

**The unity of mankind : an introductory lecture, delivered before the class of the medical department of the St. Louis University / by M.L. Linton.**

**Contributors**

Linton, M. L. 1808-1872.  
St. Louis University. Medical Department (1836-1855)  
National Library of Medicine (U.S.)

**Publication/Creation**

St. Louis, Mo. : Printed at the Missouri Democrat Office, [1854?]

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/wa2gjd3p>

**License and attribution**

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the National Library of Medicine (U.S.), through the Medical Heritage Library. The original may be consulted at the National Library of Medicine (U.S.) where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.

**wellcome  
collection**

Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

4  
THE UNITY OF MANKIND.

—•••—  
AN INTRODUCTORY

LECTURE,

Delivered before the Class

OF THE

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT,

OF THE

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY,

BY M. L. LINTON, M. D.,

Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine.

—•••—  
PUBLISHED BY THE CLASS.

SESSION '54-55.

St. Louis, Mo.

THE UNITY OF MANKIND

AN INTRODUCTORY

LECTURE  
CORRESPONDENCE.

At a meeting of the Medical Class of the St. Louis University, held in the Lecture Room of the College, P. YOUNG, was called to the chair, and A. MONTGOMERY, appointed Secretary. The object of the meeting being stated it was unanimously resolved, that a committee be appointed to solicit a copy of PROF. LINTON'S Introductory Address for publication. The following gentlemen were appointed a committee for that purpose, A. Montgomery, G. Moreau Holt, and Jno. LeBrecht.

St. Louis, Mo., Nov. 2d, 1854.

PROF. LINTON,

Dear Sir,

At a meeting of the Class of the Medical Department of the St. Louis University, the undersigned were appointed a committee to solicit the manuscript of your Introductory Address, delivered on the 31st ult. for publication.

With assurances of high respect, we remain,

Truly yours,

A. MONTGOMERY,  
JOHN LEBRECHT,  
G. MOREAU HOLT.

St. Louis, 6th Nov. 1854.

GENTLEMEN,

The manuscript of the Introductory is subject at any time to your order. The Address was delivered with the hope that it would be of some service to the Medical Class, and I comply with pleasure with the request to permit its publication.

Accept for yourselves, and tender to the Class my sincerest assurance of regards,

M. L. LINTON.

Messrs: A. MONTGOMERY,  
JOHN LEBRECHT,  
G. MOREAU HOLT.



## ADDRESS.

---

### GENTLEMEN OF THE MEDICAL CLASS :

The natural history of mankind is intimately connected with the studies of the physician. The origin of the human species; the changes which it has undergone mentally and physically in the course of ages, and the causes which have produced these changes, are topics of interest to the non-medical as well as the medical public; and the discussion of them on this occasion will, I hope, be acceptable to those here assembled to hear an introductory lecture.

Whence are we? Are the millions of human beings who now people the earth, the descendants of one primeval pair; or are they the hybrid offspring of different species of a genus man, created at divers points and sundry times on the various continents and islands of our globe?

Is the old doctrine true, that all earth's denizens are the children of Adam and Eve, or is it but a remnant of superstition and a mark of old fogyism? Has every country had its Adam and Eve, as young philosophy pretends in these latter days? Is this old and universal belief—the faith of Christians, Jews, Mahomedans and even Pagans—the faith of all ages reaching back to the first records of history and the earliest whisperings of tradition, and forward to the middle of the nineteenth century; is this consent of nations and ages founded in truth, or is it to pass away as the baseless fabric of a vision, to make room for the daring speculations of a few modern freethinkers?

I believe in the old and universal doctrine, that all mankind have descended from one pair, as related in our earliest history; and I shall proceed briefly to examine it, and the speculations to which it is opposed, by the light of reason. Of course, all who believe the Pentateuch, believe also the doctrine of the unity of the human race. But I do not propose to examine the question theologically; I wish only to estimate the bearings of science upon it; to meet the objector on the ground chosen by himself. It is contended by the advocates of a plurality of origins, of multitudinous Adams and Eves, that men are too different in color, in form, in language and locality, to have descended from one pair. It is contended by them, that the differences observed amongst nations and races, are specific differences; that



there are many different species of mankind. On the other hand, the advocates of the old doctrine say, that all these differences of color, form, &c., are but variations induced on one original type, by climate, modes of living, and various other agencies.

What is meant by the term species? It would be well to settle the meaning of this term, before we enter the discussion of the question, as to whether mankind are of different species or but varieties of one species. We say, in common parlance, that there are different *kinds* or species of plants and animals; and we mean thereby, well marked differences which no combination of circumstances can change. The oak is different in kind or species from the willow; the rose from the magnolia; the beech from the walnut. The cat and dog are of different species or kinds; the turtle-dove differs in species from the albatross; the whale from the shark. There may be hybrids between the more closely allied species or kinds, but these hybrids are themselves unfruitful, and thus has nature provided a barrier against the chaos which would follow the indefinite mingling and transmutation of species. Now there are evidently no such wide and well marked differences between men as those mentioned of plants and animals; and those who contend that the Indian and the white man are of different species, rely upon those slight differences which may evidently exist in the same species. If fruitfulness inter se be a proof of specific identity, then, evidently, mankind are but one species; but if every philosopher is to use the term in his own sense, regardless of the consent of mankind and common usage, then the word ought to be erased from our lexicons. It is a remarkable fact that those who contend that specific differences exist amongst men, cannot agree about the number of the species into which the human family is divided. Now if these differences were well marked and constant, there could be no difficulty in recognizing them. There is no difficulty in fixing the specific boundaries of plants and animals; nor would there be in doing the same with regard to mankind, if there were really different species of men. Some, as Metzan, say there are but two species of men, the white and the black; others, as Desmoulins, divide the human family into sixteen species; Bory de St. Vincent, has fifteen species; Joquinot thinks that there are three species, and the authors of the "*Types of Mankind*," though they also contend that there are many species of human beings, admit what it would be useless to deny, viz: that all the classifications of authors are arbitrary. But if men really are of different species, it would certainly not be *arbitrary* to classify them as such. These classifications are arbitrary only because there are no specific



