

have referred above, that Volney gave the considerably old age of 23,300 years to the second period of Egyptian history,—up to the establishment of the Sacred College. The building of the temple of Eina, and the third period, he admitted, extended only to the modern period of 4,600 years before Christ. "Oh for a Daniel!" to read those mystic pages, was the cry of Voltaire. Well, as a great modern writer says, a Daniel has appeared, in persevering and intelligent industry,—but it is to read the Condemnation of the Illuminés.

I am not going to trace the various steps, by which the learned world succeeded. It would occupy too much of your time, and tends little to my object. To the honour of our country, he it said, that Dr. Young, an Englishman, Burton, who I believe was a Scotchman, and a gentleman named Wilkinson, have contributed much, towards the accomplishment of this most desirable of events. Translations of the hieroglyphic inscriptions are now made and being made, and as far as they have gone, Egypt is replete with its confirmation of the Sacred penmen.

It would be unjust, and might be well charged as an unpardonable prejudice, if I would neglect to say, that our neighbours the French have done more in this way than ourselves. Perhaps it is the utilitarian spirit, for which John Bull is celebrated, that influenced his economy: but certain it is, that, while the French and Tuscan Governments will always claim the respect of men of science, for their liberality to Rossellini and Champillon, and the pecuniary sacrifices which they made to forward the development of hieroglyphic science. John can claim no more, than having produced the private genius, that would have accomplished it but could not.

Not long after Champillon had succeeded, he wrote to Europe a most interesting letter on the developments, which were gradually taking place. He was anxious to remove an impression which had gone abroad, that his researches were unfavourable to Mosaic chronology. You will not be displeased with me for saying, that the letter was to the Pope, with whose blessing and encouragement he had departed for his Mission. He died shortly after, and Rossellini completed the work, which himself and Champillon had commenced.

The first matter which struck these antiquaries, and struck hundreds since their time, was the explanation of the Scriptural phrase Pharaoh, which every monument presented. Attached to the name of each King was invariably found the word "PHE," the Sun; and thus they were encouraged, at the very outset, to enter with spirit, into the harvest from which they were promised so much abundance.

It was found, as they proceeded, that the names given by the S. S. to the Kings of Egypt, were being constantly discovered—and also found reigning, at the intervals which the Bible had noted for their sway. One remarkable reign there is, which explains an obscure passage in Genesis. I must claim your attention to it for a few moments. You will all recollect, no doubt, the advice of Joseph to his family, to declare themselves shepherds: and you did not fail to be startled at the reason which he assigned for this mode of conduct: that the Egyptians detested shepherds and persons of such a calling; (a strange reason for declaring themselves shepherds you would say.) The monuments explain it. It appears that this reign brings us exactly to the time of the "Hyk Shos," or Shepherd Kings. These, it appears, had seized upon the throne and expelled the native dynasty. As their profession was that of shepherds, it is easy enough, to see how the declaration of Joseph's family, that they were of a like profession, would endear them to the sovereign, and procure for them the favours which Joseph promised. But it does more. It explains the wisdom of Joseph's policy in bringing the whole kingdom into dependence upon Pharaoh; and we cease to be surprised at the subsequent detestation in which the Israelites were held. In addition to this, it appears that the Hyk Shos, on their accession, destroyed every monument, in those parts of the country, which were subject to them. Hence the region occupied by them affords not one specimen of ancient building. They were driven, however, from Egypt by Amosis, a native prince, who endeavoured to repair the havoc which had been committed by the usurpers; and accordingly we find the monuments of this dynasty upon the ruins of the older ones. How many generations the shepherd kings wielded the Egyptian sceptre before they were expelled by Amosis, I need not explain; but the reputation of those monuments which the "Hyk Shos," the last reigning monarchs, had destroyed, tell the tale of Hebrew oppression, and remind us of the merciful interposition of the Almighty in their regard. Here we at once recognize the king who "knew not Joseph,"—and that cause of wonder, that the benefits he had conferred upon Egypt should be so soon forgotten, is at once removed. We behold, clearly, that nothing is more natural, than the task imposed upon the Hebrews, of rebuilding the edifices, which their friends the "Hyk Shos" had destroyed; and we have before us the grounds of that regal apprehension, that the descendants of the house of Jacob would join with the enemies of the country. It was difficult to understand the language of Diodorus Syculus, who mentions it as an Egyptian boast, that no native hand had contributed to raise their majestic piles. This passage is no longer obscure. The old objection, too, that the books of the Jews could not be correct records of Hebrew history, from the omission of the expedition of Sesostri, who overran their kingdom, and laid waste their cities, is at once removed. The departure of the Israelites was at the end of the

reign of Ramses, to whom Sesostri succeeded, and they were, consequently, in the desert at the time of the expedition alluded to. So far have the monuments done their duty to religion and enquiry, given language to their symbols.

