

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

VOL. II.



LONDON :
(Published for the Institute)
ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY, W.
1867.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

NOTE. (See p. 159.)

THE EXTINCT VOLCANOES OF AUVERGNE.

Mr. INCE has kindly forwarded to me copious extracts from the article in the *Quarterly Review* referred to by him ; and upon investigation I find that the matter is of still greater importance and involves more important issues, with reference to the whole question of "the Scriptures and Science," than would merely result from establishing as a fact that the volcanic cones of Auvergne had been erupted in the fifth century of the Christian era, and were not of the great antiquity ascribed to them in the first instance by Dr. Daubeny, and it would seem more recently by Sir Charles Lyell himself, not only in his *Antiquity of Man*, but in his *Elementary Geology*, the latter being cited by Dr. Colenso, in the Introduction to his work against the historic character of the Pentateuch, as his authority for "referring especially to the circumstance, well known to all geologists, that volcanic hills exist of immense extent in Auvergne and Languedoc, which must have been formed ages before the Noachian deluge," &c. Now, instead of this being the fact, I find from the supplement to Dr. Daubeny's *Description of Volcanoes* (p. 748), that Mr. Scrope has always disagreed with Dr. Daubeny as to the ages of these volcanic cones ; and it would appear from the article in the *Quarterly Review* I am now about to cite, that at one time Sir Charles Lyell also differed from Dr. Daubeny on this subject ; so that, setting aside the historic evidence altogether—which, as will abundantly appear, has been too much ignored,—it is not a true representation of the facts of the case to allege, as Dr. Colenso has unfortunately ventured to do, that it is a *circumstance well known to all geologists, that these cones must have been formed ages before the Noachian deluge!*

I shall now proceed to quote from the article in the *Quarterly Review*, which has the title "The Conquest and the Conqueror," and is otherwise well worthy of attentive perusal. (*Quar. Rev.*, vol. lxxiv., No. 148.)

Referring to the probability that the fires of Vesuvius might have been "quenched before the soil of Italy had been trod by the sons of Japhet," up to the time when they again burst forth in the days of Pliny ; and referring to the remarkable omission of all allusion by that precise writer to the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii, the reviewer goes on :—

"Concerning the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii, Pliny says nothing ; an omission so singular, that, as Mr. Lyell truly says, it baffles all explanation. Nor is the void of Pliny's information otherwise than most scantily supplied by the sources which might have been expected to afford us aid. Amongst the whole body of Greek and Roman writers, three only notice the entombment of these polluted communities. Our knowledge of a visitation such as no human being had beheld since the destruction of the cities of the plain, is derived merely from the casual allusion of the epigram—

matist, the confused hint of Tacitus,—‘*Haustæ aut obrutæ urbes fecundissimâ Campaniæ orâ,*’—and the tradition reported by Dion Cassius. Had Herculaneum and Pompeii never been discovered, the accounts transmitted to us of their tragical end, would therefore have been discredited by the majority of critical inquirers, so vague and general are the narratives, or so long subsequent to the event. Mr. Lyell thereupon wisely observes, ‘This case may often serve as a caution to the geologist, who has frequent occasion to weigh in like manner negative evidence derived from the silence of eminent writers, against the obscure but positive testimony of popular tradition.’

“Perhaps even more remarkable than the record of the first outbreak, within the historical period, of volcanic activity in the Italian peninsula, are the circumstances attending the memorials of the last known occurrence of such phenomena in Central France. During three years (458—460), Auvergne and Dauphiné were convulsed by violent and continued volcanic eruptions; streams of lava bursting forth from the summits of the mountains, broke down the cones which ejected continuous ignited showers, attended by earthquakes, shaking, as it were, the foundations of the earth. Thunders rolled through the subterranean caverns; so awful were the concussions, the sounds, the fires, that the beasts of the forest, driven from their haunts, sought refuge in the abodes of mankind. Strange as it may seem, these phenomena are commemorated by the usages of the Church, and inscribed in the pages of our Liturgy.

“An impending invasion of the Goths added to the terror of the threatenings of nature. Instructed and profiting by the example of the Ninevites, Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, assembled his people in prayer and humiliation. To avert the evil, he instituted the solemn Litanies, or Rogations, on the three days immediately preceding the feast of the Ascension, and which three days acquired distinctively the appellation of *Rogation Days*, because they were the only days of the year then annually set apart for the purpose of such solemn supplications. These forms of prayer, rendered more impressive by the awful character of the calamities and portents which had suggested them, corresponding so nearly with the signs and judgments of Scripture, were speedily adopted throughout Gaul and England. Here they were continued by usage and tradition, until finally established as a portion of the national ritual, in the council held at Cleofeshoe (A.D. 749), which appointed that those three days should be kept holy, after the manner of former times; and it is hardly needful to observe that the Rogation Days retain their station in the rubric of the Church of England at the present day.

