

Whence, whence came to our sinful race the idea of such a Being, of such a kingdom? Has man's reason framed it; and the human imagination, hath that gendered it? With cold eye and heart I might gaze on the face of nature in her grandest or her loveliest scenes; with intellectual delight I may scan the principles and follow out the deductions of an abstract scheme of philoſophic speculation; with sublime wonder I may follow the astronomer as he describes the laws and order of firmaments and systems radiant in their solar light; I may feel all my human sympathies enlisted by any philanthropic scheme which would bring justice and love into this world so full of oppression and hatred; but when I think of the wonders of our Saviour's Person and of the glories of his redemptive work, of all his love, his love for me a sinner, his love to all so great that He could die for all, and of that blessed and perpetual kingdom which his blood has purchased and of which He is the ever living Head; when, in some rapt moment, my heart can realize this in all its fulness, then, if ever, is my whole being filled with the profoundest emotions of awe, of gratitude, and of love. Never is the soul so conscious of its full capacities of thought and feeling, never does it throb with such unwonted and divine life, as when it has most fully grasped the majestic reality of the Christian faith, as a wondrous and harmonious whole, tending to the highest imaginable end, and centering in that glorious Being who unites divinity with humanity and reconciles heaven with earth.

In comparison with the fulness, fitness, and sufficiency of such a system, the most colossal structure which pantheism ever reared is but as a palace of ice, cold and cheerless, contrasted with that heavenly city, whose gates are pearl, whose streets are gold, thronged with a company innumerable and exultant, vocal with the melodies of the redeemed, of which the Lamb is the light, and God the glory.

ARTICLE V.

REMARKS ON BUNSEN'S LATE WORK UPON EGYPT.

THE Chevalier Bunsen, who has been for some years the Prussian minister at the court of St. James, is publishing in German and in English, a work on Egypt, which has been anticipated with much pleasure by all who are acquainted with his talents, or who have taken

any interest in Egyptian discoveries. The author possesses, in many respects, eminent qualifications for the work which he has undertaken. He is now in the full maturity of his powers. His early studies were purely philological, and were completed at Göttingen under the direction of Heyne and Heeren. He then went to Paris, and under the guidance of De Sacy and others, attended to several of the oriental languages. Having studied Sanskrit, he formed a plan of visiting India in company with an Englishman, and proceeded to Florence for that purpose. His fellow traveller failing to meet him there, Bunsen went to Rome, where he found his early friend, Professor Brandis, then secretary of Niebuhr, the Prussian ambassador. Niebuhr became immediately interested in him, and animated and directed his studies. He was subsequently appointed Niebuhr's private secretary, and then secretary to the embassy. After the departure of the distinguished historian, Bunsen became minister resident at the Papal Court. A visit of the bookseller Cotta at Rome, in the winter of 1817-18, occasioned the preparation of a very able and comprehensive work on the Antiquities of Rome, by Bunsen, Platner, Gerhard, and others. While in Rome, Bunsen formed the acquaintance of Champollion the Younger, with whom he studied the hieroglyphics on the Egyptian obelisks in that city. Since 1838, when he left Rome, Bunsen has resided for the most part in London, as Prussian ambassador. He is a gentleman no less distinguished for the excellence of his moral and religious character, for the liberality of his views,¹ and for his generous feelings, than for the extent of his knowledge and his accurate learning.

Bunsen's work, now before us, is entitled, "Egypt's Place in Universal History : an Historical Investigation, in five Books." It is to be included in three volumes. Two volumes of the German edition and one of the English are printed. The latter is not a mere version, but is in some respects a new work. "It owes," says the author, "many valuable remarks and additions, particularly in the grammatical, lexicographic, and mythological part, to Mr. Samuel Birch of the British Museum." The hieroglyphical signs, instead of being given in separate plates, are printed by the side of their respective interpretations. In the Coptic explanations in the Dictionary, the author has enjoyed the aid of Professor Moritz Schwarze of Berlin, who has been sent to London to prepare for publication important Coptic MSS. found in the British Museum and other libraries in England. Mr.

¹ Some of our readers will remember the affection and reverence with which the late Dr. Arnold speaks of him.

Bunsen is also in constant communication with Professor Lepsius. The system of Egyptian chronology drawn up by Bunsen has been adopted substantially by Lepsius.

