken not less than two thousand. But the comparative philologist passes his wand, and the whole scene is changed. The learned grammarian Vater, announces this as the conclusion of his researches, "that different as may be the languages of America from each other, *the discrepancy extends to words or roots only, the general internal or grammatical structure being the same for all.*" Humbolt uses the following language :

"In America, from the country of the Esquimaux to the banks of the Orinoco, and again from these torrid banks to the frozen shores of the straits of Magellan, mother tongues entirely different as to their roots, have, if we may use the expression, the same physiognomy. Striking analogies of grammatical structure are acknowledged, not only in the more perfect languages, as that of the Incas, the Aymare, the Guarani, the Mexican and the Cora, but also in languages extremely rude."

Dr. Latham sums up a review of the argument in these words :

"The evidence of language then is in favour of the unity of all the American population—the Esquimaux not excepted."

But the argument takes a wider range than this. The most recent investigations show this astounding result. In eighty-three American languages, one hundred and seventy words have been found, the roots of which have been the same in both continents ; and it is well remarked that it is easy to perceive that this coincidence is not accidental, since it does not rest on imitative harmony, or on that conformity of organs which produces almost an identity in the first sounds articulated by children, (see Dr. Smyth's work, p. 217.) Now apply Dr. Young's mathematical test,

given in his *Calculus of Probabilities*, to this number of agreements in two tongues; the odds would be 3 to 1 against an agreement of two words—10 to 1 against three coincidences—1700 to 1 against 6—100,000 to 1 against 8. And how many against an agreement of 170 words, neither the reader nor reviewer has arithmetic enough to tell.

But, we are asked, whence then this admitted diversity. We might waive the answer by showing undeniable coincidences between the highest and lowest forms, and leave the diversity unexplained. For instance, Dr. Latham says—

“The Hottentot stock has a better claim to be considered as forming a second species of the genus homo than any other section of mankind. It can be shown, however, that the language is no more different from those of the world in general, than they are from each other.”

Much has been made of the jargon of the Bushmen, the lowest type of man yet found; and Prof. Lichtensein supposed that they constituted a different species. But Vater has clearly shown that they speak a comparatively recent dialect of the common Hottentot; and it is now well known that the guttural tones and clacking sound that accompany their enunciation, have been adopted by them designedly to conceal their meaning from their neighbours and enemies, the Hottentots. In short, that they speak a slang language, such as is growing up in the streets and purlieus of every city in the world.

The Bushmen are the outlaws and refugees of the Hottentots, and their different dialects are accounted for on the well understood principle, that an inferior and lawless race hides its meaning under strange pronunciations and new coined words. We may see an illustration of this principle in the slang language of any large city. The street-folk of London have a language peculiar to themselves, and utterly unintelligible to the uninitiated. Specimens, both in prose and verse, may be found in Henry Mayhew's most interesting work, *London Labour and London Poor*, to which we would refer the curious reader.

Now shut up these people to themselves for a few generations, and all knowledge of the English language would die out from among them, and they would speak an en-

tirely new tongue, unlike any one now known. And we can fancy some wiseacre coming upon them in their isolation, and proving by their unintelligible jargon, on the principles adopted by our opponents, that here was a distinct variety of the human race—a new creation—instead of a degenerated branch of the boasted Anglo-Saxon stock.

But this does not explain the disagreement in kindred tongues, where no such sinister motive can be assigned. The cause of this variation lies in the very constitution of our mental powers, and we think can be readily understood by every reflecting observer. But we have not space to philosophize; a shorter, and perhaps more satisfactory, course is, to show the fact of actual divergence in languages that are known to be cognate.

This will be notorious to any one who will compare German, Greek, Latin, Russian, English and Lithuanic—all of which are Indo-European, and yet present to the eye and ear the most striking differences. In a narrow geographical district, the greatest variations are found in the Indian languages of America, even when the tribes are known to have had a common, and by no means remote, origin. The tables prepared by Dr. Latham present this fact in the strongest light. To them we refer the reader.

The conclusion of the argument from languages is, that we find unmistakeable traces of agreement in all tongues that have been thoroughly examined—that coincidence becoming clear and well marked in direct proportion to the completeness of the analysis to which they have been subjected. And on the other hand, we can exhibit the causes, and point to the fact, of a marked divergence in cases known to have a common origin. We claim, therefore, that the objection founded on language, is not only fairly disarmed, but actually becomes a powerful auxiliary in proving the unity of the races of men.

2. Another manifest distinction among the races of men is found in colour. But it must strike the most superficial observer, that these colours are not well defined. White, yellow, red, brown, olive and black; shade off and melt into each other by insensible gradations, and no one can point to the line of separation. This fact, to a considerable extent, comes within the range of observation of every one. Now, Dr. Pritchard announces it as an indisputable truth,

that "separate species of organized beings do not pass into each other by insensible degrees." And Guyot and a host of others affirm the same proposition.