“A remarkable epistle of Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont (consecrated A.D. 471), who resided on the borders of the Lake Aidat, which owed its existence to the damming up of a river by a lava-current, addressed to Mamertus himself, within fourteen or at most sixteen years after the events (Mamertus died A.D. 474), preserves a full notice of the earthquakes and the volcanic eruptions, the crumbling of the cones and the heaping of the showers of ashes and scorïæ cast forth amidst their fires. Aleimus Aвитus, the successor of Mamertus, carries on the chain of testimony. This prelate, who was promoted to the see of Vienne about thirty years after the eruptions (A. D. 490), composed an ample series of Rogation Homilies; and, in addressing his people, he recalls to their memory the events which a great portion of them must have witnessed, and exhorts them to gratitude for the deliverance they had received. These homilies appear to have been numerous; but, with the exception of some fragments, all have been lost except two; and amongst the strange examples of the oblivion attending written evidence, not merely when lurking in archives or concealed in manuscripts, but when amply diffused by means of the printing-press, we may remark that this is perhaps the

first time that Avitus has been quoted as elucidating either Sidonius, or Gregory of Tours, the latter of whom also notices the events, though with more brevity.

“An eminent geologist, forgetting Mr. Lyell’s sensible prohibition against entertaining arguments deduced from the silence of historical authorities, and zealously anxious to assert the wholesome doctrine of the indefinite antiquity of the Auvergne volcanoes, apparently contradicted by the freshness of their aspect, exhorts us to reject the evidence of our senses, in order to support a theory sustained only by negative proof. He desires us to remark that Julius Cæsar, who encamped in their vicinity, could scarcely have failed to notice them. Yet has not the writer’s enthusiasm caused him to forget that the *Mont d’Or* may have been, like Vesuvius, in a state of temporary quiescence : and, in the case of a military commander, whose main object was the narrative of his operations, should not the inquirer peculiarly avail himself of Mr. Lyell’s caution against drawing inferences from silence ? Again, the geologist appeals to the absence of any mention of these volcanoes in the great work of the Roman naturalist ; yet here again is not the deduction overstrained ? In one chapter of fifteen lines, the elder Pliny enumerates the cities of Aquitaine, and does nothing more. Had he possessed a full record of the eruptions, would his omission of facts known to him only by report, have been more remarkable than the neglect of the younger Pliny to notice the fiery burial of the cities which took place in his immediate presence ? And if the list of Gaulish eruptions, occurring during the most calamitous and disturbed era of the declining empire, when, in Gaul, we have literally no historians or chroniclers at all, had been utterly uncommunicated in the written page, we could not have been surprised at the absence of the information required.

“Yet the testimony has been given to us. In this dark and obscure era two witnesses rise from the tomb, not men of obscure station or humble authority, but individuals of the highest rank, concerning whose character and respectability, if such a term can be employed, we are as fully convinced as if they were living at the present day. Sidonius, the poet, the prefect, the patrician, the senator, the bishop ; Alcimus Avitus, equally high in the Church, nephew of an emperor, counsellor and friend of Clovis, the founder of the Frankish monarchy. These, not recording the events in the studied chronicle, or in the technical description of the naturalist, or the exaggeration of the poet, but in the language of friendship and devotion. Briefly and emphatically they advert to transient calamities as the reason for lasting gratitude and repentance ; speaking not to strangers who would need any elaborate explanations of localities, nor preserving details to satisfy the curiosity of posterity, but seeking the comfort and edification of the friends and contemporaries whom they addressed,—men who had seen the incandescent streams and showers, heard the subterranean thunder, felt the earth shake beneath their feet, knelt before the same altar, uttered the same prayers,—the people to whom every word and every expression of the preacher brought up in their minds the whole spectacle of the desolation which had mercifully passed away.”