The first volume of the English work contains only the first of the five Books. It treats of the sources and primeval facts of Egyptian History, under the six following heads :

The Nature and Antiquity of Egyptian Tradition, especially of the Sacred Books; The Researches of the Greeks into Egyptian Chronology—Herodotus, Diodorus, Eratosthenes, etc.; Egyptian Tradition among the Jews, the Biblical accounts, the Septuagint, Josephus, etc., and the Christian researches into the Chronology of Egypt, by Young, Champollion, Wilkinson, Rosellini, and others; The fourth Section is on Egyptian Grammar. The fifth is on the Writings of the Egyptians, containing a Sketch of the History of Modern Hieroglyphical Discovery, and the sixth is on the Egyptian Mythology. Two large Appendices of nearly 300 pages, contain an Egyptian Vocabulary, and a complete List of Hieroglyphical Signs.

In the 2d Book, Mr. Bunsen proposes to restore the chronology of the Old Empire, a period of 1076 years according to the data of Eratosthenes. In the 3d Book, he will treat of the Period of the Middle and New Empires, comprising nine and thirteen centuries respectively, following the guidance of Manetho. In the 4th Book, Mr. Bunsen proposes to test the Chronological Results of his researches, first by astronomy and secondly by historical synchronisms; in other words, to gain fixed points of time both by contemporaneous celestial phenomena and of remarkable events in the history of other nations. The 5th and last Book will contain a survey of General History, intended to exhibit whatever in the History of Egypt is of importance for the human mind, or mankind in general.

It is not our intention to offer any criticisms on the general views or theories advanced in this work, or to express any opinion of its merits. It would be obviously improper to pass any judgment upon it, were we possessed of the ability, while so large a part of the work remains unpublished. All which we propose to do in this Article is to offer two observations of a general character, and then some suggestions on a particular statement of the author.

Our first remark is, that the work, even should it fail of the special object which the author has in view—to establish the position of Egypt in universal History—cannot fail to be instructive in a high degree. It will furnish a comprehensive outline of the entire subject. A survey of so rich and wide a field by a scholar so able and experienced, will serve as landmarks to future explorers. It will bring

subjects of great extent and of no little intricacy into such a shape that many may be able to understand and pursue the investigations.

Our second general remark relates to the confident tone, the decisive air with which the author advances his propositions and announces his results. His bearing, indeed, towards individuals is eminently courteous, as every one would expect from his position and character. At the same time, we are struck with the rapidity with which the author disposes of the opinions and views of others, and with the firm faith which he feels in his own.

As examples of this unshaken reliance in the correctness of his own views, and the untenable nature of those adopted by his predecessors, we may refer to his assertion that he shall feel called upon decidedly to combat almost every one of the chronological views of Champollion. He also expresses his conviction that the chronological system of Rosellini is essentially as groundless as the one adopted by Champollion, though he pays the fullest credit to the value of the labors of both in other departments. "The path pursued by the English travellers Felix, Salt, Burton, Wilkinson, and others," he remarks, "is by no means satisfactory. With regard to the time prior to the 18th dynasty, the English inquirers stand on the same rough and unsafe ground as Champollion and Rosellini. Even as regards the period where they wholly or chiefly follow the old series of royal succession, they have plainly abandoned, together with the order and number of the kings, the dates also of the individual reigns, and hence have become involved in still grosser self-contradiction than the French and Italian critics."

Now in some respects a scholar able and learned, as Bunsen is acknowledged to be, is entitled to speak with confidence of the results of his investigations. He enjoyed an excellent preparatory, classical training, and he seems to have patiently and fundamentally studied all the sources of information accessible in Europe. He has thus been in possession of advantages, to some extent, of forming a truer judgment than a mere practical explorer in Egypt. Still, on the other hand, examination of the Egyptian antiquities on the spot forms one indispensable element to an adequate and perfectly trustworthy judgment. There is no substitute for the sight of the eye. Champollion, Rosellini, and Wilkinson, in addition to the great advantage derived from actual inspection in the localities, are familiar with all the principal literary helps and sources on which Bunsen relies. Rosellini was an eminently safe investigator, discarding all theories, and searching only for the facts, the real phenomena. Wilkinson has the unaffected modesty of genuine science. He everywhere shows that he is search-

ing for the truth, not contending for victory, or to support a favorite hypothesis. The reader insensibly feels more respect for his judgments than if they were propounded categorically, or with undoubting confidence.

It should be remarked that Mr. Bunsen enjoys the special aid of the latest Egyptian investigator, Professor Lepsius. But as the principal results of his labors are not yet published, we cannot form a correct judgment of the importance of the additions which he will make to our knowledge of the subject. It seems, however, to be the impression in Germany, that there will be some disappointment in this respect; that the ardent hopes cherished of the value of his discoveries will not all be fulfilled. If we may form an opinion from a little work which he has published in relation to Mount Sinai, we should have some misgiving in respect to the soundness of his judgment.