marks by which to make the necessary distinctions. Color will not do for a distinctive mark, because there are a thousand shades of color; and the advocates for distinct species would not like to have a thousand of them. If a shade of difference in color be taken as a mark of difference in species, then one sister will be of a different species from another. All of us have seen a blonde and a brunette in the same family. If a difference in the size of the head be specific, then two brothers may belong to different species. If the shape of the face be specific, we may find in one set of children three or four species. I have seen in one family, the oval face of the Caucasian, the high cheek bones of the Mongolian, and the median cheek bones of the American. I have seen in one family, the features of the Greek and the Egyptian. And yet young Philosophy would persuade us that these differences, when observed on a large scale are specific; that men, differing in color, and in the shape and size of the head, cannot have descended from one original pair that lived six thousand years ago; that all the varied circumstances of climate and mode of living, the ennobling power of civilization and the debasing tendencies of barbarism, cannot, in thousands of years, have produced the varieties which we see; when the fact is, that many of the differences or varieties are observed in the same family of brothers and sisters. From such facts I should argue thus: if even slight differences in color and size and form may exist in the individuals of the same immediate paternity, it may be supposed that great differences, in all these respects, will be effected by widely differing circumstances operating on the various descending lines of such a family in a few thousand years. It would do well enough to regard the Englishman and the negro as specifically different, were it not for the fact, that there is every intermediate shade. The Frenchman is a shade darker than the Englishman; is he of a different species? The Spaniard is darker still; is he of a different species? The Berber is darker than the Spaniard. How dark must we get before we stick a pin, and say, Ah, here we must end one species and commence another! The Abyssinian is still darker than the Berber; and now we are on the borders of negro-land, and its sable denizens come next. But the negro has thick lips and prognathous jaws and woolly hair: so have many white persons. And then, again, many of the blackest tribes have neither the thick lips, the projecting jaws, nor the woolly hair; for example, the Kafirs and the Yolofs, the Mandingos and many of the natives of Mozambique. The fact is, that the differences in lips, jaws, hair and head of the various nations of mankind, shade off into each other just as their colors do, and afford no gaps to



separate them into species : and this is the reason why no two ethnologists agree as to the number of species. We have cyanometers to measure the differences in the color of the sky ; perhaps we may yet have a melanometer, by the aid of which our modern philosophers may measure the shades of darkness so nicely as to determine the exact boundaries of the species, from the fairest Caucasian to the blackest African.

But if a shade of difference in color be specific, then one man may belong to two species. Let a northerner reside in Cuba a year or two, and expose himself freely to the sun and he will change his species. We have seen, that according to some of our modern classifications, the members of the same family are of different species ; but the absurdity of their principles goes even further and makes two or three species of one individual. The metaphysical scissors of Hudibras

“ Could sever and divide,  
A hair ’twixt north and north-west side.”

but our modern savants can bisect all the intermediate degrees. How shall we account for all the shades of difference in mind and body that we observe in the human family ? Certainly not by supposing that they are the hereditary traits of as many primeval pairs, for we have seen that children differ from their own parents ; and we know that various circumstances are capable of producing many of the observed differences ; and we do not know that these circumstances are not capable of producing all of them. We do not know that climate, the modes of living, civilization and barbarism, in short, all the influences, moral and physical, which have operated on men from the flood to the present day, may not have caused all the difference we now behold. Even if this be not a sufficient explanation, the doctrine of the unity of our race will not be affected, for it is easier to suppose that God has degraded men, and families, and races, in penalty for their crimes than to suppose the multitudinous creations involved in the doctrine of a plurality of species.

We know that heat tends to darken the skin. This is one item of knowledge with which we are all familiar. But is it capable of changing the color of the Caucasian into that of the negro ? This is the question. I answer that it may do this in a long course of generations. Perhaps in a few hundred years. Life is short and such a change requires a long time, so that we cannot estimate it from actual observation. Like the growth of the oak it is so gradual that we cannot see the change during a short period of observation. From the cradle to the coffin of even the octogenarian but little change is observed in objects whose



mutations are tardy. They appear the same in the evening as in the morning of life. A small segment of a great circle appears as a straight line. Could we follow it far enough the curve would be evident. Facts go to prove that climate has changed the white to the black man. Apriori, we would suppose this possible from our knowledge of the effects of heat, but facts are not wanting to show that the change has been really effected. I quote from Cardinal Wiseman a few of such facts.

"All classes of men, Persians, Greeks, Tartars, Turks and Arabs, in a few generations, without any intermarriage with the Hindoos, assume a deep olive tint little less dark than the Negro, which seems natural to the climate." He is speaking of the climate of India.

Again—"The Portuguese natives form unions among themselves alone; or if they can, with Europeans, yet the Portuguese have during three hundred years residence in India become as black as Kafirs." Now facts of this kind abound in works on the natural history of man. The whole evening would not suffice for the briefest recital of them. So that it is certain that a white man may become black. We learn from Pritchard, on competent authority, that there is in India every shade of color in the same race—that there are white Pariahs and black Brahmins, and vice versa; so that the color does not depend on the caste. The American Indians which are admitted to be one race present also all the varieties of color. For example the California Indians very much resemble the negroes in color and features. La Perouse compares them to the negroes of the West Indies, whilst in the extreme north, they are found with fair complexions. Captain Dixon says that the natives of Port Mulgrave are so covered with paint that it is difficult to determine what is their color. He adds "we persuaded one woman to wash her face and hands and the alteration in her appearance surprised us. Her countenance had all the cheerful glow of an English milk-maid, and the healthy red which flushed her cheeks was even beautifully contrasted with the whiteness of her neck. Her forehead was so remarkably clear that the translucent veins were seen ramifying in their minutest branches." Mr. Rollins says that their hair is of a chesnut color. Speaking of the aborigines of South America, Mr. D'Orbigny remarks, "The Peruvian differs more from the Patagonian, and a Patagonian from a Guarani than does a Greek from an Ethiopian or a Mongole. We could quote numerous authors to prove that the natives of high mountainous districts are whiter than those of the lowlands, in the same latitude. Differences in the degree of heat fully explain the phenomena. It is a matter of fact then, that the white man may become black. It is a matter of fact, that of the same race, some are white and others are black.