The able Reviewer here appends the following foot-note :—

“The observation in our text respecting the claim to ‘indefinite antiquity’ possessed by the Auvergne volcanoes, as evidenced by Cæsar and Pliny, are those of Dr. Daubeny (*Daubeny on Volcanoes*, p. 14, quoted by Mr. Lyell, *Elements of Geology*, ii. 305) ; but Dr. Daubeny mistakingly ascribes the same silence to Sidonius Apollinaris ; whilst, singularly enough, the very witness upon whose omissions the geologist lays the most stress, is the

one who is the most explicit. We add as large extracts from the epistle of Sidonius and the homily of Avitus as we can find room for. But those who are interested in the subject will do well to consult the originals. In considering the words of these *speakers* rather than writers, it must be recollected that though other notices of the phenomena are merely incidental, and not purposely descriptive or historical, *yet that they are far more ample, intelligible, precise, and correct than Tacitus, who omits all notice of Vesuvius or the eruption, in his account of the Campanian cities.*

“Sidonius, Domino Papæ Mamerto salutem :—Rumor est Gothos in Romanum solum castra movisse. Huic semper irruptioni nos miseri Arverni janua sumus. Namque odiis inimicorum hinc peculiaria fermenta subministramus, quia quod necdum terminos suos ab oceano in Rhodanum Ligeris alveo limitaverunt, solam sub ope Christi moram de nostra tantum, obice patiuntur. Circumjectarum vere spatia tractumque regionum jam pridem regni minacis importuna devoravit impressio. Sed animositati nostræ tam temerariæ, tanque periculosæ, non nos aut ambustam murorum faciem, aut putrem sudium cratem, aut propugnacula vigilum trita pectoribus confidimus opitulatura : solo tamen invectarum te autore Rogationum palpanur auxilio : quibus inchoandis, instituendisque populus Arvernus, et si non effectu pari, affectu certe non impari cœpit imitari, et ob hoc circumfusus necdum dat terga terroribus. Non enim latet nostram sciscitationem, primis temporibus harumcæ supplicationum institutarum, civitas cœlitus tibi credita *per cujusmodi prodigiorum terriculamenta vacuabatur. Nam modo, scenæ manium publicorum crebris terræ motibus concutiebantur ; nunc, ignes sæpe flammati caducas culminum cristas superjecto favillarum monte tumulabant ; nunc stupenda foro cubilia collocabat audacium pavenda mansuetudo cervorum : cum tu inter ista, discessu primorum populariumque statu urbis exinanito, ad nova celer veterum Ninivitarum exempla decurristi, ne divinæ admonitioni tua quoque desperatio convitiaretur.*—(Sid. Apollinaris Epi. vii. 1, Ed. Sirmond. i. p. 586.)”

“The title *Pope* is given to Mamertus by the elder writers, and perhaps the style of *Pope* was assumed by or given to the see of Vienne, so venerable for its antiquity. We must now take Avitus :—‘Currit quidem tramite vitali, non per Gallias tantummodo, sed pene per orbem totum Rogationalis observantiæ flumen irriguum, et infectam vitis terram uberi fluxu annuæ satisfactionis expurgat. Peculiarior tamen nobis in hac ipsâ institutione servitii et gaudii causa est ; quia quod hinc modo ad cunctorum utilitatem defluit, ex nostro primitus fonte manavit : et forte nunc pertineat ad cujuscumque privilegii ornatum sumptæ primitus institutionis exordium.

“Ceterum cum ad hujusmodi humilitatem ineffabilis necessitas rigida Viennensium corda perdomuit, sentiens ecclesia nostra causam ægritudinis suæ, non sibi quasi maxime præ omnibus, sed quasi soli ex omnibus, existimans opus esse instituendâ observatione presenti, sollicitius captavit remedium quam primatum.

“Et quidem terrorum temporis illius causas multos nostrum recolere scio. Siquidem *incendia crebra, terræ motus assidui, nocturni sonitus, cuidam totius orbis funeri prodigiosum quoddam bustuale munitabantur.* Nam populosis hominum concursibus domestica silvestrium ferarum species observabatur, Deus viderit an ludificans oculis, an adducta portentis. Quicquid tamen ex iis duobus foret, perinde monstruosum intelligebatur, seu sic veraciter immania bestiarum corda mansuefieri, seu tam horribiliter conspectibus territorum falsæ visionis phantasmata posse confingi. Inter sentiebant dissimulando, quæ fletui nolebant dare, casui dabant ; alii spiritu salubriore, abominabilia nova quoque congruis malorum proprietatis significationibus interpretabantur. *Quis enim in crebris ignibus, imbres sodomiticis non timeret ? Quis trementibus clementis, aut decidua culminum, aut disrupta*

terrarum imminere non crederet? Quis videns, certe videre se putans, pavidos naturaliter cervos per angusta portarum usque ad fori lata penetrantes, non imminentem solitudinis sententiam formidaret? — (Alcimi Aviti Homilia de Rogationibus, ed. Sirmond., ii. 90.)