The particular passage on which we wish to offer a few remarks, is found on page 32d of the Introduction, and is as follows:

"The germs of national existence which we find in Egypt, are not the most ancient traces of humanity. No historical investigator will consider the Egyptians as the most ancient nation of the earth, even before he has called to his assistance the science of the philologist and mythologist. Their very history shows them to belong to the great Middle Ages of mankind." "The Egyptian patriarchs, perhaps, were descended from a cognate race, which sprang, in like manner, from another of kindred origin."

We may remark, in the outset, that the question which we are about to consider is wholly distinct from that pertaining to the antiquity of the earth itself. If it be admitted that the date of the creation of the earth is very ancient, it does not follow that the date of the creation of man is to be indefinitely extended.

The argument, substantially, for this indefinite extension of the Egyptian national existence, and of the life of man on earth, is drawn from the high state of civilization and of many of the arts in Egypt, at a very early period. "The Egyptians had the same arts," Mr. Wilkinson observes, "the same manners and customs, the same style of architecture and were in the same advanced state of refinement, on the arrival of Joseph in Egypt in the reign of the first Osirtasen, as in the reign of Remeses II.," an interval of several hundred years. "There is palpable proof," says Mr. Bunsen, "that the old Egyptian language, in so far as yet known or investigated, was in its essential element, a *legacy*, inherited by Menes and his empire from their forefathers." Menes reigned, as Bunsen interprets Manetho, 3555 years before Alexander the Great.

1. The first observation which we would offer on this position, or on what seems to be implied in Mr. Bunsen's remarks, is the very obvious one, that all the attempts hitherto made to assign an indefinite antiquity to different nations, have proved abortive. However gratifying to national vanity, the assumption has hitherto been entirely unsubstantiated. In reference to China, India, Persia, and Greece, this exaggerated chronology has been brought within reasonable limits, with the sanction of all scholars who have attended to the subject. The recent excavations in the plain of Assyria, though revealing a high antiquity, do not as yet afford any countenance to the idea of an indefinitely distant origin of the people.

2. Our second remark is, that in all researches into the ancient history of mankind, and into the Egyptian antiquities among others, the highest credit is due to the Biblical notices, even if we regard them (apart from their divine authority) as a common authentic history, like the histories of Herodotus and Josephus. They have been subjected to every species of scrutiny, and their accuracy, not merely their general, but their minute accuracy, has been demonstrated. Mr. Layard's investigations in Assyria, prove that the shades of thought, the minute colorings in the delineations of the Hebrew Prophets, were wonderfully exact. We may be allowed to refer to a few testimonials. The English traveller, Legh, remarks that the Old Testament is, beyond all comparison, the most interesting and instructive guide which an Oriental traveller can consult. "The oldest and most authentic record of the primeval state of the world," remarks Mr. Wilkinson, "is unquestionably the Scripture History." "Wherever any fact is mentioned in the Bible History," he continues, "we do not discover anything on the Egyptian monuments which tends to contradict it." The same cannot be affirmed of Josephus, or Diodorus, or Herodotus, or Manetho. "All the kings of Egypt," says Champollion-Figeac, "named in the Bible," except the two mentioned in the history of Joseph and Moses, "are found on the Egyptian monuments, in the same order of succession and at the precise epochs where the sacred writers place them." "It has been said that Egyptian studies tended to impair the belief in the historical documents furnished by Moses. The application of my discovery, on the contrary, goes invincibly to support them."¹

Now this acknowledged accuracy, which might be drawn out into a multitude of particulars, does not cover merely common *historical* events, but it extends to the genealogies of nations. In the tenth

¹ Letter of Champollion-Figeac to the duke of Blacas.

chapter of Genesis, there is a tabular view of the origin and distribution of the different families and nations of the earth, which is recognized as authentic and veritable by all classes of critics. One of the most recent and sceptical of these, Bruno Bauer, admits that in no nation of antiquity, is there found a survey so universal of the relations of different nations. John Von Müller, a critic of the opposite school, says that all true history must begin with this chapter. A number of the earliest names found in this table, are likewise found on the Egyptian monuments. Much doubt rests on the application of some of these names; yet, so far as any light has been thrown upon them by the monuments and by profane history, it has been shown that they belong to a perfectly trustworthy document. Now this table asserts that Egypt was colonized from Assyria, by a grandson of Noah, forming a race not cognate with any other, but *identical* with that of the common ancestor of man.

