

day of the creation, we shall not attempt to deal, we shall merely refer to the more accurately determined period of the Deluge of Noah's time. We may here refer to a late circumstance which is most significant, and gives us greater confidence than ever in Seyffarth's opinions.

Professor O. M. Mitchell delivered on Tuesday night, in Philadelphia, an astronomical lecture in which he gave the following remarkable statement:—"He had not long since met, in St. Louis, a man of great scientific attainments, who for forty years had been engaged in Egypt in deciphering the hieroglyphics of the ancients. This gentleman stated that he had lately unravelled the inscriptions upon the coffin of a mummy in the London Museum, in which he had discovered the key to all the astronomical knowledge of the Egyptians. The zodiac, with the exact position of the planets, was delineated on this coffin, and the date to which they pointed was the autumnal equinox in the year 1722 before Christ, or nearly 3,600 years ago. Professor Mitchell employed his assistant to ascertain the exact positions of the heavenly bodies belonging to our solar system on the equinox of that year (1722 B. C.) and sent him a correct diagram of them, without having communicated his object in doing so. In compliance with this the calculations were made, and to his astonishment, on comparing the results with the statements of his scientific friend already referred to, it was found that on the 7th of October, 1722, B. C., the moon and planets had occupied the exact points in the heavens marked upon the coffin in the London Museum."

The historical traditions of all the nations of the ancient world have, in the course of the last twenty years, been made the subject of special research by the Students of Germany. In the prosecution of these enquiries, they have taken advantage of the very widely extended range of documents with which the constant accumulation of manuscripts, copies of inscriptions and monumental remains, during this period, in the libraries and Museums of Europe, has supplied them. Armed with all these advantages, the early histories of Greece and Rome have been subjected to close analysis by Niebuhr. The obscure and intricate mazes of the histories of the Hindoc Nations, have been to some extent, disentangled by the sagacity and patience of Ideler and Lassen. The Chinese annals have received much useful illustration from the labours of the missionary Gutzlaff. The few available remains of ancient Babylon, of Persia, and Arabia have also engaged the attention of Ideler; while upon the Hebrew Chronology as embodied in the Scriptures, and a vast mass of commentary upon them in all languages, and of all ages, have been lavished the life-long labours of a host of scholars in every conceivable stage of belief and of unbelief. The results of all this expenditure of mental energy, are among the most remarkable that ever were obtained by critical research. The flood of Noah according to Scripture Chronology, notwithstanding that it has been rendered intricate by many causes, clearly took place about the year 2,500 B. C., but Mr. Osburn's best and most direct proof is taken from the monumental records of Egypt: he says, "When Lepsius declares that there is no trace of Noah or the Deluge, we have no hesitation whatever, in stating our conviction that he is mistaken. One proof is direct, and a plain appeal to the senses; not an elaborate exertion of intellectual power. It is to be found in the name of one of the most ancient of the gods of Egypt, who was entitled "the father of the gods," "the giver of mythic life to all beneath him." Birch has truly identified this god with water. He was in reality the mythic impersonation of the annual overflow of the Nile. His name was written as

ordinarily transcribed, *nb* in Roman characters. It seems however, to have escaped students of hieroglyphics, with the exception of Sir G. Wilkinson, that in the tomb of Nahrui, at Ben-hassan, which belongs to the times of the 12th dynasty, a change constantly takes place in the orthography of this group. This variation shows the phonetic power of the *Ram*, (which like the water-vase is used as a symbol, as well as a sound, in this group,) to have been *h* or *u* and not *b*, as had been inferred from its occurrence with that sound in the Roman name *Tiberius*. Champollion and Birch had therefore with perfect truth identified the name of this God with the word *nou* or *nh*, which signifies the primordial water, "the abyss" so that the name of the divine impersonation of the annual overflow in the Egyptian mythology, was *Nh* or *Nuh* as it is not unfrequently written. How is it possible, not to recognise in this idol the apotheosis of the Patriarch Noah, we must confess ourselves unable to understand, especially when we call to mind, that so indissolubly was the name of Noah linked with the remembrance of the general Deluge, that it was afterwards called by the Hebrews, "the waters of Noah." It is on this ground that we distinctly deny the assertion of Lepsius, that there is no memorial whatever of Noah's Floods in the hieroglyphic records of ancient Egypt. The stupendous pile of inferences which he has built upon this single assumption, will fall to pieces of itself, should it prove that we have succeeded in grinding to powder his foundation-stone. If these his inferences rest upon any other ground whatever than this assertion, it consists in the admitted fact, that many of the primitive institutions of Egypt differed widely from those of the Asiatic Nations. The most remarkable of these differences, and the only one which will require our special notice, is the institution of the Sabbath, which seems to have been lost in Egypt, when the decadal week of ten days was substituted for the week of seven days, of which we find traces among the other nations of the earth. Hence it is inferred that the origin of the civilization of Africa was altogether distinct from that of Asia. Any shadow of support to such a theory, which may seem to project from this circumstance, vanishes at once before the well known fact in geography that Egypt is separated from Asia by a vast tract of desert, which, on the first dispersion of mankind, would form a perfect barrier to all but unfrequent and casual communication between the inhabitants of its two borders. This circumstance alone accounts for the oblivion into which the Sabbatic institution had fallen in Egypt. The triple division of the month of thirty days, into three weeks of ten days each, which was substituted for it, was suggested by convenience, and also by the natural division of the year in Egypt into three seasons. The other points of difference noted by Lepsius admit of the same solutions. They are nothing more than might have been anticipated in two incipient civilizations, both based upon the same extinct economy, growing up at the same time, in two countries distant from each other, and having but unfrequent intercourse. The whole argument then, seems to stand thus: The number 3,555, which, according to Manetho, was the actual duration of the Egyptian Monarchy, or 113 generations, is the exoteric, or secret interpretation of the exoteric or vulgar summing up of the lists of Manetho, which amounts to near 6,000.