The great agency in the production of the "lights and shadows" of the "human face divine," is heat; though it is subject to modifications, which we will take occasion to mention. The classics tell us, that when Phaeton mounted the chariot of the sun, he drove so unskilfully as to bring this luminary so near the earth, that the heat of his rays curled the hair of the negro and burned his skin black. "I am black, because the sun has looked on me," is the declaration of the spouse in Solomon's song. The lower animals follow this law. It may be announced as a general truth, that the birds, beasts and fishes, of the equatorial regions are deeper tintured in their feathers, spots and scales; while as we approach the arctic circle, they put on the silver livery of those snowy regions. The home of the black races is the domain of tropical heat. The old adage is, that "beauty is but skin deep." Colour is still more superficial, having its seat in one of the coats of the skin. We must not be surprised then that it is subject to constant mutations. For instance; the Syro-Arabian family of nations, which had its original seat in Western Asia, has spread itself over Northern Africa. It includes the Jews. The territory occupied by them embraces great diversities of soil and climate—from the fertile vales of Palestine, through the burning plains of Arabia and Egypt, to the lofty mountains that skirt the great Desert of Sahara. Their language and physical formation are strikingly similar, proving their common origin. Now, according to the theory we oppose, the colour of these nations should be the same. The fact, however, is far different; and facts are stubborn things. The Kabyles, who inhabit Algiers and Tunis, have generally a swarthy hue, and dark hair; but the tribe of Mozabi, (which is one of them,) is remarkably white; and the lofty table land, called Mount Aurasius, is inhabited by a tribe fair and ruddy, with hair of a deep yellow. On the other hand, some of the Tuaryck tribe, that live on the borders of the great desert, are as dark as the negro. The dwellers on the highlands of Arabia have light complexions, blue eyes, and red hair. Those near Muscat are of a sickly yellow;

those about Mecca are yellowish brown; and those on the low countries of the Nile are jet black. Mr. Buckingham says that the Arabs of the valley of the Jordan—a region of constant heat—have darker skins, and flatter features, and coarser hair, than he had elsewhere seen; and in the Hausan, a region beyond Jordan, he met with a family who had a black face and crisped hair, that is negro characteristics, though he was assured that they were of pure Arab blood.

The purity of the Jewish race is one of the best attested facts in history; yet, while they preserve certain general features, which mark them as a peculiar race, they show a strong tendency to assimilate themselves to the prevailing colour of the nations into which they have been dispersed. In England, as with us, blue eyes and flaxen hair are not uncommon, though a brunette complexion and raven hair are the prevailing type. In Germany and Poland, their complexion is fairer, and blue eyes and red hair are frequently found. In Portugal they are very dark, and those who have dwelt long in Cochin and Malabar are so black, as not to be distinguished from the natives. But at Malacheri, a town of Cochin, there is a recent colony; they are called Jerusalem or White Jews, not having yet had time to don the prevailing sable.

The other great family of nations is the Indo European. They stretch from the Indies, through the larger portion of the continent of Europe, and they have taken as their own, the broad and fair domain of this western world. All these nations have the same general form of cranium, and a fundamental conformity of language which, with the testimony of history, make their common origin sufficiently certain. Here again, the same variety of colour meets us. The changes pass from the fair hair and blue eyes, of northern Europe, to the jet black, of the dwellers in the plains of India. Even among the Hindoo tribes, where cast keeps the blood pure, we have black and white Brahmans. The light complexions are found in the cold and lofty mountains; the dark ones on the burning plains. As another illustration, look at the African nations that many suppose are characterized by uniform sable. Some of the Kaffir tribes have light brown complexions and reddish hair. There are also tribes on the Gold and Slave

coasts, much lighter than the negro usually is, and the Hottentots have a considerable admixture of yellow, while the Fulahs of Central Africa are of a dark copper colour, trenching on the Indian's peculiar prerogative. And having mentioned the Indian, it may be well to say, that he is as much of a chameleon as his more civilized brethren. Though called the red man, and a copper red is the prevailing livery in which he appears, yet he is sometimes well nigh as fair as the European; and then again is found nearly as black as the negro. And while this is true, the identity of the Indian tribes may now be considered as established.

But, then it may be asked, if heat, or rather climate, produces colour, why is not colour uniform in a given region? For the simple reason, we reply, that climate is not uniform even on the same parallels of latitude, and then the period during which races have been exposed to particular climates varies. Some tribes have, in all their migrations, kept within the tropics; while others have travelled across them, passing from cold to hot, or the reverse. But again, many influences, such as food, clothing, and employment, modify the operation of climate. Compare the brawny, sunburned and well-fed field laborer, with his own sister, shut up in a cotton factory, ill-fed, over-worked, and bleached, by seclusion from light and air, to a chalky whiteness, and our meaning will be distinctly apprehended.

It should be remembered also, that elevation changes climate—the ascent of a mountain producing the same result as moving towards the nearest pole. The dryness or humidity of the atmosphere has also its power: a moist and shaded region produces fairness, a dry one embrowns.