3. A third observation suggested by Mr. Bansen's theory is this, that in order to account for the early and extraordinary civilization of the Egyptians, we may assume that the *original* condition of man was not that of barbarism. Had we no positive evidence of this, we should reason correctly, *à priori*, that the Supreme Being, who originally formed man, according to the hypothesis of all, by direct creation, would not introduce him into the world as a savage or barbarian. Ignorant we may suppose him to have been, in the sense that his powers and faculties were undeveloped, but still, all the germs were there, in a strength and a harmony too, which would not require long years of necessity to unfold them. It is utterly derogatory to all our ideas of the Creator to suppose that he would form a being, as an image of Himself, who could provide for his wants only by the most slow and toilsome steps, arriving at a degree of civilization only after the lapse of centuries.

Now this presumptive argument is strengthened by the preponderant traditions of all nations. These traditions imply an original, golden period of virtue and knowledge and that the degeneracy of man was some time subsequent to his creation. The tradition that the human race were originally only as a slight remove from the beasts, like them, living on roots and acorns, was not the earliest nor the one which was most generally received. Man originally lived long and happily in a friendly and highly useful companionship with the gods; those benevolent beings were his instructors in the most necessary arts and sciences. He was not thrown upon the shores of time a rude, helpless being, to reach his true moral and intellectual development only after ages of slow and wearisome effort. There is every reason

to suppose that the earliest dwellers on the banks of the Nile did not migrate thither as stupid barbarians. Springing from Central Asia, they would come with no inconsiderable degree of intellectual light, with an aptitude at least to take immediate advantage of the wonderful facilities now opening before them.

4. A remark on the character of the civilization of the Egyptians and of their advance in knowledge is important. We are perhaps dazzled by their extraordinary progress in certain arts and in certain departments of action, so that we do not make the necessary discrimination. Their civilization at the best was, in some important respects, very imperfect. It was radically different, on some fundamental points, from what we understand by modern civilization. War, in its most revolting forms, was the great business of most of the Egyptian dynasties. Not a trace of humanity is discernible in their spirited and innumerable delineations of war. The face of the Egyptian and the Assyrian warrior is as passionless, as devoid of all human sympathy, as the horse that is bearing them forward. It is the grim sternness of a beast of prey. As a general thing, the people lived as long, and in the manner, that would please their sovereign. His will was despotic. Now in the development of the arts in modern times, there are two points of essential importance in which Egyptian art was entirely, or almost entirely deficient. One was the practical application of art to the well being of the great body of the people. *Humane* tendencies and applications were not sought. Art was cultivated, to a great extent, only as a gratification of regal or priestly taste and luxury. Again, in modern times, the field of art is far wider. All arts are cultivated simultaneously. Certain great ideas lie at the basis of modern improvement, which were unknown to the Egyptians, and which ensure the harmonious progress of all science and art. In Egypt there was a wonderful development in certain directions. Certain processes may have been carried to a perfection which is now unknown. Ingenious contrivances, which then were familiar, seem to be wholly lost. But on the other hand, there is a wearisome monotony or uniformity, in most of their sculptures and paintings. With scientific principles of fundamental importance, e. g. the principle of the arch, they were, in the earliest times of the monuments, unacquainted. In this respect they resemble the artists of the Middle Ages. The Gothic structures in the Netherlands have a perfection which may not now be approached. The modern artisan finds it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to put up buildings of the exquisite proportions so common in Mediaeval times, or to sustain a vast weight without pillars, or to color glass in the manner so familiar

to those old workmen. And yet the arts of the Middle Ages were comparatively isolated; they were the possession of but few individuals; they came accidentally, as it were, and were not the component parts of a great system; the gifts of sudden inspiration, the *miracles* of genius; like a great epic poem springing out of a region of thick darkness; they did not imply a long antecedent period of growth, of gradual preparation, of the unfolding of a thousand influences all co-operating to the same end. So it seems to have been, to a great extent at least, with Egyptian art. It did not necessarily imply, as is the case with much of modern culture, a long process of preparatory training, ages of converging and increasing light, patient study on the part of a great number of individuals. It has more resemblance, in this respect, to the phenomena of art in the Middle Ages.

It is said, indeed, that the old Egyptian *language* was a "legacy," transmitted from a long past period. But a language, separated from its literature, does not necessarily imply a great antiquity. It may be, in some respects, remarkably developed; it may be formed in the most scientific manner, with all the regularity with which a philosopher would construct it, and yet it may be the speech of barbarians; as is the case with the Cherokee dialect, and with the Mpongwe, on the western coast of Africa. Over the growth of language, in such cases, impenetrable mysteries as yet hang. There may have been a sudden and tropical growth. Causes which appear to us accidental, may have combined to produce a rapid yet regular development. As far as we can see, the mere *existence* of a finely developed dialect, does not imply an immeasurable antiquity of the people that used it. We do not know enough of the *literature* of the Old Egyptians to pronounce in the case. All the German critics who give up the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, allow that there are certain fragments of a date at or before the time of Moses. But these fragments exhibit the Hebrew in its perfect form. Yet this perfection does not by any means imply that the Hebrew was the original language of man, or that it had been in the process of development during long ages.