The earliest records of history place man in Asia in the valley of the Euphrates in the northern temperate zone. Take a map in your hand. Egypt is not far off; only a short distance to the southwest. Thitherward a portion of the descendants of Noah, bent their march in the early morning of the post-diluvian world. They ascended the Nile to Nubia, Abyssinia, and to the ardent regions of tropical Africa; and still onward beyond the Tropic of Cancer, to the Cape of Tempests. The first tropical climate reached by man was that of Africa; and there where he has been burned and carbonized by the suns of four thousand years he is blackest. This seems to have been the land of Nod to the descendants of Ham. Starting southeastward from the plain of Shinar, other families and tribes reached Persia, Afghanistan, India, Burmah, Malacca, and the equinoctial line in the Islands of Sumatra, and Borneo. Here again in the tropical region of southern India—in Malacca, in Sumatra, and the other Tropical Islands of the south sea, we find the skin of the natives deepening to the sable hue of Ethiopia. They are not yet so black, as a general rule, as in Africa, where man found a hotter and dryer climate, and where he settled at an earlier day. Man is cosmopolitan and omniverous—he can live every where and subsist on every variety of food. He may be darkened by a southern sun or whitened by northern frosts, but neither can arrest his march or oppose insuperable barriers to his sovereignty or dominion. He subsists on the dainty fruits of the glowing Islands of eternal summer, and reposes beneath the shades of umbrageous trees, listening to the songs of rainbow colored birds. He cultivates the fields of the temperate zones and with due forecaste provides for the changing seasons. He inhabits ice built villages on the dreary coasts of Siberia, and harpoons the whale, amid the rigors and storms of the Arctic seas. His civilization may languish and his face may blacken, as he marches southward to the line. His civilization may pause in the presence of the eternal snows which bleach him to whiteness, yet he, universal man, in virtue of the mental and physical powers bestowed on him by his Maker, is lord and master of this lower world.

From Burmah, following the shores of the sea of China north-westward; the shores of the blue sea, the yellow sea, the sea of Corea, man finally reached America by the straits of Berhing, and spread from the ice-bound regions of the north, across the entire hemisphere, to the snow invested islands of the land of fire. Here, too, we find him varying in color, and this variation influenced by climate. If the tropical Indian is not as black as the tropical African, may it not be because the former has not been so long subjected to these climatic influences



as the latter. Let us return to the banks of the Euphrates. From this cradle of mankind issued families and clans, not only to Africa and Eastern Asia, but to northwestern Europe and northeastern Asia: and it is in these northern latitudes where man settled in the earliest ages that he is whitest.

I do not mean to assert that men are black or white, just in the degree of their proximity to the equator or the poles; but I feel disposed to say that such would be the case were all other things equal—as the degree of altitude, the dryness and moisture of the atmosphere, and in general everything that enters into the constitution of climate; the length of residence, the isolation and mixture of races, &c.

A moderately white race may be inter-tropical, if it has occupied its position but a few hundred years; and a black colony may migrate beyond Cancer or Capricorn, and remain black for many hundreds of years. There is every variety of climate even within the tropics; the Andes are covered with everlasting snows even under the equator. Islands are moister than continents. The following conclusions of Pritchard seem to be fully justified by the immense array of facts which he adduces. "Thus," says he, "it is obvious that the inter-tropical region of the earth is the principal seat of the black races of men; and the region remote from the tropics that of the white races; and that the climate approaching to the tropics are inhabited by races which are neither of the darkest nor of the fairest complexion, but of an intermediate one. To this observation it may be added, that high mountainous countries of great elevation are generally inhabited by people of a lighter color than those where the level is low, such as sandy or swampy plains on the sea coast. \* \* \* \* \*

In fact," continues the author, "if we divide Africa into three portions we may define by the tropics the extent of the black color of its inhabitants."

The argument that the black man does not become white by long residence in a cold climate, has no weight, even if true; for it does not follow that the absence of the sun should whiten a man whom its presence has blackened. The mere absence of that which kills cannot restore life. Time and toil produce old age and decrepitude; but there does not exist on this earth a rejuvenescent fountain to bring him back to the bright and halcyon days of youth. It is easier to make white wool black, than to make black wool white. But I am not certain that climate may not change the black man to the white one. I think that our northern negroes are not so dark as those of the south; and that in a few centuries, those of them who reside in very cold countries will



become passably white. I think I may safely say, that they are not so dark here in Missouri as in Dahomey and other parts of Africa. I made the remark only the other day of a very black woman, that she must have been born in Guinea. I was slightly mistaken, the mother of the woman had been imported. Why should color be regarded as a mark of specific difference in men, when it is known that the same species of other animals, as the horse, the cow, the dog, are of all colors, from the snowy white to the deepest black; and why should it be denied that climate affects the color of man, when it is known that it affects the color of all other animals? But our belief that all men have a common parentage, would not be affected even it should be demonstrated that climate has not produced all the varieties of color which we see. There seem to be now and then accidental productions of various colors. We call them *accidental*, because we do not understand how they are effected. Albinos or white children are often born of black parents. The reverse may sometimes happen, and these accidental changes of color are often transmissible. Our time is too short to permit even the mention of these accidental varieties of color and of form. A family of Arabs residing in the valley of the Jordan, having the color and the hair and the features of negroes, is described by a recent traveler; and it was ascertained that it was of the pure Arabian blood.

The differences in organic form are as far from constituting marks of different species as the shades of color. Dr. Morton has defined a species to be "a primordial organic form": very well, I accept the definition; but I say that there was but one primordial organic form, or, in other words, one species; and to assert that there were more, would be to assume (not prove) the doctrine of a plurality of species. It is true, we have the oval face, common amongst Caucasians, and the high cheek bones and pyramidal skulls, common to the Mongolians, and the thick lips and prognathous jaws common to some of the black races; but then there are all the intermediate forms. Civilization and barbarism, have a great deal to do with the size and shape of the head and the cast of the features, as much perhaps as climate with the color of the skin. The brain is the organ of the mind, and mental culture develops the brain. Any organ not exercised suffers emaciation. The heads of savages should not then be as large as those of sages. The Irish of Connaught, though of the same race with those of Leinster, have many of them receding foreheads, prognathous jaws and thick lips, which can scarcely be made to stretch over thin projecting teeth, whilst their more cultivated brethren in the latter province are the finest



specimens of humanity. The natives of the South American Andes, who have occupied those highlands for centuries, have much larger chests and lungs than those of the lowlands: the necessity of breathing a rarer atmosphere, is the cause of this apparently preternatural development. This great size of the chest might be regarded as a proof of specific difference, but for the fact that we are acquainted with the circumstances which cause it. A philosopher like Agassiz might make of these South-American highlands a distinct province, having its peculiar species of men, its peculiar Flora and Fauna. The fact that there are physical differences between wild and domesticated animals of the same species, accords with the views here advocated in regard to man. The horse, the hog, the sheep, the cow, goat and many other animals, were brought to America by the Spaniards. These animals multiplied rapidly and great numbers of them ran wild. It is known that they are of the same stock with the domesticated animals, and yet the differences between them are so great that they might well be mistaken for different species. The wild boar and the domesticated hog, which are known to be of the same species, differ from each other more than the Caucasian and the African Negro. The savage and cultivated plants of the same species afford differences quite as great; but space cannot be afforded in an essay like the present for analogical evidences. The changes observed in man himself, show that he may present great diversities of color and form, and yet be of the same species; and I merely allude, in passing, to the fact, that similar or greater changes are observed in the lower animals and in the vegetable kingdom.