The above article in the *Quarterly Review* was published in October, 1844. In 1858, also, Mr. Scrope "brought out a new edition of his beautiful work, *On the Geology and Extinct Volcanoes of Central France*, in which he denied altogether the correctness of the division which Dr. Daubeny had proposed for the volcanoes of Auvergne into modern and ancient." So we are informed by Dr. Daubeny himself in the *Supplement* to his History, before referred to, copies of which were distributed at the meeting of the British Association at Cambridge in 1862. In it Dr. Daubeny admits "*that the eruptions which he had designated as ancient are not divided, in point of time, from the so-called modern ones, by any great deluge or cataclysm which overspread the country,*" though he still maintains that there is, "generally speaking, a marked difference in the volcanic products of Central France, *in correspondence with their relative antiquity,*"—a somewhat vague qualification of the previous more definite admission; and were it of much consequence for my present argument, I might show by more ample citations, that these qualifications are based upon assumptions of antiquity merely, which again are based partly upon the old abandoned theory of igneous formations, and partly upon the appearances that are assumed to favour "the distinction between lavas of submarine and subaërial origin." But I make the following extract, as bearing on the present question, and also upon the now presumed great antiquity of man, since man's contemporaneous existence with certain extinct animals has been discovered:—

"I have omitted, in my account of the rocks of the Puy, all mention of those remarkable accumulations of scorïæ which occur at Mont Denise, and at other places near the town of Puy, evidences of volcanic action of the most recent epoch.

"It was underneath the scorïæ which caps Mont Denise that Mr. Scrope mentions the occurrence of a volcanic breccia or peperino, which, though of great antiquity, as shown by being antecedent to the excavation of the valley which it overlooks, has been found to contain human skeletons, associated with bones of the elephant, rhinoceros, cervus elephas, and other large mammalia. If this be fully substantiated, it would lead to the inference that man must have existed long before the volcanic eruptions of the country had reached their termination." (*Suppl.*, pp. 749, 750.)

I must here notice the assumption of man's great antiquity, in the above extract, depending upon the supposed "great antiquity" of the formation in which the remains were found; and (as M. Prestwich said with reference to the flint implements found at Amiens) the evidence here also may yet be found "as much to necessitate the bringing forward the extinct animals towards our own time as the carrying back of man to the geological times."*

* Vide *Journ. of Trans. of Vict. Inst.*, vol. i. p. 34.

In the article in the *Quarterly* already cited will be found further evidence to this effect and in support of Mr. Scrope's views.

But, to resume. Notwithstanding the long-standing difference of opinion between Dr. Daubeny and Mr. Scrope as regards the antiquity of these extinct volcanic cones, and notwithstanding Sir Charles Lyell's former caution as exhibited in the above citations, he now takes for granted their great age, disregards altogether the historic evidence of their recent eruption, and merely argues from the *quasi* facts against the universality of the Deluge. In his *Antiquity of Man* (p. 192) he says :—

“We behold in many a valley of Auvergne within fifty feet of the present channel, a volcanic cone of loose ashes, with a crater at its summit, from which powerful currents of basaltic lava have poured, usurping the ancient bed of the torrent. By the action of the stream, in the course of ages, vast masses of the hard columnar basalt have been removed, pillar after pillar, and much vesicular lava, as is the case, for example, of the Puy Rouge, near Chalucet, and of the Puy de Tartaret, near Neckers. . . . *Had there been a single flood fifty or sixty feet in height, since the last eruption occurred, a great part of these volcanoes must inevitably have been swept away.*”

In his *Principles of Geology*, also, chap. 45, he says :—

“We may be enabled to infer, from the integrity of such conical hills of incoherent materials, that no flood can have passed over the countries where they are situated since their formation.”

Now, this is very valuable testimony by Sir Charles Lyell (supposing his conclusion to be sound), that no flood of water can possibly have covered these volcanic cones since they were originally erupted. His reasoning upon this point, however, has been controverted ; for instance by the Rev. James Brodie, in his *Remarks on the Antiquity and Nature of Man, in Reply to Sir Charles Lyell* ;* for he thinks these mountain cones of Auvergne might “have been sunk once and again beneath the deep without a single cinder having been moved.” (p. 42.) Sir Charles's and Dr. Daubeny's conclusions as to the great antiquity of the fossil remains there discovered have also been questioned by other geologists, on independent grounds. For instance, Mr. J. R. Pattison, F.G.S., in his *Examination of Sir Charles Lyell's Antiquity of Man*,† thus writes :—

“The testimony of the fossil man of St. Denise (if credit can be given to it, which, from personal inspection, I think is the case) proves merely an antiquity equal to that of the cave-remains. The specimen is embedded in a breccia which resulted, as M. Aymard concludes (*Congrès Scientifique de France*, 22me Session) from a volcanic eruption of water amidst scorie at the very close of the volcanic period in Velay, after the surface had attained nearly its present contour, and whilst extinct and subsisting species of mammals inhabited Auvergne.”