But if these things be so, we are asked why does not the negro lose his colour when brought to our northern clime. We answer, in the first place, that he has in some degree undergone this transition, as every one may see, who will compare an African negro with one whose ancestors have lived in America for three or four generations. And as for the rest, we would observe secondly, that it is easier to give a stain than take it away. We need not remind our fair readers, that freckles may be gotten in a day which cannot be gotten rid of in a year.

The conclusion we reach is, that colour changes with

climate; and if a different colour proves a different origin, then we must have as many origins as climates, and truly their name would be legion.

3. The next point to be noticed is the striking variety in the form of the head and face. The head is frequently measured by the facial angle. This is formed by a line drawn from the centre of the external orifice of the ear, to the edge of the nostril, and thence to the most prominent point of the forehead. It is supposed that the size of this angle indicates the amount of intellect. Camper endeavoured to show, by this mode of measurement, that a negro is nearer an ape than he is to a European—giving the following dimensions: European, 80° ; Kalmucks, 75° ; Negro, 70° ; and apes, 64° . But most fatally to this scheme, Owen proves that Camper fell into the enormous error of measuring the skulls of young apes, in which the projection of the upper jaw, which takes place on second teething, had not occurred. Owen proves that the facial angle of an ape varies from 30° to 35° . There is then a broad and manifest distinction between the lowest form of man, and the highest of the brute creation.

There is, however, another method of measuring the head, which reduces the human family to three classes: 1. The oval skull—seen in the Europeans generally. 2. The pyramidal skull—instance, the Esquimo Hottentots, and Bushmen. These widely separated races have no point of similarity in their history to account for this remarkable conformity of the cranium, but the fact that their manner of life is the same. They are both nomadic, suggesting the principle that similar modes of life develop similar forms of the head—a principle which, as we shall see, has much evidence in favour of it. 3. The prognathous: from pro, forward, and gnathos, cheek-bone. Instance, the negro. It is also seen frequently in Polynesia and Australia. It should be remarked, however, that this is by no means the uniform type of the negro. Indeed, the whole argument based on this diversity of form, is vitiated and overturned by the fact, that each of these classes appears with more or less frequency in each of the great families of nations. The African races often depart from the prognathous and develop the pyramidal, and even the oval form. This fact proves that there is not a

regular transmission of form in a given race of unmixed blood, and so gives to the winds the argument that these various forms require independent sources of the human family.

Not unfrequently we see a blending of all the three forms, so that it is impossible to tell to which of the classes the individual belongs; and there are known instances of change from one form to another. The Western Turks are known to be of the same stock with the Eastern, who live in the northern part of Asia; yet, the western have developed the oval cranium, while the eastern, *being still nomadic in their habits*, retain the pyramidal; and this transformation has not been produced by the intermingling of the Western Turks with the nations they have conquered, for they have kept remarkably distinct. Again, the Magyar race, of which the Hungarian nobility is composed, and of which Kossuth, the statesman, warrior, and orator, may be taken as a specimen, is one of the finest developements of man, considered physically or intellectually; yet they are of the same blood with the feeble Aslyacks and the untameable Laplanders. The first have the oval head, the second the pyramidal; and here again, as in the former case, there has been no mingling of blood, but a *change of location and employment*. Mr. Lyel affirms that there has been a manifest change in the form of the head, face, lips, &c., of negro-families that have remained for several generations in the United States. He received this testimony from the most intelligent physicians in the South, and that, too, where there has been no mingling of races.

We see also a transition taking place in the opposite direction, showing that man is capable of degradation as well as exaltation. Long continued want, ignorance and vice will reduce a race from the oval to the prognathous type; to prove this we need only refer to the Dublin University Magazine, as already quoted. We claim then that facts explode the theory of diversity of origin as founded on diversity of form.

4. Nearly connected with the last head, is the variety of mental endowments, and the capability of improvement. Many contend, that in these respects there is an impassable gulf between ourselves and some of the African tribes.

The most degraded of them are the Bushmen, but they are proved to be a degraded caste of the Hottentots ; but even this degraded form of humanity manifests many of the virtues of a high civilization. The Dutch who first settled among them spoke of them as remarkable for humanity, good nature and honesty—qualities which are by no means universal among ourselves ; and if they have lost these virtues in any degree, that may be attributed to their intercourse with *civilized and christianized* Europeans. It has been said they have no religion, but subsequent investigations have proved this statement to be erroneous ; they have a religion to which they are much attached, though many of them have become converts to christianity, and are much improved by it. So manifest is this influence of a propagation of our holy religion, that some of the wild tribes in concluding treaties of peace, have stipulated that missionaries should be sent them to instruct them in the faith of Christ. This is more than can be said of many refined nations, who are very prone to leave both religion and morality out of view in their international transactions.