The similarity of the languages of the various races of mankind, shows the unity of their origin. At first sight nothing can appear more diverse than the English and French, the Greek and Latin, the Sanscrit and German: nothing more diverse than the various languages of Asia and America; but a closer study has shown that in both a lexical and grammatical point of view, they are tolerably nearly allied. This close resemblance of language is irreconcilable with the doctrine that men have been created at different points, and have had for thousands of years no communication with each other. It points to a common origin for the entire race. Our native American Indians, it has been concluded, were created on this continent, and had no intercourse with other races until after the discovery of the new world by Columbus. This supposition is shown to be false by the similarity of their languages with those of eastern Asiatics. The indefatigable missionary Father de Smedt, has shown that a vast number of Indian words are



common to them and the Coriaks, and other tribes beyond the Straits of Berhing. I could give a long list of them from Father de Smedt's essay, were it necessary. Now, it cannot have been by accident, that the same arbitrary signs of things were adopted by tribes between which there had been no communication. Agassiz has remarked, that it is natural for man to speak, and that different tribes speaking the same language is no more evidence of any intercourse, than the fact that animals making certain similar sounds common to their genus or species, is a proof of previous communication with each other. This is evidently a false view. The natural expressions of the passions might be the same in different tribes of men without previous communication just as with animals—not so such arbitrary signs as a spoken or written language. Nature does not dictate whether we shall call a human being man with English, or homo with the Latins, or homme with the French, or mensch with the Germans; or whether we shall call an infant, bambino, kind, or papoose. All these names are arbitrary; one is as natural as another; and when we find different tribes agreeing in these arbitrary signs, it is proof positive that at least they have had intercourse with each other. The decision of the Academy of St. Petersburg on this subject, after long researches, was this, “that all languages are to be considered as dialects of one now lost.”

The conclusion of Klaproth was about the same, notwithstanding his disbelief of the Mosaic account of the confusion of tongues at Babel. Schlegel, Baron W. Humboldt, Herder and a host of others celebrated authorities might be quoted in support of this view. Herder says, “there is, if we deeply examine the subject, really but one alphabet in the world.” The same author remarks, “that from the examination of languages the separation amongst mankind is shown to have been violent;—not indeed that they voluntarily changed their language; but that they were rudely and suddenly divided from one another.” Cardinal Wiseman eloquently compares the languages of the world to those grouped, but disunited masses which geologists consider the ruins of former mountains, the similarity of their veins and tallies showing that they were originally united, and the roughness and abruptness of their outlines, that they had been rent assunder by some violent convulsion.

The arts and sciences indicate the common origin of mankind. They have travelled with the wise men from the same land of man's earliest traditions. The Goths, received the light of civilization from Italy. Rome, borrowed her laws and her literature from Athens; and even Greece, was barbarian until Cadmus arrived with his Phenician letters.



The Orient is the source as well of knowledge as of nations. All the early histories and traditions, the abiding records and the dim recollections of mankind point to this community of their origin. The Phœnician, Sanconiathan, after Moses, the most ancient historian, speaks in the fragments that remain of his writings, of the first pair from which descended the entire human race; of the garden of Eden, of the Serpent and of the general Deluge. Berosus, the historian of Babylon agrees with the Jewish lawgiver in his account of Adam and his fall, of the Ark, and the Flood; and Josephus, who has preserved these fragments of Berosus, affirms that this historian mentions the descendants of Noah, with their respective ages down to the time of Nabonassur, king of Babylon. The Zendavista of the Persians contains an account of one human pair placed in a garden, the parents of the human race. According to a profound Hebrew scholar, and philosopher, the Abbe Du Rocher, the histories of Egypt, by Manetha, Herodotus, and Eratasthenes, are but echos of the Bible from Noah, down to the date of the Babylonian captivity, and these histories are but the facts of the sacred history altered and mixed up with an enormous amount of fable and false traditions. The same remarks apply according to the learned Duclot, to Chinese history. It places the deluge under the reign of Yao, and represents it as covering the tops of the highest mountains, and speaks of their Peyrum, a mortal favored by God, who was saved in a bark from the general inundation. The Hindoo, Shaster, gives an account of the first man and woman. In the ancient records of the Mexicans, we find an account of the deluge which destroyed all the human race but one family.

Leaving history and writen fable, we find that the barbarian and savage who have no permanent records, possess traditions evidently drawn from that earliest of all histories, the Pentateuch. The savages of our own wilderness as well as the wandering Tartar of Asia, believe that all mankind are brethren, and speak of the first pair from which they have descended. In this agree the Blackfeet and Flatheads, of the Rocky Mountains, and the Budhist wanderer on the desert of Gobi.

If then, mankind has descended from a plurality of origins, all the histories and traditions of the world are wrong, and only a few modern philosophers are right. This is impossible; for there is no possible way of accounting for this universal agreement except by the admission of the fact, that mankind descended from a common source. All the people of the earth must have had the same origin in order to possess the same traditions. Did they all without knowing anything of each other invent the same story? This is very clearly impossible. All the



facts of science, all the traditions of men bearing on this question accord with the doctrine advanced by St. Paul, in his discourse before the Areopagus at Athens, namely that the Creator hath made of one blood, all mankind. All that the nations of the earth have to do, in order to be convinced of this truth is to become acquainted with each other. Nations, and tribes, and races, and tongues; whether languishing beneath equatorial fervors or shivering amidst Siberian snows; whether civilized or savage, have only to meet and set down together, and compare notes to become convinced that they are the children of the same parents. Thus the brothers and sisters of one household who have been long separated, who have not seen nor perhaps heard of each other for a quarter of a century, may not be able to recognise one another at first sight. Vast changes will have taken place in their appearances. One may have been darkened by a southern sun; another's brow may be deeply furrowed with care as well as time; the visage of another may be hardened and brutified by crime and his body covered with rags. Emaciated and miserable, some of them may be glad to eat the crumbs that fall from the tables of opulence and seek the companionship of dogs. Others may be blessed with all the advantages of civilization, may fare sumptuously every day, be clothed in purple and fine linen and wear the aspect of refinement and joy. Let them by chance meet again. They will not think of claiming kin with each other. They will perhaps at first look at one another as belonging to different species; but let them only sit down and talk together an hour. Each one will tell the same story of parents and of home; of the brave old oak or umbrageous beach or willow under which he rested at noontide; of the rivulet in which he bathed; of the fields and woodlands through which he wandered; of the hills he climbed, and in general of the cherished though perhaps fading memories of childhood, and long before the conversation of an hour has ended their hearts will warm as the conviction flashes on their minds, that they are brethren.