I think I need make no further citations to establish the fact that there is no unison or agreement among geologists, and never has been, as regards

* Lond., Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1864.

† Lond., Lovell Reeve & Co., 1863. (2nd ed., p. 15.)

these various controverted points. And yet let us see how Dr. Colenso has satisfied himself, and endeavours to satisfy others, upon a question that, even having regard to geological evidence alone, is full of doubt and difficulty. He says :—

“ My own knowledge of some branches of science—of geology in particular—had been much increased since I left England ; and as I now know for certain, on geological grounds, a fact of which I had only misgivings before, viz., that a universal deluge, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of, could not possibly have taken place in the way described in the Book of Genesis. I refer especially to the circumstance, well known to all geologists (see Lyell’s ‘ Elementary Geology,’ pp. 197, 198), that volcanic hills exist of immense extent in Auvergne and Languedoc, which must have been formed ages before the Noachian deluge, and which are covered with light and loose substances, pumice-stone, &c., that must have been swept away by a flood, but do not exhibit the slightest sign of having ever been so disturbed. Of course (he adds), I am well aware that some have attempted to show that Noah’s deluge was only a partial one ; but such attempts have ever seemed to me to be made in the very teeth of the Scripture statements, which are as plain and explicit as words can possibly be.”

I have drawn attention to the extremely positive character of Dr. Colenso’s opinions and assertions, as regards his assumed knowledge of geological “ facts,” by putting some of his sentences in italics. He appears totally unaware of the historic evidence bearing upon the whole question ; and, as he throws over the Pentateuch, he probably shares with Sir Charles Lyell the opinion that “ true history and chronology are the creation, as it were, of yesterday. Thus the first Olympiad is generally regarded as the earliest date on which we can rely, in the past annals of mankind,—only 772 years before the Christian era.” (*Antiq. of Man*, p. 380.)

Those who read this note may feel inclined to doubt whether “ true history” can be confidently reckoned upon even to-day ! It is not, every one must be convinced, always very well treated even when within our reach. I hesitate to express in my own words all I feel as regards what is either the ignorance or obliviousness that has been exhibited with reference to the historic evidences of the date of the volcanic eruptions in Auvergne. The state of the case is put briefly thus in Archdeacon Pratt’s *Scripture and Science not at Variance*.*

“ Some years ago, a geological lecturer of no ordinary note [Dr. Daubeny] asserted that the volcanoes of Auvergne, in Central France, have not been in activity for many ages—certainly not since the days of Julius Cæsar, who pitched his camp there in perfect safety ; and he took the intervening period of nearly 2000 years as the first step for measuring the antiquity of the deposits in those parts. Whereas, ten or twelve years subsequently [*i. e.* subsequent to the Lecturer’s assertion] an old Gaulish history was re-edited, from which it appears that during three years, long after Julius Cæsar, viz. in A.D. 458-460, the district was convulsed with violent and continued eruptions, and streams of lava carried destruction before them. (*Quar. Rev.*, Oct. 1844.)”

* Lond., Hatchard & Co., 5th ed., 1864. (p. 160.)

It is to be observed that the so-called "geological grounds" upon which the notion of the antiquity of these mountain cones was based, were not *geological* at all. It was based upon ignorance, mistaken for knowledge, and miscalled "negative evidence" *from history*. Julius Cæsar did not notice that the mountains were in a state of eruption; *therefore* they were not then, *nor afterwards*, in an active state! And of course some may say, if history was entirely silent on the subject, it was not unnatural to conclude that the eruptions must have taken place a very long time ago. In reply to this I would observe that people might very easily *guess* something of the sort. But it is worse than ridiculous to call such guessing science, and to talk of such opinions being founded upon "geological grounds."