Rev. J. L. Wilson affirms that African children are as apt as white children of the same age. The slave Ellis who has gone out to Liberia to take charge of a high school, would have been considered a remarkable man had he been born in Greece, or in any other nation. The annual messages of Gov. Roberts compare well, so far as we can see, with those of our own Governors. These and other facts prove, that “the negro is God’s image though carved in ebony.”

Classic fable tells us, that the statue of Memnon was silent all through the long dark night, but that as soon as the first rays of morning gleamed out from the rosy east, there came forth from its marble lips, sweet and musical sounds, to greet the god of day. So there may have been comparative silence and torpidity in the negro mind, through all the long dark night of ignorance and superstition that has brooded over him ; but let the sun of science and religion dawn on him, and there will be healing and enlivenment in his beams, sounds sweet as angel-melodies will greet his coming, pleading most eloquently fellowship with man, and son-ship with God. But in all this discus-

sion, we should take into the account the manifest unfairness of comparing on equal terms a race, which has enjoyed the blessings of religion and literature for centuries, with one that has been denied both these for the same time. Rather place side by side the African negro, and the early English, as they struggled, often in vain, to protect themselves from the naked Picts and Scots.

We unhesitatingly claim an identity in mental constitution, for all the races of men. The mind may be sadly dark and undeveloped, but can be educated and elevated, and then it reasons on the same principles, and admits the same axioms, with a Newton or Leibnitz. We claim each man as a brother; and were we to repeat the immortal line of Terence, the slave,

Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto,

to a company collected from all the tribes of men, we would expect to strike a chord in each breast, that would thrill in unison with the heaven descended and ennobling doctrine, that we are all brethren.

But let us for a moment suppose, that differences of mental power would argue diversity of origin, and we are at once led to conclusions known to be false. For Milton, Shakespeare and Newton, differ as widely from a Yorkshire boor or London beggar, as that low type of English intellect does, from the inhabitant of the deserts of Africa, or the jungles of Industan. Now if the one diversity proves a difference of origin, so does the other, and we are led legitimately to a conclusion known to be false. But it may be said that the elements of mind are the same, that the disparity is one of developement. We admit it and affirm the same proposition of all the tribes of men.

If we have been successful in turning the objections of our opponents into arguments in our favour, and if, as we shall subsequently show, there are strong positive proofs of a common origin of the human race, then we claim that the difficulty of position should not trouble us at all. A plausible explanation of the manner in which the dispersion of the race has taken place, can in our judgment be given. Yet if this could not be done, and we were compelled to leave that question in profound darkness, it would, as it appears to us, be entirely fair and logical to

hold to the conclusion affirmed by so many arguments. If we were to find a tribe of men on the head waters of the Mississippi, speaking the Welch language, and following their customs, as early travellers supposed they had done, we claim that it would be manifestly unreasonable to deny that *they were there*, until the discover could show how *they got there*. The fair inference would be, that some how or other they did transport themselves from the land of high hills and hard consonants, to the shores of the great father of waters. So far as our reading goes, it was never ascertained by what means the fly got in the amber, but we should not be favourably impressed with the reasoning powers of one who should hold that as sufficient cause for contending that it never got there at all.

We now come to the positive argument, which is far stronger than most persons suppose. And we may remark that this side of the question grows upon us in authority, the further investigation is prosecuted.

1. There are certain marked characteristics that attach to all the races of men, and that distinguish them widely from all other animals. Dr. Lawrence enumerates sixteen. Dr. Bachman makes a classification which is very striking. We will just intimate some of them. The complete correspondence in the number of the teeth and other bones of the body—the shedding the teeth unlike other animals—the erect stature—the articulation of the head with the spinal column—the possession of two hands—the organs of speech, and the power of articulate singing. All men are omnivorous, and man alone can inhabit any climate on the face of the globe; and he alone possesses a conscience. This distinction is worthy of especial notice. The dog and the monkey are intelligent brutes; yet who ever found a dog grieving for having torn a lamb, or a monkey in the agonies of remorse for having stolen an apple.

The human race is of slower growth, and arrives later at puberty than the inferior animals. They agree in the physical constitution of male and female—have the same period of gestation—on an average the same number of young, and are liable to the same diseases, and in these respects are strikingly unlike the lower orders of creation.

Now on the supposition of the unity of the races, all this is perfectly plain and easily accounted for. All these facts are harmonious and intelligible; but deny it and we are plunged into confusion worse confounded; a thousand questions press upon us, to no one of which can we return a satisfactory answer. The striking agreements in mythological systems, even where nations are most widely separated, make the perplexity more complete.

2. Another powerful positive argument is found in the uniformity of traditions, that have been borne down to us on the ever widening wave of time. The Bible accounts for the introduction of sin, explains the fall, and affirms the corruption of all men. Now go where you will, and you meet results that require for their explanation such a catastrophe. Human nature is every where in ruins, darkness is on all minds, and disease in all hearts; and the gospel, the great remedial system, meets and satisfies these wants wherever they exist. On our principles this is just what might have been expected. The primal taint has spread from the head to all the members, and one great remedy avails for all.