The unity of our race is shown as well by the moral and intellectual as by the physical constitution of various tribes. All have the same feelings, and desires, the same hopes and fears, and in a degree the same joys and sorrows; all are operated upon by the same motives; all have an idea of a Creator, of right and wrong, of rewards and punishments; all have the same mental faculties; and the degree of difference in the power of these faculties in different races is not greater than is sometimes found in the members of the same family. We Caucasians, as we term ourselves, boast of a high order of intelligence; most people have a high opinion of themselves; but are we superior to some of the



Mongolian tribes? Can we boast greater generals than Atilla and Tamerlane, or braver men than the Magyars, or more stirring orators than Kossuth?

But let us look for a moment at what is generally regarded as the lowest class of human beings, the Hottentots and Bushmen. These have been compared to the baboon and chimpanze, especially by the English land pirates, who drove them from their homes and oppressed them. Yet these poor Hottentots are capable of civilization. They have hearts and heads, feelings and intellects, like other men. The voyager, Kolben says, that "they make the most faithful servants in the world;" and he goes on to state that "they are honest and humane, and by no means deficient in intellect; that he had known many of them who spoke several modern languages to perfection, and that they are even employed by Europeans, in affairs requiring judgment and capacity." He says that they are very fond of brandy and tobacco; but it is said that some Caucasians are fond of these: that even Anglo-Saxons, sometimes indulge in them. This, therefore, is no mark of specific difference. Civilization and christianity make of even the Hottentots, a great and powerful people, distinguished for every thing that confers honor and glory upon a nation. Is such an anticipation not reasonable? The descendants of a tribe that lived in squalid misery and solitary dens, amidst the morasses of the Vistula, have built St. Petersburg, and Moscow, and rank in arts and in arms with the most powerful and polished nations of the globe. The descendants of this tribe now guard Cronstadt and Sebastopol!

The posterity of cannibals may feed on earth's choicest dainties—civilized man may sink to the condition of brutes, and the companionship of kangaroos; the Bushman and the Australian, may arise to the level of the favored children of fortune. Dr. Good speaks of the city of Timbuctoo, in Africa, as one of the wealthiest, most populous, and best governed cities of the world; and further remarks, that it is possible that at the very period in which our own ancestors as described by Julius Cæsar, were naked and smeared over with paint, or merely clothed with the skins of wild beasts and living in huts, the black kingdom of Bambarra, of which Timbuctoo, is the capital, was as completely established and as flourishing as at the present moment. The doctor goes on to mention the names of negroes who have been members of the Academy of Paris, who have received the degree of doctor of philosophy from the University of Wurtemberg, and whose taste and genius have enriched the polite literature of even England. From such facts as these, and their name is legion, may we not reasonably conclude with



the quaint old orator quoted by Dr. Good, that the negro like the white man is still God's image, though carved in ebony?

But the monuments of Egypt! Turn we our attention to this morning land of earth and its history. It is asserted by some modern writers that negroes were painted on these monuments as early as the date assigned to the flood. If this be even an approximation to the truth, then I should be disposed to invoke another cause, in addition to climate, to explain the fact. If negroes existed but a very short time after the flood, I should attribute their color and conformation to a supernatural cause; not that I would deny the powerful influences of climate and civilization, but a hundred or even two hundred years of heat and barbarism appear to me to be too short a time for the conversion of a white man into a negro. This may be, or rather may have been, possible, but it is not easily believed; and, as already remarked, if negroes can be shown to have existed with the present color and features two thousand years before Christ, I should attribute the fact more to supernatural than to natural causes. I should attribute it to the curse of Noah, pronounced upon the descendants of Ham, and which doomed them to be the servants of servants. I know that in these hyper-philosophic days it is regarded as rather unscientific and hardly in good taste, to attribute anything to supernatural causes. But the fact is, that we cannot get along without such causes. We cannot even get a start without them. The atoms of which the material universe is composed, the sun and stars, the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and we ourselves were ushered into existence by some supernatural cause. Even our plurality philosophers have to admit this. They are not quite prepared to assert the eternity of matter, and to attribute all its present forms to the fortuitous conjunction of its vagabond atoms. We are obliged to refer the commencement of all things to a miracle. The creation of man was a miracle, and we, who hold to the unity of the race, are under the necessity of invoking but one or at most two miracles; one for the creation of the first man and woman, and another for such changes in their posterity as climate and other natural causes may not have been sufficient to produce, admitting for the sake of argument such to exist: whilst those who hold the plurality doctrine and who assert that a miracle is "the silliest of all desperate suppositions," invoke ten times as many miracles as we. Some of them seem to think that there were a hundred or so of such miracles. It is strange that men of science and of sense should thus contradict themselves. A miracle is the "silliest of all desperate suppositions," when adduced in support of unity, but you may introduce as many as you



please to prop up the plurality of origins. Some modern ethnologists seem to think it more reasonable to conclude that man was created in Egypt, than that he migrated thither from the plains of Shinar; that men like trees are confined to the soil of their origin, that they cannot get from one island to another in sight of it; that certain sorts of men belong to the fauna of certain districts as opossums do to the fauna of Kentucky; and so they go on peopling the islands and continents by what they have already condemned as "the silliest of all desperate suppositions."

