

which has been thoroughly investigated, positive testimony to the truth of the Bible. You will be in mind that, although the Bible is a volume of writings inspired of God, yet the copyists by whom these writings have been transmitted to us, and the translators who rendered them into our language, were liable to err equally with the copyists and translators of our ancient books. We have, therefore, no reason to be surprised or troubled if science have shown, as undoubtedly it has, both that the Hebrew and Greek text from which our English version was made is, in many places, corrupt, and also that in that version many words and sentences have been incorrectly rendered. On the contrary, it is a strong confirmation of our faith that not only do not the errors, although numerous, seriously affect any point of faith or duty, but the correction of them has frequently furnished an answer to some previous objection. You will also remember that, although the diligent and humble student of the Bible may confidently expect, in answer to prayer, that the Holy Spirit will teach him and guide him into all truth, yet he cannot so depend upon Divine inspiration as to be able to say that his interpretation of every particular passage is certainly correct; and this liability to error, which attaches to every Christian individually, attaches also to the whole church collectively. We cannot wonder, therefore, that science, as it has detected spurious readings and false renderings, so likewise should have shown some generally received interpretations to be incorrect. At the same time we can readily understand how, when these various errors were first exposed, an outcry arose that the truth of the Bible was at stake; and that if science were permitted to teach such things, man's belief in the sacred volume would be gradually undermined and destroyed. But it has not been so. We now have no difficulty in believing that the earth is a globe suspended in space, and that it rotates daily about its axis, and revolves annually round the sun. The language of the Bible, which seems to represent it as a vast stationary plain, and to ascribe day and night to the motion of the sun, we now readily interpret with reference to things as they appear to us, not as they are in reality. Such language is not inaccurate, any more than it would have been for one of us, when leaving England for Australia, to speak of the shores of our native land rapidly receding from our view. In the same manner we are now quite content, I suppose, to give up 1 John v. 7, although some of our fathers of the last generation contended most earnestly for retaining so distinct an affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. I, therefore, have no difficulty in admitting, and only that science sometimes has for a while appeared to contradict the statements, but that in many instances it has also necessitated modifications both of the received text and interpretation of the Bible. This testimony is both negative and positive. The negative has been generally overlooked; but it is very remarkable, and to my mind itself quite conclusive. Recollect for a moment what a variety of writings the Bible consists. In the Old Testament we have a collection of distinct books of the most diversified kind—historical, didactic, devotional, prophetic, in prose and in poetry—written at intervals extending over a period of about 1100 years, by men of the most various characters, and in the most different circumstances. In the New Testament also we have another collection of a very various, although not so various, description. Yet, if we except the first eleven chapters of Genesis, there is no one portion of the whole volume in which it can even plausibly be alleged that science has found a flaw. There are many things difficult to be explained in the Bible. There are discrepancies, real or apparent, between the books of Kings and Chronicles; between the historical references of the martyr Stephen and the apostle Paul. But all these difficulties and discrepancies lie upon the surface. They have not been brought to light by scientific research. Any reader of ordinary intelligence may perceive them. Science, so far from adding to, has, by the explanations which it has suggested, greatly diminished both their number and their force. In not a few instances where science seemed to have detected an error, science has itself confirmed the accuracy of the Bible. Some of these I shall mention presently. What I now want to impress upon your minds is, that neither the science of history nor that of language—neither the investigation of the archeologist nor that of the geographical explorer—neither natural history nor natural philosophy has convicted one of the sacred writers of any actual mistake. In the Bible there is found no such fabulous animal as the phoenix, referred to in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians; no such absurd reasoning as that of Plato for the immortality of the soul; no such controversy with any trustworthy historian, as Xenophon's "Cyropædia" exhibits to the narrative of Herodotus. It is quite true that the Bible was not written to teach us general history, or geology, or natural history, or natural philosophy; but if its writings were inspired of God, we should at least expect that any statements which incidentally occurred in it, relating to any branch of science, would be accurately true. And what I now assert is, that science has not shown any of them to be false; and that, taking into consideration the character of the Bible, this negative fact is alone conclusive testimony to its truth; and I might add, not only to its truth, but its inspiration also. But, further, science has, upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, borne positive testimony to the truth of the Bible. The time at my disposal does not permit me to adduce proofs of this assertion from the discoveries of Lyell in the ruins of Nineveh, the late acquisitions of Egyptian history, and the inscriptions upon the rocks of the Sinai; but I will notice one or two particulars which can be briefly told, as showing in a remarkable manner how science has removed difficulties which itself has suggested. You remember that a king of Babylon is related to have sent messengers to Jerusalem to congratulate King Hezekiah upon his recovery from his sickness, and his success against the Assyrians. But, during a long period of years before and after the reign of Hezekiah, Babylon