But on the other theory all again is confusion. If there have been five or fifty, or five hundred Adams—for Ethnographers admit, that if the strict unity of the race be denied, the number of origins to be supposed is altogether indefinite—how comes it that they have all fallen, and that they have all transmitted a corrupt nature to their posterity, and what is still more remarkable, the same corrupt nature; for it is essentially the same. There is a mental and moral, as well as a physical likeness in the whole race.

But the case is stronger, when we take into account the startling similarity of traditions found in the most opposite corners of the globe. The creation, the location of man in a garden, primeval innocence, the fall by means of the serpent acting through the woman, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the promise of deliverance through an incarnate, but divine redeemer, and the deluge; some account of these great facts, seems to be the heritage of man, an evidence of a common origin, and we fondly trust, earnest of a common and glorious recovery. Hesiod tells us that man originally lived wifeless and ig-

norant, but innocent and happy. Prometheus, however, steals fire from heaven and teaches man its use; Jupiter incensed, threatens vengeance, and to accomplish his purpose, he orders Vulcan to form a woman of clay, on whom the gods bestow every grace and beauty, but at the same time fill her heart with vanity and cunning, and all violent devices. This woman, Pandora, Jove presents to Epimetheus, who accepts the gift and marries her, despite the dissuasions of his brother Prometheus; and from that moment disease and evil of all kinds have been the lot of man.

In an engraving preserved in Creuzer's *Symbolik*, and taken from an ancient bas relief, we have an account of the fall, that would be intelligible to a child. On one side of the picture we see a man and woman standing naked under a tree, the woman in a drooping and disconsolate posture, the man with one hand raised to the tree, and the other pointing to the woman. On the other side is a sedate and august figure seated upon a rock, and strangling the serpent with his outstretched hand.

The Chinese inform us, that man was originally upright; was good and wise by instinct, but was ruined by over desire of knowledge, according to some, others say by the flatteries and temptations of the woman. He thus lost dominion over the creatures, and they became his enemies. Essentially the same account meets us in the Lamaic faith, in the doctrines of the Budhists, and in the Hindoo mythology generally. The Persian account is too striking to be omitted. They say that the world was created in five periods, that on the sixth man was produced. He enjoyed a season of innocence and happiness. But he becomes proud, and then Ahriman, the evil one, brings him fruit of which he eats, and in that instant all his excellences departed save one.

In one of the oldest of the Hindu pagodas there are two sculptured figures. One represents Creeshna an incarnation of Veeshnu, trampling on the crushed head of the serpent. In the other, the serpent is represented as encircling him in his folds, and biting his heel. The Gothic mythology also preserves in the Edda, traditions remarkable for the coincidence with the first promise of the Messiah. They call Thor the eldest of sons—the middle

divinity—a mediator between God and man, who bruised the head of the great serpent and slew him.

But a volume might be filled with similar traditions. These, however, will subserve our purpose. To us they seem to be undeniably the *disjecta membra* of the history of the race as given by Moses.

Now these agreements must be explained. To suppose that they were accidental—occurring spontaneously to different races of men, deriving their existence from different sources—offends against every principle of reason. Admit, however, a common origin, and at once all is plain and intelligible. Each race as it travelled away from the cradle of the human family, bore with it as sacred heirlooms of the past and attestations of their legitimacy, the memory of the great facts in their early and common history. These accounts are distorted, and the representations are not a little grotesque; but considering the time that has elapsed, and the mutations that the tribes have undergone, the wonder is that they are so accurate.

3. Our concluding argument is derived from the known barrenness of hybrids. A hybrid is the product of a union between two distinct species, in the vegetable or animal kingdom. The doctrine that such mongrels are absolutely incapable of a *permanent* reproduction of their own kind, may now claim the dignity of an accepted truth among physiologists. In proof of this, we refer among others to Hamilton and Carpenter. The latter in his great work just issued, *Comparative Physiology*, speaks as if there was no reasonable ground of doubt on the subject. This principle was long regarded as so well established, that Buffon, Cuvier, Flourens and others, introduced the capability of permanent reproduction into the very definition of species. Dr. Morton, however has laboured to overturn this general belief; but his investigations have been followed by those of Dr. Bachman, who is second to no naturalist in Europe or America.

The following are some of the conclusions which he regards as sufficiently well established:

“1. Nature in all her operations, by the peculiar organization of each species, by the unfertility of a hybrid production, where by art or accident this takes place, and by the extinction of these hybrids in a very short time, gives us the most indubitable evi-

dence, that the creation of species is an act of Divine power. 2. That no race of animals has ever sprung from a commingling of two or more species. 3. Consequently this fact, that all the races of mankind produce with each other a fertile progeny, by which new varieties have been produced in every country, constitutes one of the most powerful and unanswerable arguments in favour of the unity of the races."