Now it was certainly not difficult for the descendants of one pair to reach every part of the world. Noah could have walked around it nine times during the time he lived after the flood, at the majestic and patriarchal rate of one mile and a half per day. Europe, Asia and Africa, are united by land, and America is separated from Asia by the narrow straits of Behring; surely the descendants of Noah, could easily have reached all these places. In what condition do our opponents suppose man to have been originally created? Was he created a savage or a civilized being, an adult or an infant? The idea of peopling desert continents and islands with infants, incapable of self protection, seems not in accordance with sound reason. Just think of a swarm of babies alighting on an uninhabited island! Moreover it is not in accordance with our ideas of divine wisdom and goodness, that men should be created in a savage state: then, the most reasonable theory is, that he was ushered into existence, full grown and civilized. Now, if "swarms of men," as some say, have been created at various points all over the globe; civilized, full grown men and women; is it not strange that none of these swarms have left us any record of the fact, nor even a tradition of it? There is no authentic history of but one such "swarm," and that swarm consisted of one man and one woman. As according to the plurality doctrine, man is created on continents and islands as soon as they are fitted for his abode, would it not be well for a commission to be appointed to watch some uninhabited island and test the doctrine; see how man is created; see how the "swarms" of men make their advent. I am disposed to think that said swarms would neither fall from the clouds nor spring up from the earth, but arrive on steamboats, and that the afore-said commission would find them speaking familiarly of most earthly things; perhaps speaking of keows and to hum, and guessing shrewdly on different subjects, and projecting tobacco juice all over their newly found Eden.

Leaving our scientific commission with their newly created swarm of green-horns, let us return to the Nile. Is it certain that those mon-



uments, and paintings, and inscriptions, are as old as some have thought? Have the hieroglyphics been rightly interpreted in all instances? and do they always tell the truth, even when rightly interpreted?—Egyptian darkness shrouds these questions. At any rate the connoisseurs in Nilotic lore differ vastly as to the dates of Egypt's dynasties and monuments. Thus Bockh places Menes, the first Pharaoh, 5702 years B. C.; Bunsen places him 3643 B. C, whilst Wilkerson, thinks that there is no evidence for more than about 2000 years. A difference of more than three thousand years in their computations, shows that there is no certainty about these ancient Egyptian dates — some authors making Menes older than Adam, and Egypt older than the world, and others placing both some hundreds of years posterior to the flood. But, say the long chronologists, there were 30 dynasties from Menes to the time of the historian Manetho, who records them. Admit it—but, then, according to the authorities quoted by the Abbe Duclot, some of these dynasties were simultaneous, one king and his viceroys making up the list; as if we should enumerate the Lord Lieutenants of Ireland amongst English monarchs, or call President Pierce and the various governors of the States who are his cotemporaries, a dynasty: and then some of the dynasties were very short; thus, Manetho's 7th dynasty consists of 70 kings, each one reigning but a day, a dynasty of less than two months and a half. Eusebius says there were five kings reigning each a half a month. In the 14th dynasty there were 73 kings who reigned two or three years each on an average. At this rate Manetho's 30 dynasties might be gotten through within a shorter time than even the short chronologists would require.

The fate of the Zodiacs of Dendera and Esneh, will be that of many an Egyptological speculation. These Zodiacs were found upon the ceilings of temples, and an enormous antiquity was allowed them. It was contended by some savans that they were 3000, and others that they were 17000 years old. And people were frightened at the so termed discovery, until Champollion, the greatest Egyptologist of them all, demonstrated that one of the Zodiacs dates about the commencement of the Christian era, and the other a hundred and forty years after. A long battle was fought by men of science and research over these Zodiacs, and the question as perfectly settled in favor of the short chronologists. Bearing indirectly on the subject of negro antiquity in Egypt, and directly on the age of its monuments, I will here quote the highest authority that of Champollion himself. It is from an original letter, which can be seen entire in the lectures of Wiseman. Champollion says, "I have demonstrated that no Egyptian monument is really anterior to the year



2,200 before our era;" again, "the monuments of Egypt confirm our sacred history;" it will require a "swarm" of ordinary Egyptologists to invalidate such testimony as this.

To weaken the testimony afforded by sacred history, in favor of the doctrine of unity, that history has itself been scouted as a book of fables. The tactics of the pluralist are to show that the Bible is false in some of its statements, and consequently unreliable on the subject of the origin of mankind. They deny that there ever was an universal deluge. We have seen, however, that all nations believe that there was such a deluge; all ancient history speaks of it; and the deposit of marine shells even on the mountain tops, and the stratified structure of the earth's crust, almost every where found, prove that the whole globe has been at one time or other under water. The granite heads of the tallest mountains were heaved up from the level of the plain by subterranean fires, carrying with them the evidences of previous submergence. The brightest name that adorns the annals of natural science may be quoted in favor of this fact of Genesis. Cuvier, in his essay on the theory of the earth, fully endorses the Mosaic account of the flood. He says, "that there was such a flood, is established by geology." But, urge opponents, the lives of men were not as long as Genesis represents them; they think it impossible that men should have lived 900 years. Physicians can see no reason why they should not; and ancient profane history attests the great longevity of the early inhabitants of the world. Homer makes Nestor say, that the length of his life was nothing in comparison with the lives of ancient heroes. According to Hesiod the ancients lived a thousand years. Helen, the beautiful but rather faithless Helen, was about a hundred years old at the battle of Troy, and yet her husband was transported with joy at the idea of recovering her. Now-a-days elopements do not take place at 90, nor are battles fought for centenarian dulcineas. Now-a-days, when a young lady gets to be over fifty or sixty years she is looked upon as rather old maidish.

It is confidently asserted by the pluralists that man has been a denizen of the earth longer than six or seven thousand years; indeed some of them say that he has inhabited the Mississippi valley one hundred and fifty thousand years or more. Prove to me that man has been on the earth a hundred thousand years, and I shall begin to believe the theory of Lamarck, that he sprang from the monkey; perhaps he might have been developed from an oyster in such a length of time. What has man been about these hundred thousand years? It is only within the last six or seven thousand that we have any account of him. All the things which he has done, all the exploits he has performed, all the discoveries he has



made, have been accomplished very recently; many of them within the memory of the present generation. Was he asleep during the myriads of centuries that preceded the date of history? There is no evidence in nature or in history of this exaggerated antiquity of our race. The fossils of man do not prove it; his bones, found beneath the bed of the river Soame, do not prove it, nor do human remains found in the alluvium of the Mississippi. Fossil trees have been found in England fifteen feet under ground, along with medals of the time of Julius Cæsar. But for these medals and certain marks on trees, they would probably have been set down as fifty thousand years old. We know the date at which Herculaneum was destroyed. In the course of seventeen hundred years it has been covered by several layers of earth and lava to the depth of one hundred and seventy two feet; and yet the depth of the layers of lava around Ætna is brought forward as proving that that mountain has been sending forth its fires for unnumbered ages.