Let me now call your attention to Ezekiel. You will recollect how the Prophet declares, that the Lord had given up the Pharos to Nebuchodon, and how a king should not reign, any more, in Egypt. Herodotus was at one time triumphantly opposed to this passage of holy writ; for the historian mentions both Amasis and Diodorus, as reigning about this period. To a man of reason, who had measured the depth and solidity of the foundation, on which the authority of that dread word was based, the remark of a historian would appear of little weight, against the declaration of the Prophet. But men of proud hearts, and who had too much reason to be rational, were not so easily satisfied. Well, a hoary witness of nearly three thousand years has opened his dumb mouth to vindicate the ways of the Almighty. The monuments of this Amasis have been found, and in no one of them does he receive the title of king. "Melek" is the title by which he is designated; and this means nothing more, than one who governs as the vicegerent of another. That such is the fact,—that the meaning of Melek, in the language of the monuments, means no more, is quite evident,—first because, under Darius—where there can be no doubt on the matter, the son of Amasis bears the same title,—though it is quite evident, that he is only a Lieutenant; and, secondly—Rossellini found a monument, in the time of Persian domination, recording a person as "Melek of Upper and Lower Egypt," who of course, could be nothing more than a Persian Governor. From these two circumstances it is quite obvious that the threat of the Prophet, and the Word of the Most High are vindicated; for no king hath reigned in Egypt.

Supposing that I have said quite sufficient to convince you, that our progress in decyphering the hieroglyphic characters has been of vast service to the cause of revelation, I would not mention the following monuments, but for the varieties of scientific knowledge, which contributed their quota to vindicate that which we all hold so sacred. The French, as you all know, were accompanied during the late war, by men who lost no opportunity of pointing out to their commanders whatever was worthy of appreciation—and to do the commanders justice, they were not slow in profiting by the suggestions of the connoisseurs, whether they were slow or not, in regarding the claims of honourable dealing. Among other things which they picked up in Egypt, were two magnificent porches,—one at Esnah, if I mistake not, and a smaller one at a place, the name of which I believe is Dendera. To the first our Parisian Philosophers gave the modest age of 7000 years, and I suppose, for an exhibition of most especial moderation, they allowed the latter only something more than half such an antiquity. Banks, a countryman of ours, begged of them to remember, that the most ancient columns at Thebes were bells upon fluted shafts, while these had all the magnificence of a more recent time. Letronne pointed out that the style and colouring of the pronaon brought them no farther back than the time of Tiberius. Hygot, a man of some celebrity in decyphering Greek inscriptions, said, that a legend over the Pronaon declared the painting to have been executed in the tenth year of Antonius, (for I should have said that two zodiacs were painted upon the porch.) Another found a Greek inscription declaring the temple to be dedicated to the safety of Tiberius. But no one succeeded in crushing the hopes of an infatuated few, who wished to give Astronomy and Architecture to Egypt, before God gave the world to man. Champillon, however, was all this time employed in perfecting his alphabet. He brought the light of hieroglyphic evidence to bear upon it; when lo! upon the Pronaon in deep and undeniable characters, stood forth, "Tiberius," and in another place, the motto of which he was so fond—the "Autos Krater" of the medals.

Thus, gentlemen, you may behold of what vast importance the progress of this recondite study has been to revealed truth. Filled with these stupendous monuments, the remnants of an age that was forgotten, and the evidences of resources which create wonder, Egypt wrote a history which she imagined such monuments might accredit. The pride of the human heart will endeavour to take advantage of any accident, by which it may administer to the prejudices, so interwoven with national character. Here were piles whose "date overawed tradition"—at whose base History folded up her page, as if in awe of their sublime antiquity—and whose brow told the story of by-gone times, in a tongue so old, that Time could not remember when he heard it. Why would not Egypt number her cycles of years, and fabricate the dynasties for which she could easily bring forward such hosts of probable testimony? Accordingly she had her periods of thousands of years. She had numbered the times in which the north star had made many revolutions. She had lived the six and twentieth thousand year again. The names of her kings were inscribed upon her records; and the tongues that lisped the giant powers of their day, were crying out in language of mystery from her temples, and obelisks, and caves. Infidelity took her by the hand, and welcomed Egypt as its ally. Absurd she might be in her notions of religion—barbarous she might be in her notions of policy—and pitiable for her degrading homage to the passions of our nature; but still she must be credible on this occasion, because she impugns the foundations of a creed which impugns the principles by which we direct our moral being. But the Providence which knows out of evil to bring good was looking on.