If any confirmation of this authority is needed, it is found in this statement of Prof. Owen:

"The tendency of all the natural phenomena relating to hybridity, is to prevent its taking place, and when it has occurred, to arrest the propagation of varieties so produced, and to limit their generative powers, so as to admit only of reversion to the original specific forms. In a few exceptional cases, serving only to establish the rule of their inferiority, specific hybrids have been known to propagate together, and produce a degenerate intermediate race which soon becomes extinct."

But to avoid the crushing force of this argument, an attempt has been made, as the forlorn hope of the diversity theory, to show that the varieties produced by the mingling of the races of men manifestly degenerate, and have a tendency to extinction. But the world is full of the evidence which overturns this objection. The Caucasian, the Mongolian, the Malay, the African, and the Indian, have all produced permanent varieties of the human family. In Mexico a race has sprung up that is the result of mingling the Caucasian, African and Indian blood. The Caucasian and African blood is flowing in the veins of thousands in our country, and cases of this kind have been known to be productive for five generations without a union with the parent stock on either side. The Maloes in Africa, who are Negro and Portuguese, and the Griqua, who are Dutch and Hottentot, are illustrations of this truth. Indeed, this process of amalgamation has gone on so far, that even the *Ethnological Journal* admits, that "the primitive races no longer exist, all or nearly all of the inhabitants of the world being of mixed blood."

We cannot forbear here glancing at this fact, as taken in connection with the notion that the Bible only gives us an account of the Adamic race. The sweep of these doctrines is wider and more desolating than at first appears. Men are not brothers; missionary success is an impossi-

bility, and the attempt fanaticism. This holy enterprise gives place to a war of races—the strong oppressing the weak—the Bible shut up, for we cannot find the Adamic race, if it exists now at all; and we reach the dreary, soul-sickening conclusion, that there breathes not on this globe of darkness and sorrow, one human being who dares to open the precious Book of God, and apply its promises to himself as his own. Oh, this would be an orphaned world indeed if that were true. There would go up from bereaved humanity one universal and despairing wail—taking the melancholy language of the women by the empty sepulchre, and giving to each syllable a deeper and sadder significancy—ye have taken away my Lord, and I know not where ye have laid him. But on our view, how cheering the prospect—a common origin and destiny; a common Father and home; a common Gospel, that opens its rich treasures of hope and life to all, and tells them, amid all their perverseness and antipathies, not to fall out by the way, for they are brethren. Under the influence of this doctrine, no man can ask, in God-insulting insolence, “am I my brother’s keeper?”

We have now reached the conclusion of our resumé of the general argument. We have shown that diversities of language, colour, form, and intellect, are not insurmountable difficulties in our way; and that we have in facts, constantly occurring around us, the key to explain them, and thus, when properly considered, we have seen them change from apparent antagonists to willing and efficient auxiliaries. In addition, we have exhibited the identity of physical structure and intellectual constitution; the surprising uniformity of the principles of language, and the agreement of traditions, and the capability of indefinite reproduction of mixed races; and thus we have given our readers a meagre outline of the evidence on which we affirm, without a shadow of doubt, that all the races of men are one.

We come now to consider briefly the new theory of Prof. Agazziz. Its peculiarity is, that while he admits that all men are of one species he concludes that they are derived from different origins. In his view, God has created an indefinite number of centres, from which men have gone forth to people the globe. This theory is a very accommodating one; it overleaps all difficulties, by bring-

ing in at every exigency the arm of God. Whether he conforms to the Horatian rule,

Nec Deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus,

we leave the reader to determine. It is, at all events, capable of indefinite expansion. Wherever a variety occurs which he cannot readily explain, he has, as in classic fable, but to stamp his foot, and a fountain of the human family gushes up and flows on at his bidding. And we see no reason why he may not be driven to adopt five hundred centres, as readily as the dozen or so he now claims. He seems actually to run riot in the covert expenditure of creative energy.

“We maintain,” says he, “that, like all other organized beings, man cannot have originated in single individuals, but must have been created in that numeric harmony which is characteristic of each species. Men must have originated in nations, as bees in swarms, and as the different social plants have at first covered the extensive tracts over which they naturally spread.”

The strangest feature of this theory is, that he pretends to reconcile it with the Bible, and protests his willingness to renounce it, if it is inconsistent with the teachings of the sacred oracles. Now, even admitting that Moses gives us an account of the creation of but one of these centres, yet, if there be any certainty in language, he restricts the creation to one man and one woman. The laws of interpretation that can reconcile this narrative with a theory that makes men and women swarm up from different localities, like Virgil's bees from the bruised carcass of a calf, can do anything; to them nothing is impossible. Without stopping to do more than suggest that this view is inconsistent with a community of traditions and religious forms, already proven, we will look at it as a Bible question, which Prof. A. is willing to make it. It is surely a new thing under the sun, that Bible readers are to be told that it does not teach the unity of the races. That doctrine is interwoven with the whole system, both of the fall in Adam, and the recovery in Christ the second Adam. It is the woof of the mighty web of providence and grace.—Take it away, and the penalties and promises become unintelligible.

