

analogy, (p. 557,) "oldest of historical lands, representing, therefore but the 'middle ages,' of mankind's development upon earth, typified by our cosmic man, arrived at one third of the 'three score and ten years' imagined by Hebrew writers to be the average of post-mosaic human longevity, it follows that at the third dynasty, say 5300 years ago, the Egyptians at least, among, very likely, other oriental nations whose annals are lost, had long before passed through their periods of adolescence, childhood, and infancy." Yet the bewildered student who looks in vain for some *terra firma*, pretending not (as even the best educated of scholars or students of natural science may surely be allowed, without charge of unbecoming ignorance,) to judge for himself of Turin papyri, petroglyphic inscriptions, Apis-periods, and disputed dynasties, is not to suppose that he may ask for any definite chronology on which learned Egyptologists are agreed. The very Chevalier Bunsen, whose views are quoted approvingly on p. 587, as newly received, and interesting matter "in support of preceding remarks," is referred to on p. 487, before such new matters had come to hand, in these terms:—which disclose to us the the pregnant fact that even Mr. Gliddon is now reserving his own final decision, till the forthcoming of the long promised "Book of Kings" of Lepsius: "until the appearance of which, I have consistently maintained since 1844, no professed system of Egyptian chronology can, in the very nature of human things, possess solid or durable claims to attention: such as have recently appeared, worthy of respect, being either like M. Brunet de Presle's, a re-examination of the classical sources; or else like Chev. Bunsen's second volume, a labyrinth of arithmetical adjustments, satisfactory to no one but their learned calculator: or again, similar to the useful but very piece meal coverings of a skeleton chronology, by M. Brugsch, who, in the main, agrees with the time-measurements previously laid down by Lepsius; or finally, ingenious attempts at unsettling that which had been generally agreed upon, by Champollionists, through M. Poitevin's attorney-like process of detecting some supposititious flaw in the indictment. For myself, therefore, as before stated, I have no more precise Egyptian chronology to offer than that already sketched in *Types of Mankind*; and having waited some twelve years for Lepsius, it is small hardship to extend one's patience a few months longer."

But what, meanwhile, is the inquiring student to turn to, while waiting till the luminaries of Egyptian chronology shall have made up their minds what is to be believed? There is the Geological