But then comes the confounding fact, that history has been far from silent on the subject. Not only so; but I am now about to show that the historic proof of the volcanic eruptions in Auvergne has by no means depended upon the re-editing of Sidonius or Avitus in our own day, but has been kept up on the face of history, sufficiently, at least, to have prevented any moderately well-read English theologian from following the geologists blindly in their erroneous path. The origin of our "Rogation Days" has been shown by the able writer in the *Quarterly Review* to be traceable to the violent eruptions of the volcanoes of Auvergne in the fifth century. But Dr. Colenso might have easily found that out long before 1844. He will find the fact sufficiently referred to in Nelson's *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England (in loco)*, where Le Comte's *French Ecclesiastical Annals* are cited in confirmation of the text, and will probably narrate what were the precise "calamities" merely so referred to in Nelson. A still more definite reference to these calamities is to be found in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* (Book V. ch. xli. §§ 1-4). Cartwright, whom he is answering, had objected to the prayers in our Litany against "dangers which are nothing near us,"—lightning, storm and tempest, &c., and refers thus to the origin of what he calls "this abuse" in the Church:—

"There was one Mamercus, Bishop of Vienna [Vienne], which in the time of great earthquakes which were in France, instituted certain supplications, which the Grecians (and we of them) call the Litany," &c.

Hooker, in reply, after noticing that what the Greek Church termed Litanies were called Rogations of the Latins, then goes on to say:—

"To the people of Vienna (Mamercus being their bishop, about 450 years after Christ) there befell many things, the suddenness and strangeness whereof so amazed the hearts of all men, that the city they began to forsake as a place which heaven did threaten with imminent ruin. It beseemed not the person of so grave a prelate to be either utterly without counsel, as the rest were, or in a common perplexity to show himself alone secure. Wherefore, as many as remained he earnestly exhorteth to prevent portended calamities, using those virtuous and holy means wherewith others in like case have prevailed with God. To which purpose he perfecteth the Rogations or Litanies before in use, and addeth unto them that which the present necessity required. Their good success moved Sidonius, Bishop of Aversa, to use the same so

corrected Rogations (*Sidon.*, lib. vii. Epist. i.—ad Mamercurum), at such time as he and his people were after afflicted with famine, and besieged with potent adversaries.”

I need not, however, make further citations from Hooker, who explains the connection between these “Rogations” and the Rogation Days established by the Council of Aurelia, A.D. 506, and also with the petitions in the Litany of the Church of England against sudden calamities, to which Cartwright had objected. The Oxford edition of Hooker’s works (1845), from which I quote, refers also to Palmer’s *Origines Liturgicæ*, i. 267–272, where, also, these “dreadful calamities” are referred to, thus affording a sufficient key to this neglected passage of “true history”—well-nigh forgotten, though twelve centuries later than the First Olympiad!

And what is the brief sum of the whole matter as regards the extinct volcanoes of Auvergne? Supposing Sir Charles Lyell to be right in his conviction that these mountain cones have never been covered with water since they were last erupted, then that certainly would prove that they were not erupted prior to the general deluge. But, instead of that conclusion supporting Dr. Colenso’s illogical scepticism, that *therefore* the deluge was not *universal*, as the Bible “manifestly” teaches, it merely confirms the modern historical evidence that the eruptions took place not only long after Noah’s flood, but even long after Julius Cæsar invaded Gaul,—namely, in the fifth century of our era. Thus the sacred history of the universal deluge is not affected by what “we know for certain” respecting Auvergne; and one of the most positive geological conclusions of Sir Charles Lyell, that these mountain cones were never under water, is confirmatory of the historic evidence, which every time we hear the Litany in church, and as often as the Rogation Days before Ascension-tide come round—as often, even, as we see the boys of a parish “beating the bounds,” that old custom being in fact a relic of the Auvergne processional Rogations,—must now be brought to our remembrance, to remind us of this extraordinary specimen of “the Logic of Scepticism” with which Dr. Colenso has “especially” identified himself. One thing is completely settled besides, by the whole evidence now before us,—namely this, the *very modern character* of those mountain cones, the fancied great antiquity of which was first guessed at, and then put forward as established upon “geological grounds,” and lastly relied on as one of the grand proofs of the antiquity of man in connection with his probable ape origin!—Verily, “pulchræ illæ meditationes et speculationes humanæ et causationes *res malisana sint*, nisi quod non adsit qui advertat!” (*Nov. Org.*, Aph. X.) I may add, that the age of the deposits in the valley of the Somme is also affected by this disproof of the antiquity of the Auvergne mountain cones; inasmuch as the “flint implements” there found were embedded with palæontological remains, similar to those discovered along with the “fossil man of St. Denise.”