We may suggest, in passing, that the Bible flatly con-

tradicts Prof. A.'s parallell between the production of plants, and animals and men. The former were produced in swarms like bees, the latter in a single pair.

“And God said, let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit, after his kind whose seed is in itself upon the earth.”

“And God said, let the waters bring forth ABUNDANTLY the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven; and God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters bring forth *abundantly*.”

But how altered the style when the higher creation is announced: “And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” And then we are told that he made one man and one woman; not a bee-swarm of Adams and Eves. And He tells that single pair to be “fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the creatures.” Language which is stubbornly irreconcilable with the idea that there were others of the same dignity to dispute with them the dominion of the earth. But our theorist finds unmistakable evidence of the existence of other races, in the account of Cain's flight into the land of Nod: “And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, eastward of Eden, and he builded a city.” Now, Nod means flight, the land of the vagabond, and manifestly derived its name from Cain's flight to it. But we are gravely told, as an end of controversy, that he must have found many people there to help him build a city. We should like to be informed, what idea Prof. A. has formed of Cain's city. One would think that there rose before his mind a vision of some glorious handiwork of myriads of men—a Thebes, with its hundred gates of brass—a Nineveh, with a diameter of three day's journey, or a Palmyra, rising from the desert like a dream of beauty and grandeur, and opening its flashing gates to the merchant princes, who bring the riches of the earth from afar. But how is all this romance exploded by the sober fact, that the word translated city means, in addition to the modern acceptation of it, “a camp, and even a small fortification, as a tower—a watch tower.” (See Gesenius Lex.)

A nomadic hamlet, made up of a few stragglng huts,

or mud-walled cottages, meets all the requirements of the case. But even if a multitude were required, Adam's descendants had already become numerous. It should be remembered, that though but three of Adam's sons are named—Cain, Abel, and Seth—yet it is distinctly affirmed, that he lived 930 years, "and begat sons and daughters."

Now, if we remember the rate of human progress, even in these degenerate days, we will have no difficulty in understanding how the best authorities put down the population of the globe at the time of Cain's flight, which occurred when he was about 130 years old, at not less than two hundred thousand. Some say more than 400,000 men alone. So that if Cain had needed aid to build this famous city of his, he could easily have gotten it. But be these Noddites many or few, they were closely affiliated with Adam's family, else Cain would have had no dread of their punishing him for the murder of Abel.

But let us close this argument by presenting a synopsis of the Bible declarations on the subject. Adam is called "the first man." We are expressly told, that after God had made the heavens and the earth, "there was not a man to till the ground;" and to supply this deficiency, he made Adam. Eve is called the "mother of all living."—It accounts for the curse which rests on the whole earth by Adam's sin; death is referred to the same event. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."—"As by the offence of one, judgment came on all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, judgment shall come upon all men to justification of life. For, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous." We are "debtors to all men," on the ground that we are brethren. But to crown the Bible testimony, take Paul's sermon at Athens. The Greeks proudly claimed to have sprung from some drops of sacred blood, that fell down from Jupiter. They scorned to acknowledge the common herd of men as of the same blood. It is under these circumstances that Paul throws down the gage and stakes the reputation of Christianity on the unity of the races.—"And God hath made of one blood, all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." No one can mistake the meaning of the phrase of "one blood," unless he

is blinded by desire to sustain a theory. It has the sense of the English *consanguinity*, in classic Greek and Latin.

If the objection is made that some versions read "God hath made of one, all the nations," it does not alter the case. Some word must be supplied of the same signification essentially, and it would still be an assertion of *unity* for all men.

We cannot conclude without saying a word on the relation that Revelation sustains to the speculations of science. Some seem to think, that she stands by, trembling lest some truth should be discovered that would explain all her doctrines and give her authority to the winds. Far from it, she calmly bides her time, with no fear except for her opposers. We see here exemplified the peaceful and confident heart, in the centre of universal doubt and hesitation. No new or strange thing happens to the Bible when it is attacked—"The word of the Lord is tried," as silver in the furnace. It can expect no less than opposition. It is a revelation of pure truth and holiness to a world of ungodliness. Its light condemns their darkness; and hence the effort of Satan and his emissaries is to put out that light. The Bible has been in a crucible, heated seven times hotter ever since its promulgation; and from this furnace of trial, it has come forth only purer and brighter for the ordeal. He who threw the shield of His omnipotence over the Hebrew children in the Chaldean furnace, so that the very smell of the fire was not found on their garments, has so defended His own oracles that in no one instance have they been worsted. When weighed in the balances, the Bible has never been found wanting; and it has never shrunk from investigation. It has never fallen back on any ground of right, which lay above or beyond the range of human inquiry, in its fullest and most unbiassed exercise. It has laid open its claims to obedience, and asks no advantage in the scrutiny. It admits the same rules of investigation that are applied to any department of human knowledge.