was under the government of the kings of Assyria. Here, then, seemed to be an historical mistake. But the more exact knowledge recently acquired has shown that precisely at the time when the Bible mentions this king Babylon had revolted from Assyria, and Balaam had established in it an independent monarchy, which, however, was overthrown a few years afterwards by the Assyrians. I will take another instance from the New Testament history. St. Paul, the ruler of Paphos when Paul and Barnabas visited the island, is described as the deputy of the provincial governor of the country. This was the title of the governors of those Roman provinces which were under the Senate, and was never given to the rulers of provinces which were under the direct government of the Emperor. The rulers of these latter were called propretors or legati. Now Paphos was originally an imperial province, and so it was thought that he title of propretor was incorrect. But it has since been pointed out that a Roman historian relates the Emperor Augustus to have exchanged this with the Senate for another province; and hence the title is proved to be correct. The following instances are of another kind:—The ancient idea that the earth was en-

closed by a solid concave canopy, in which the stars was fixed, has been shown by science to be erroneous, and, therefore, the word "firmament" used in Gen. i., which expresses that idea, is clearly wrong. But while the science of natural philosophy condemns our English Bible, the science of language clears the original Hebrew of all responsibility for the error, the word used in it meaning, not a "firmament," but an "expanse." Again, natural history has taught us that whales do not belong to the class of animals related in Gen. i. to have been created on the fifth day, but to the order of mammals, which were created on the sixth day. Here appears an incongruity; but again the science of language helps us, by pointing out that the word rendered "whales," properly signifies "monsters," and aptly describes those saurians which occupy so prominent a place in that geological epoch. Two more proofs of the confirmation of the truth of the Bible by science I must mention. One, which I have never seen noticed, and which, therefore, may perhaps not strike others as it strikes me, is afforded by the discovery of Galileo, to which I have already alluded—the rotatory motion of the earth, by which the alternations of day and night, and the rising and setting of the sun and moon, are produced. Through this rotation of the earth the apparent motions of the sun and moon are so connected with each other that if the one were stopped in its course the other would be stopped likewise; whereas if the earth were stationary, and each of those revolved round it, their motions would be independent of each other, and there would be no reason why, if one were stopped, the other should not go on its course as before. Now, we have an account in the Bible of the sun being miraculously stopped, and we are expressly told that the moon, in accordance with the true theory of the earth's motion, was stopped also: "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies." The other, and the last that I shall refer to, is the most remarkable of all:—inasmuch as it distinctly demonstrates not only the truth but the inspiration of Genesis i. It is the correspondence of the geological with the Bible record of the creation. Bear in mind that Moses, or whoever wrote that chapter, must have been wholly ignorant of geology, for there is not a trace of the existence of this science among mankind in the early ages of the world. Bear in mind, also, that he could have obtained no information concerning the creation of the world from any human source. Upon this subject neither he nor any other man could have known anything, except by revelation from God. The account, therefore, must have been either inspired of God, or else a pure fiction of the imagination. Now, that it was not the latter is irrefragably proved from the confirmation of its statements by geology. Suppose anyone thoroughly acquainted with geology to be required to give a summary history of this earth, the succession of plants and animals upon it, and the laws which have regulated their reproduction, could he do it in the same space—with the same accuracy? I will venture to affirm that he could not. Let us just call to mind the several steps in the work of creation as they are related in Genesis, and observe how geographically they describe a series of events each of which is verified by the discoveries of geology. The Bible history commences by telling us that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" and it proceeds to represent the earth as entirely destitute of all vegetable and animal life, and immersed in darkness. This description exactly agrees with the conclusions of geology, the darkness, doubtless, being occasioned by the thick vapors, through which the sun's rays could not penetrate. The creation of light upon the earth, which we can conceive to have been produced by the thinning of those vapors, is afterwards related; but, in the mention made of the Spirit of God brooding upon the face of the waters, there is an intimation of animal life having been previously produced in them; and this is quite consistent with the geological record. Next comes the creation of the expanse, the space occupied by the air, when the larger portion of the surrounding vapor was gathered into clouds, forming the waters above the expanse, which were thus divided from the waters under the expanse. The latter still continued to cover the earth. But the Bible tells us that the next step in the progress of creation was the gathering together of those waters, and the consequent appearance of the dry land. This would be the natural upheaval of all the great chains of mountains which geology tells us occurred at that particular epoch. Here, again, the two records agree. Upon the earth being thus prepared, we read that the dry land was immediately covered with vegetation; and this fact, too, is attested by geology. And now we come to a very remarkable part of the Bible story, the making of the two great lights, or rather luminaries, for the earth—the sun and the moon. At first we are perplexed at this statement; for we cannot doubt that the sun and moon were created at the beginning with the earth. But this perplexity is removed by the explanation, that then these luminaries first