It was the fashion in the last century to consider the Pentateuch as a very recent book in comparison with the annals of China and of India. According to Chinese and Hindoo records, so it was said, these nations had been in existence untold ages before Adam dwelt in Eden. But China and India are pretty much abandoned now—Egypt is the oldest country in the world now-a-days. It is conceded on all hands that India and China are no older than they ought to be. But Egypt towers about a thousand years above the dawn of creation. We see that the impugners of the Mosaic account of the world, are being dragged towards the truth. They took their stand in China as far as possible from the original seat of man's creation, and said here, and not on the banks of the Euphrates was man found at the earliest epochs of the world. Forced from this position, they took refuge in India, and gloated over the fables of the Brahmins, as to the vast antiquity of that country. Beaten on that field they have fled into Egypt and taken their stand, not far from the country indicated by Moses as man's earliest home. They have been forced into Egypt, the land trodden by the feet of Abraham and the early patriarchs, and they will yet be beaten out of the valley of the Nile, and forced to take their stand with the Jewish histortan, on the plains of Shinar. All of us have heard of astronomical calculations and records made by Chinese and Hindoos, proving the Pentateuch to be too recent. But these calculations turn out to have been made backwards instead of forwards. In the same way I could prove the clock on my mantle-piece to be a thousand years old. The clock struck yesterday at the same hour it did to-day, and so on



backward as far as you please. The moon was in eclipse at a certain past time, and at a certain time beyond that again, and so on for a million of years : this would do well enough if it was first proved that there was a moon at so remote a time.

Is it not strange, that if men have been so many hundreds of thousands of years on the earth, and the Bible is so recent that no older history can be found? The Chinese have no older history than that of Confucius, who lived only 550 B. C.\* Berosus, the Chaldean historian, flourished in the time of Alexander, 330 B. C.; Herodotus, but 484, B. C.; Sanconiathon, about 1000 B. C., and the Jewish historian at least five hundred years earlier than this — the oldest historian of the world, towering above all others, as Mont Blanc above the surrounding Alps; and yet our modern scientific diletante say, Oh, he is too young, his history is too recent, he makes the world and man entirely too late for men of research; for us, ethnologists, ethnographists, geologists, paleontologists, who have studied eocene, miocene, and pliocene; who have dug up encrinites, trilobites, gasteropods, cephalopods, brachiopods and pieropods; who have disentombed megalosaurians from the oolite of Normandy; thecodontosaurians from the dolmitic conglomerate, and rhyncosarians from the new red sandstone of Grinshill; megalonyxes paleotherii geuglodons. It is too recent, as shown by researches in Egyptology, Indology, and Sinology. We may live to see Illinois bottomology brought forward to overturn the faith of mankind; and Owl-Creek-valleyology; and mummied frogs, brought from the marshes of our own State, to illustrate a course of infidel lectures on Missouri swampology. But, at any rate, it is urged, the Pentateuch makes the earth too young, if not its inhabitants. Here, the objectors are evidently going beyond their depth. Science does not enable mortal man to say how the world was created, or how long a time was required for the pristine arrangement of its component parts. We may theorise about the primal condition of matter more or less plausibly, but we cannot grasp the miracle and mystery of its existence. It appears reasonable to conclude that the earth was at first in a fluid or even gaseous state; on no other supposition can reason explain its present rounded form and its depressed poles. Here, Genesis, and the most popular theories of philosophers seem to harmonize: Moses and Humboldt speak the same language.

“In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth; and the earth was without form and void, and darkness rested upon the face of the deep”; and Humboldt says, that it is evident that the matter of which our planet and all others are composed, was, in the beginning,



dispersed as a formless, cosmical vapor throughout the regions of space.

"God said, Let there be light, and there was light;" and Humboldt says, that the world of phenomena and that which constitutes their causal reality, are dependant on the propagation of light.

Genesis represents light as existing before the sun and moon; Humboldt contends for a luminous ether existing before these celestial bodies. Genesis represents the creation of plants and the lower animals as preceding that of man; philosophers with one accord testify to the truth of the assertion. But, it is contended by many, that the six days of creation were six indefinitely long periods. How do they know this? They say, that animals and plants were entombed in the rocky layers of the earth's crust myriads of ages before the appearance of man on its surface. How do they know this? Might not the six or seven thousand years, which have elapsed since the creation of man, have sufficed for the deposition of all these strata with their contained animal and vegetable remains? How long a time was required for the original cosmical vapor, formless and void, to condense and form a globe? Is one day too short? Admit this globe to have immediately become a blazing ball, how long did it take to cool its granite surface, its vapor to condense into seas, loaded with the materials of earth's future strata? I see no reason why this might not have been done in a day by intense natural causes. This is not the fashionable view, but I cannot help it. How long a time was required to have a spot fit for the habitation of man? It seems to me that six days were sufficient. Philosophers may take their time, they may add six millions of years, it don't cost them anything.

Theologians should be a little cautious in admitting these speculations of philosophers; for the next theory in fashion may be that the world was created in six seconds instead of six days, and certainly it is as reasonable to contract a day to a second as to dilate it to a million of years. And moreover, no one will dare deny that the Creator could have performed his work as well in six seconds as in six days.

A more desperate supposition, a more reckless interpretation of language cannot be conceived, than that the six days of Genesis may mean six indefinitely long periods. No body ever thought of such an interpretation until geologists pretended to have demonstrated that the world is millions of ages old. Regarding this great age of the earth as a settled fact, frightened theologians, and non-infidel geologists set about reconciling Genesis and geology; and devised the theory of the six long periods. Let us look at this theory for a moment. On the



first day according to Genesis, matter and light were created. Now where can the human mind find any data in the bible or in geology, in common sense or even in fancy, by which to determine how long a time was required for matter and light to be created? Science is perfectly ignorant on this point; and to say that a million or a thousand years were employed in the process, is a gratuitous and foolish concession which geology does not demand and cannot demand. The infidel and honest geologist, will think nothing the better of the bible for such a concession as this. On the second day, there was a division of the waters and the arrangement of the firmament. Can human science say how long a time was required for this? The third day witnessed the separation of the land and the water; and the creation of the vegetable kingdom. Does geology furnish any data by which the length of time necessary for the work of the third day to be performed? No reasonable being will answer in the affirmative. On the fourth day the sun, moon and stars were created. How long a time was required for this work? The bible says one day—science cannot tell—compromising theologians say thousands of years; but neither reason nor science has authorised any such compromise. On the fifth day the fish and fowl—the inhabitants of the sea and the air—were created. Does geology or reason show that these were created an indefinitely long period after the vegetable kingdom? By no means, for animals, according to the reported facts, existed simultaneously with, if not previous to, vegetables. Geology wants no long period here. One day will answer all the wants of geology, and theologians may keep their long period to themselves. On the sixth day the land animals and man were created. And here again neither reason nor the probable time as shown by the strata of the earth, which elapsed between the epoch of some of the sea and some of the land animals, indicates that thousands of years transpired between the operations of these days. Fossil man has been found as well as fossil fishes, and there is no evinence that the latter were created untold ages before the former. Nothing is better calculated to make men lose all faith in revelation than the twisting of it, by so called theologians to suit every new fangled speculation of philosophers.