The form of opposition has ever been changing; when one store-house of weaponry has been tried unavailingly, another, and often entirely different one has been opened. There is scarcely a science known among men that has not been pressed into this unholy warfare. Its adversaries,

too, have been unreasonably exacting; men who are credulous on every other subject, are incredulous here. But above this scene of continual change, and looking down on the self-destructive efforts of its enemies with a calm and pitying eye, the Word of Truth has occupied an eminence of unclouded light, and its foundation is the rock of ages. There stands its fortress, and its base is strewn by the wrecks of systems which have been dashed to pieces in conflict with it. And as the advocates of revelation have been ever thus successful, they have no fears for the future.— They look calmly on the rush and fever of speculation, as it searches all the deep and dark places of creation, fully satisfied that no one well ascertained truth, brought out from all the vast arcana of nature, will controvert one of the declarations of God's word. The Bible comes from Him who formed the earth in the hollow of his hand, and hung it upon nothing; who spread above us the beauteous canopy of heaven, and sent the stars on their courses.

Then, no truth that can be gathered from the heavens above or the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth, can oppose that revelation. God is self-consistent. True, some things that are announced as the discoveries of science, have been uncompromisingly hostile to revelation. But we have had only to wait awhile, and science herself has repudiated these notions, and that without reference to the claims of revelation.

A striking illustration of this remark is found in the history of the "Vestiges of Creation," which a few years ago had a great but ephemeral popularity. Its cardinal principle was, that there is in nature a power of progressive development upwards. According to this high priest of nature, reptiles produced four-footed beasts—these, monkeys—then apes, and then men; and we were gravely told the ominous secret, that in some highly favourable conjuncture of circumstances, that men may produce another order of beings, as far above them as they are above apes, and so on in infinite progression. This principle is the germ of that book, which, under the hypocritical garb of respect for revelation, endeavoured to undermine its foundations. That book is now the jest of men of science. Among them all there is not one who could acknowledge its paternity without blushing. Indeed it is destitute of

an enlarged and thorough view of knowledge. A witty writer remarked of it, that its author had been at a geological feast, and had run away with the scraps. It is rather curious that one of its main doctrines was exploded before the book had well gotten dry from the press. It based a portion of its claims on the nebular hypothesis; but Lord Ross about that time turned his wonder-working telescope upon these famed nebulæ, these embryo worlds, and in an instant this theory was dissipated into thin air.

If science and revelation differ, they cannot both be true. The question then arises, and it is worth a moment's thought, should a discrepancy arise, which stands on the best ground of evidence—which should be believed. It will at once be admitted, that to weigh any thing against revelation, an opinion should be based on well ascertained facts. We are under no obligation to notice the crude guesses of a dreaming speculator. Now while we accord all due reverence to these sciences, we would suggest, that great uncertainty hangs over them. This their warmest votaries admit and lament. What is reverently regarded in one generation, is laughed at in the next. A text book which was regarded as specially accurate fifty years ago is valueless now, except as a depository of exploded theories. The difficulty of reaching certain conclusions is felt the more deeply, the more profound is our acquaintance with the subject. Hence really learned men are modest, mere smatterers are bold. He who sees nothing but results as they are arranged in a theory, knows nothing of the doubts through which those conclusions have been reached. He sees the building, but does not see the foundation, and is blissfully ignorant of the labours of the quarry, in shaping and polishing the stones. As the heart knoweth its own bitterness, and a stranger intermeddleth not therewith, so each profession knows its own difficulties. We say then, that science has not yet reached that state of maturity and fixation, that would justify us in putting it into the scales to weigh against revelation, which comes to us with history, miracles, prophecy, propagation and internal and self-evidencing witness, all in its favour. We have no idea that this question will ever become a practical one. But should this be so, we ask not an hour to choose. Let God be true and every man a liar.

We look then cheerfully and confidently on the future. We anticipate a day of conflict, fierce and trying, but we are not afraid of the result. The Bible is the light house of a dark world. By it alone can the voyager be guided to the desired haven. The waves of tumult may lift up themselves and foam and dash around its base, and clouds may obscure its summit, and many may perish on the rocks and quicksands for want of its light; but when the noise of that tumult shall have been hushed, and those clouds have rolled away, we expect, and those who live till that day will see it, that it will shine on calm, clear and truthful; the Pharos of the world, at once the witness for God and the hope of man.

ARTICLE VII.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1 *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D. D. LL.D. By his son-in-law, the REV. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Volume 3d; 531 pp. 12 mo.; Harper & Brothers. New York. 1851.*

This volume was upon our table when the preceding number of this Review was issued; but we had not then enjoyed its perusal. It gives the History of Dr. Chalmers' life and labors as a Professor, commencing with his inauguration to the chair of Moral Philosophy, in the University of St. Andrews, and leaving him in the most successful occupancy of the Divinity Chair in University of Edinburgh.

It sketches briefly the various publications prepared during this period, and which added to his fame as an author: and sketches his retired and quiet labors as a Christian, in which he partially occupied his Sabbaths. In this volume, Dr. Chalmers is presented more conspicuously than before, as the champion of the rising