became visible—shone clearly forth upon the earth. And it is very remarkable that the effect of sunshine is, at that epoch, first distinctly indicated by geology. The manner in which it is indicated is exceedingly curious. During a long series of ages the plants I use the word as including all manner of trees) with which the earth was thickly covered were all of a character that required for their growth heat, moisture, and shade; and hence we may infer that the earth was then still overhung with thick fogs, which the rays of the sun were unable to penetrate. But at the end of that period, as their fossil remains show, these began to appear forests of trees, the hardness of whose wood, and their season rings, proved that the earth was then in sunshine. On the fifth day, as it is called, our Bible record relates the creation of all manner of aquatic reptiles and birds, and this likewise agrees with the geological history. For it was at this epoch that, as it tells us, all the great saurians abounded upon the earth, and that birds first began to fly in the heaven. Hitherto according to both records, no mammals, i.e. no animals of the highest class of being, existed upon the earth; but now, in this sixth and last era, the Bible describes their introduction, and geology also bears its testimony to the fact. Nor is our comparative review yet complete. There is still one point more to be noticed. Whatever disputes exist among them about the antiquity of man, all geologists are agreed that he was the last created animal upon the earth. Thus they confirm the Bible narrative in this also, that, when all also was finished, and God saw that it was good, He said, "Let us make man." Thus the brief record in Genesis is confirmed in every point by the results of geological science. That record may suggest many questions as to details which we are unable to answer; but this inability does not in the least impair the force of my present argument. What I affirm is, that such a perfect correspondence between science and Genesis i., in so many particulars, upon a subject on which nothing could have been known except by Divine revelation, can be explained only by the truth, and therefore the Divine inspiration, of this portion of the Bible. I can only just remind you of the controversy upon this subject, and the doubt and perplexity occasioned by it, even up to a few years ago. Even now many hesitate to

accept the interpretation which geology seems to me to render necessary, and to which I see no reasonable objection, that the days in the Bible record do not mean periods of twenty-four hours, but long eras of time. I must also content myself with simply mentioning that geology affords no countenance whatever to the hypothesis of Darwin and the "Vestiges of Creation," but, on the contrary, confirms the statement of the Bible that God created every plant and every animal after its kind. The following out of this argument has compelled me to draw very largely upon your patience; but I trust, my friends, that I have succeeded in proving to your satisfaction the truth of my proposition—that science, although it sometimes has for a time appeared to contradict the statements, and in many instances has necessitated modifications of the received text and interpretation, yet has always borne not only a negative, but upon every question which has been thoroughly investigated, positive testimony to the truth of the Bible. The third proposition, which I shall now endeavor to establish, is this:—There is no reasonable cause to doubt that, although not scientific discoveries, and the speculations to which they have led, will likewise issue in the confirmation of the truth and inspiration of the Bible. The discoveries and speculations to which I particularly allude are those relating to the antiquity and original condition of man, which have lately excited so much attention. A few weeks ago, my friend Dr. Bromby delivered a very interesting lecture upon them in this building. The hypothesis by which he would reconcile the facts of science with the Bible story, is not, in my opinion, admissible; and there were some expressions used by him in his lecture which I greatly regret, as seeming to indicate a doubt respecting the title of the Bible to our unqualified belief in matters of history, and as likely to be misapprehended by many of his hearers; but while I feel bound to say thus much, I am quite sure that, although my friend, I am quite sure that, although, he has an equal reverence with me for the Bible as the divinely furnished treasury of all religious truth, and with respect to all matters of Christian faith and duty, would be equally earnest with myself in contending for its inspiration of God. From the great variety of particulars comprehended in it, this branch of my subject is exceedingly difficult to compress within the short space that I am able to allot to it, and I must therefore strictly confine myself to those matters which are essential to my argument. The course which I shall adopt will be, first, to bring together the several classes of facts which science presents to our consideration for determining the two points that I have mentioned, the antiquity and original condition of man, and to notice some of the inferences which have been drawn from them, and afterwards to examine what the Bible tells us about them. We shall then be able to compare together the respective testimony of these two witnesses, and observe whether the conclusions of science disagree, and if so, in what particulars, and to what extent, with the statements of the Bible. Several quite distinct classes of facts relating to the early ages of man's existence upon the earth have recently caused scientific men to attribute a very great antiquity to the human race. Of these, the first to be considered is the evidence which history and tradition furnish of the existence at an extremely distant period of highly-civilised nations, and the establishment of powerful empires, such as those of Egypt and China. Little doubt appears to be entertained by persons capable of forming a correct opinion, that the Egyptian kingdom dates from at least 2700 B.C., and that the authentic records of the Chinese empire extend back upwards of 2000, and probably 2300 or 2400 years before the Christian era. Next, there is another class of facts, described at some length, and with much graphic power, by Dr. Bromby, in his recent lecture, which are thought to indicate that man