Both these numbers are equally the fabrication of the priests of Egypt.

The circumstance that the lists, of which these numbers are exponents, commence with an admitted fable, militates strongly against the assumption that either of them has been constructed with that scrupulous regard to truth which

alone could entitle them to be received as history.

The flood of Noah was known to all the other ancient Nations of the world, and according to the traditions of all of them, who have presented any dates, it must have occurred 2,500 B. C. If we admit the canonical number, the kingdom of Egypt was founded by Menes 3893 B. C., giving to Egypt an age which exceeds that of the earth's present surface, by nearly 1,400 years. It is strongly suggested by this circumstance that the canonical number was greatly in excess.

The fact that the numbers and additions to the arts, admitted to be fabulous, are in the same direction, adds great force to the suggestion.

The taste for a remote antiquity of origin, which prevailed among all ancient nations of the world, and especially in Egypt, still further strengthens it.

We then proceed to the direct, and as it seems to us, irrefragable proof, by pointing out on the monuments the name of Noah as the god of the inundation.

It is exceedingly interesting to find how utterly inconclusive the interpretations of Iepsius and Bunsen are, and that they are not sustained in their opinions. The excellent and well intentioned author Seyffarth, has shown the strongest reasons for accepting the Septuagint Bible as the most authentic version, and quotes several strong expressions of opinion, from the older writers, to confirm and strengthen its claims to our respect and admiration. Augustine, for instance, combats, in a number of instances, the falsified chronology of the Hebrew text. "The christians," he says, "will not refuse credence to those books which the Church has received, as possessing the highest authority; they believe that the truth is contained rather in these books than in those of the Jews. The Christians maintain it is incredible that the Seventy Interpreters would have erred, or would have lied; as they had nothing to gain by it; but that on the contrary, the Jews had made alterations in their Books in order thus to diminish the authority of ours. The Christian people are accustomed to hear the translation of the Seventy which has been approved by the Apostles themselves. Julianus Pomerianus, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toledo, did not hesitate A. D. 356, to demonstrate, in spite of the already authorized Vulgate, that between the creation and Christ's advent, six thousand years had intervened, and that especially the chronology of the Septuagint was the work of the Holy Spirit. But some of the strongest statements in favour of the Seventy may be tabularized.

I.—If at the birth of Lamech, Methusaleh had been only one hundred and sixty seven years old, as the manuscripts say, he would have survived the deluge. But if we read three hundred and forty nine years, Methusaleh's death occurred one hundred and sixty eight years before the flood. Again the Hebrew chronology as arranged in the Masoretic text according to the common manuscript confutes itself. For it is related, that there existed as early as the time of Nimrod, a great people and a large kingdom, beginning with Babel, and Eueh, and Accad; and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. If Nimrod lived one hundred years after the flood, how came it to pass that in one hundred years such populous nations and kingdoms proceeded from one and the same grandfather? According to the LXX, six hundred years intervened. Again, it is stated, that in the time of Phaleg, Noah's descendants built the immense tower of Babel, and were scattered over the whole surface of the earth, &c. Now if Phaleg lived 180 years after the Deluge, who can conceive that in 130 years, Shem, Ham, and Japhet their descendants, were so numerous as to have populated all countries in Asia, Africa, and Eu-