But allowing all which is claimed for the high civilization of the Egyptians in the most ancient period of history and of the monuments, — and a wonderful advance and maturity are obvious to all — is it necessary to suppose an indefinite or a very long extended previous existence? May not all the phenomena be accounted for on the supposition of the lapse of only a few centuries?

It is a matter of course that the progress of a nation in art, science, civilization, will be rapid in proportion to the strength and activity of

the causes at work fitted to promote this end. The advance of England in nearly all those things which we understand by English comfort and culture, during the 350 years since the reign of Elizabeth, has been very great. There has not only been progress, but the absolute creation of some of the most important elements of this culture. The republics of Venice and Genoa shot rapidly upwards to great renown and commercial prosperity, and comparative refinement of manners, amid the stagnation and darkness of the Middle Ages. It required but a few centuries to develop an extraordinary prosperity. There was, no doubt, in both cases, an excellent basis in the ardent temperament of these children of the sea. This native, restless disposition only required scope for its exercise, and an occasion or powerful cause to call it forth. In the time in which the poems of Homer were written, the Phoenicians on the coast of Syria had made great progress in some of the arts, and had attained to a distinguished position among the nations. Now it is susceptible of the most satisfactory proof that their ancestors, a few centuries before, had emigrated from Babylonia. Böckh, e. g., has proved that their weights and measures had their origin in Chaldea. But this great advance in civilization was caused by their maritime position.

Now it will be universally admitted that in Egypt a combination of causes existed for the rapid development and growth of art and civilization, such as is not probably to be found elsewhere on earth. These causes are so obvious that it is hardly necessary to allude to them. The climate is eminently favorable, during the greater part of the year, genial, yet not enervating. The position of Egypt — central between Asia, Africa, and Europe, on or near the great highways of nations, the Mediterranean and Red seas and the Indian Ocean, and on the banks of a great river for a long distance, probably the most useful of any stream on the globe, bearing on its bosom an annual tribute of immense wealth, yet not indolently pouring it into the laps of the people, but demanding their active coöperation and, to a considerable extent, nautical skill, being the means and occasion of affluence, not affluence itself. Again, Egypt is, by eminence, an agricultural country. Many wants would be immediately felt which could not be experienced by a nomadic people. The powers of invention would be set to work. Various implements and labor-saving machines would be the result. This civilizing tendency of agricultural labors was experienced in a high degree in Assyria, the cradle of the human race, as is demonstrated by the recent discoveries. Again, Egypt, occupying one of the gardens of the world, would hold out strong temptations to the cupidity and ambition of surrounding nations.

Wars would be the consequence, with all their accompaniments — armor, horsemanship, means of attacking and defending cities, ships, etc. Then these warlike exploits must be recorded and perpetuated. Happily the country abounded with the materials of writing. The great deeds of kings and warriors could be engraven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever. The hardest and most beautiful granite, in inexhaustible quantity, was perfectly accessible, while the religion had provided a learned class, who had leisure and skill to hold the pen of ready writers. In short, such facilities, operating on a portion of the human race highly endowed, originally very susceptible to impression, and undoubtedly migrating with many advantages from the oldest seat of civilization, may be sufficient to account for the speedy and extraordinary growth of Egyptian art and civilization, and render it unnecessary to suppose that the “old empire,” or the earliest dynasties of Manetho, belonged to the “middle ages of mankind.” At least, the phenomena do not render such an hypothesis indispensable.

ARTICLE VI.

THE INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ELEMENT OF RELIGION.

By Rev. James W. Ward, Abington, Mass.

SYSTEMS of religion very dissimilar in character have, at different times and places, prevailed in the world. They have all, however, been alike in one particular, viz. the profession of two grand elemental principles — an internal and an external one; and the difference between them has arisen mainly from the different proportion in which these two elements have been combined. It is true in the moral as in the natural world, that the same elements, when united in different proportions, produce compounds whose characteristics are not only unlike, but even opposite to each other. As alcohol and sugar, the one poisonous and the other nutritious, are formed, by combining in different proportions the same original elements (carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen), so paganism and Christianity, the one a baseless fabric of hope, and the other the power of God unto salvation, are formed by the union, in different proportions, of *internalism* and *externalism*, or faith and form. These two elements possess each its