Enquiry was roused by the impeachment of all that was sacred to Christians. The cloud that darkened with gloomy grandeur the page of Egyptian history, vanished before the light of intelligence, and the Prophet that had been sent forth to curse the children of the promise, opened his mouth in a blessing upon them.

I fear, Gentlemen, that I am becoming tiresome. However, if you look upon these details, in the same important light that I do, you will not deem the exercise of patience, which I am exacting, in the present instance, misapplied. I would wish now to direct your attention to illustrations which the holy Scriptures have received, from an increased knowledge of the philosophy and fragments of the ancients. It will be interesting to us to behold how circumstances, which appear inexplicable, become quite natural by the accession of information—it will influence us to encourage enquiry,—and finally to bow with submission, in those cases beyond our comprehension, from the liability to error, which we discover in those things, that fall within it. One of the great faults of modern philosophy was, in supposing that every other historical record was more credible than Scripture; and instead of paying any attention to the positive proofs, which existed in favour of the Divine Word, and concluding from such proofs that discrepancies, though not reconciled, were reconcilable—they took the opposite mode, and because they could not reconcile the discrepancies, they asserted that the proofs of Holy Writ were unfounded. This was a most absurd mode of action: for you may perceive that a little want of information on their part, a little unacquaintance with the circumstances of the times, and the nature of the fact recorded,—a misapplication or misapprehension, might embody a discrepancy of this kind; and thus, for a fault intrinsic to themselves, they might condemn all the evidence in favour of the Word of God. It would not be much wiser than the conduct of an unlearned person, who, seeing some apparent contradiction, in the Newtonian system of philosophy, would say all must be false, because that he could not see how such a thing could be true.

Many of you will recollect, if I mistake not, the 39th chapter of Isaia, where Merodach Balladin, the son of the king of Babylon, is said to have come to Ezechiah, the king of Judea, whose vanity on that occasion is punished by the prophecy of the Babylonish captivity. Now we have positive evidence, that Babylon was at this time in subjection to the Assyrian monarch; for in the second Book of Kings, Salamanazer is said, about nine years before this time, to have distributed all the people of Babylon into other parts, and not many years after, Manasses is carried to Babylon by the king of Assyria. How then could Babylon have a king at this time? This was the impious interrogatory of the Infidel. In vain were the proofs of the veracity of sacred penmen laid before them—in vain were all kinds of probable hypothesis submitted to them—in vain was the common sense of mankind appealed to, as to the frivolity of such an objection: the answer was, How could Babylon have a king? Enquiry has answered them. In far Armenia a copy of the chronicles of Eusebius has been discovered; and this copy contains a fragment of the ancient historian Berossus. From this we learn, that at the very period of the embassy alluded to, Merodach was king of Babylon. A murderer of the governor Acius or Acus, he reigned six months, at the end of which time he was himself murdered by Ebibus, whom three years after Senacherib conquered and took prisoner. Now, that Merodach would endeavour to strengthen his influence by entering into league with the monarch of Israel, is quite feasible, and not only feasible, but very likely, because he well knew that Ezechiah was the enemy of Assyria, and one whose strength in a conflict with his own Sovereign, was a thing of immense importance. Here then, by the accidental discovery of a fragment of history, a part of the Sacred Volume, which before was wrapped in obscurity, becomes at once clear and satisfactory.

But by far the most interesting thing that it has been my lot to see for a long time, was an extract from a Syriac Book, much esteemed—in fact, the sacred volume of a sect of Christians near the Bassora. I had often felt surprised, and not a little puzzled, at the curious appearance presented by the proem to St. John's Gospel. You all must have remarked the extraordinary pains taken by the Evangelist to impress upon the reader, that Christ was "the light," and "the life," and that he made all things,—and the apparent vehemence with which he insisted upon three things relative to the Baptist: 1st, that he was inferior to Christ,—2ndly, that he was not "the light,"—and 3dly, that he was only a man. Now, this would appear, to one of the uninitiated, as a matter quite uncalled for. It would appear that the blessed St. John was insisting upon matters, again and again, which no one ever thought of denying. This Syriac volume, and the Gnostics who make it their rule, explain the enigma,—for you will be astonished to find them calling John the LIGHT and the LIFE, and the superior of the Messiah. Furthermore you will be surprised to behold them saying, that the world was produced by an evil principle; and complaining that many of its people have gone astray, following the Baptism of the Messiah, for what they call the Baptism of the light and the life, which is that of John the Baptist. This at once shews how St. John should insist upon the three things above, and illustrates most beautifully a thing, which to my mind was really obscure.

While upon this part of my subject I may mention, "en passant," that until I became acquainted with the fact, that in the parlance of Persian philosophy, to become a member of a celebrated sect was said to be "born over again,"—and until I knew