But to return—how long a time has been requisite to deposite all the strata from the granite upwards? No one can tell. I have suggested that all the deposits containing vegetable and animal remains, may have been formed in six or seven thousand years; because Genesis seems to me to assert it, and because geologists cannot disprove it. An ocean loaded with the materials of which these strata are composed, may



have deposited layers a thousand feet thick in a year, for aught any one knows. But it is asked, why is man not found in these layers as well as plants and the lower animals, if he was then on earth? Because man does not inhabit the ocean, and because there were but few men even on land, in the first years of the world; whereas, animals and plants were created in myriads; and of them a vast number inhabited the ocean.

To show how little agreement there is amongst geologists themselves, as to the time required for the formation of the aqueous deposits of the earth's crust, I here quote a passage from the report of a committee appointed by the French academy to examine a geological work by M. Andre. The committee says, after noticing the many contradictory theories on the subject, that "some of the authors require millions of years for the formation of the secondary deposits, whilst others say they may be formed in one year."

But, say the long chronologists, more than six thousand years are required for the formation of deltas, as that of the Nile for example. This might be true if the delta increased no faster in early, than in recent times. It is asserted by some that it has not increased perceptibly within the historic period—say that it increases none at all in one year, and then calculate how long a time has been necessary for it to attain its present size! Evidently according to this sort of reasoning the delta is eternal. But immediately after the primitive separation of land and water, when the Nile was loaded with the detritus of the Nubian hills and the mountains of the moon; or after the flood, when a similar state of things existed, the delta may have been deposited in a hundred years, with almost its present limits. So also of the alluvium of the Mississippi and other rivers.

But the Falls of Niagara, amid their thunders and spray and rainbows, have been thirty-six thousand years in cutting their escarpment from Queenstown to their present site. So it is said, but it is not proved. This would be true admitting that the Falls were originally at Queenstown, and that they have been wearing their way up stream at the rate of a foot a year. But are these data certain? Grant a logician his data, and he can prove what he pleases. In early times, when the rocks were newly deposited and soft, may not the mighty current have cut them at the rate of three hundred yards in a year.

Cuvier warns us over and over, against the error of attempting to explain the present condition of the earth by causes now in action. "It is in vain," says he, "to seek amidst the forces now acting on the surface of the earth for causes sufficiently powerful to produce the revolu-



tions and catastrophes of which its exterior bears traces." The earth seems comparatively quiet now; it is enjoying a sort of Sabbath; but who can estimate the changes which might have taken place in a year in the earlier epochs, when it was the sport of the two great revolutionizing causes, fire and water. When the Andes, the Alps, the Himalayan and Rocky Mountains, were being upheaved, deluging continents; when islands were springing all blazing from the ocean, and again sinking in its mysterious caverns; when volcanos were rocking the globe, and spouting forth their fires on every side. The earth cannot be very old in its present form, of land and ocean, mountain and plain. Mr. Deluc has shown that the accumulation of the detritus brought down by glaciers is nearly constant every year, and, that by calculation, the deposit thus formed, cannot have required more than five or six thousand years. Dolomieu comes to the same conclusion from similar investigations; and here, again, I may mention the authority of Cuvier, who agrees with Dolomieu and Deluc. Dunes or downes, as they are also called, which are moving sand banks, serve also as chronometers of the earth. These sand hills first accumulate on the seashore and then gradually invade the interior lands under the influence of winds. M. Bremon tier has submitted these dunes to calculation. He found that they advanced from sixty to seventy-two feet a year; and then, by measuring the entire space they had traveled, he concluded that they cannot have commenced much more than four thousand years ago. Deluc had previously come to the same conclusion, from measuring the sand-hills of Holland, where the dates of the dykes enabled him to ascertain the rate of their progress with absolute certainty.

In passing over the various topics connected with the subject of my lecture, I have been obliged to be very brief; I have been obliged to leave much unsaid that I wished to say. I am not disposed to enter the province of the theoiogian, but the fact is, that the natural and theological sciences are so intimately connected, that in discussing the one the other is necessarily brought into view. Nature and revelation have a common author, and are consequently in harmony with each other. Man may array them in attitudes of hostility to each other, by false and distorted interpretation, and thus injure the cause of both. Nature will never contradict revelation. Science will not curse religion, though adjured to do so by infidel philosophers.

When the tents of Israel were pitched on the plains of Moab, Balak, the son of Zippor, sent for Balaam, the son of Beor, to come and curse the invaders; and he took the soothsayer to the high places of Baal



and built altars and offered sacrifices. But all in vain, Balaam could not curse whom God had blessed. The enraged king then conducted him to the top of Pisgah, hoping that the prophet would launch his maledictions from thence. But lo, Balaam blessed the chosen people. The lofty top of Peor was next tried; but there, in full view of the God-guarded encampment, the enraptured seer exclaimed, "How goodly are thy tents, oh Jacob, and thy tabernacles, oh Israel!"

Thus has the Balak of modern skepticism called on the Balaam of science to oppose, and condemn, and invalidate the facts and principles of the bible. Thus have its opposers invoked the records of nations, and the monuments of nature to put down, eclipse and extinguish the faith of christendom and the world. Science has been forced upon the tripod in China, in India and in Egypt; but her responses have not satisfied her torturers. She has been tempted in the lonely wilderness, and buffeted in the thoroughfares of civilization. She has been transported to mountain tops, and the pinnacles of temples and pyramids. She has been forced to stand amid the silent grandeurs of fallen empires; to pore over the dead languages of crumbling columns and obelisks; to unwrap the cerements of the grave from long buried generations; to count the successive seas of lava poured forth by Vesuvius and Ætna; to note the march of cataracts amid their thunders; to dig the monsters of bygone ages from their rocky tombs; to sound the depths of earth's strata, and ocean's bosom; to scan the heavens and grow dizzy in the contemplation of their vastness and their wonders; to measure time and space, and sink beneath the thought of their infinitude. But instead of cursing her heaven-born sister, Revelation, she has intoned in her honor a psalm of praise and benediction to be chanted with increasing rapture throughout all coming time.