was an inhabitant of the earth very long before that time. For my present purpose it is necessary that I should briefly re-state them. In England and France, in certain strata, and among the bones of certain extinct animals, of a kind that geologists had previously regarded as long anterior to the existence of the human race, have recently been discovered flint and other stone implements, known now by the name of celts, together with tools of bone, and broken pieces of a very rude species of crockery, which clearly show that a race of men in a very low state of civilisation was coeval in that part of the world with those extinct races of animals; also in the extensive peat bogs which are found in various parts of Denmark have been discovered implements of stone, bronze and iron, lying in the successive strata of the bogs—the stone being in the lowest, the bronze in the next, and the iron in the next recent strata; and, what is especially noticeable, in the lowest strata with the stone implements are found the prostrate trunks of Scotch firs; in the next higher, with the implements of bronze, the trunks of oaks; and in the most recent, with the implements of iron, the trunks of beeches. Hence it is inferred that there was in the country a succession of forests of fir, oak and beech, with which the successive races of man who used these various materials were respectively contemporary. But neither the fir nor the oak has grown for the last 2000 years known to us, or can now be made to grow, in Denmark, and therefore it is argued that many ages must have elapsed since the existence of these ancient races of men dwelt in or near them. Denmark likewise furnishes other remarkable relics of its primeval inhabitants. The shores of its islands "are dotted" with numerous mounds composed of gnawed bones and shells of fish, such as are not now to be found in that neighborhood, interspersed with stone implements. From the circumstance that in these old "kitchen-heaps," as they have been appropriately called, no remains of any extinct animals, with the exception of the urus, or wild bull, which was alive in the days of Julius Cæsar, are found, and so that the flint knives and hatchets are of a more finished description, it has been inferred that these mounds belong to a later period than the relics in England and France of which I spoke just now. This is therefore called the second stone period. In Switzerland, again, there exist very curious remains, which are of quite a different character, but which tell a similar story of its ancient inhabitants. A large number of the lakes in that country contain the ruins, if they may be so termed, of villages which were built on platforms raised upon piles, in water from 5 ft. to 15 ft. in depth. The sites of these villages—i.e. the mud under the platforms on which they were built—afford abundant evidence of the condition and habits of the people who dwelt in them. In some—principally those of the Eastern lakes—no implements, except of stone, horn, and bone, have been found; but yet, in these are indications of an advance in civilisation beyond the people of the stone age in Denmark. In others, which are confined to the Western and Central lakes, bronze weapons and utensils have been dredged up, some of which bear a close resemblance to those which have been found in Denmark. The inhabitants of all these villages appear to have domesticated the ox, the sheep, the goat, and

the dog, and to have cultivated wheat and barley. But in those of the stone age, hunted beasts seem to have been eaten more commonly than the domestic animals, and the reverse is true of the bronze age. There is yet another class of facts which are adduced in this argument, viz. those which ethnology and the science of language have made us acquainted with. It appears to be now generally acknowledged that, while all the manifold races of mankind blend into one another, they may be classified under three types: the Caucasian, which includes the principal European and many Asiatic nations; the Mongolian, of which the Chinese may be taken as representatives; and the negro. There seems also to be no reason to doubt that these three great divisions of the human family were characterised 3000 or 4000 years ago by the same broad distinctions as at present. This, as respects the negro, is actually proved by ancient Egyptian pictures, in which he is clearly portrayed, and it may, I think, be not unnecessarily assumed of the Mongolian also. In correspondence with this threefold division of mankind, there is likewise (and this is a very curious coincidence) a threefold division of the various languages of the human family. Science has now grouped these also in three classes; one of which, the Aryan—or, as it is sometimes called, the Iranian or Indo-European—constitutes, in its many modified forms, the language of the Caucasian race, and includes the Sanscrit, the Greek, and the German. Another, the Turanian, is the language of the Chinese, and (strange to say) that, although with some peculiarities, of the American Indians; and the third is the language of the negro race. Each of these families of languages may be regarded as having existed as long as the race of men which uses it. In this brief summary of principal facts which modern science has brought to light, relative to the antiquity and original condition of man, I have merely put together results which I have taken, and which you might any day have taken, from the common popular works upon the subject. I have not examined, and in many cases I should not be able to judge of the evidence—historical, archeological, geological, ethnological and grammatical—from which these results have been deduced, but I accept them as I accept the phenomena of natural history described by Darwin, upon the authority of the various scientific men who have made these several branches their peculiar study, and whose characters justly entitle their statements to credit. They certainly present to us a problem, the solution of which, while it is a matter of no small interest, is one of very great difficulty. I do not pretend to be able to solve it; but I trust to be able to satisfy you that, if it ever be solved, it will be in a manner consistent with the truth of the Bible. But, before proceeding to compare these facts with the statements of the Bible, it is necessary to notice some of the inferences which have been drawn from them, and which, although all conjectural, and some, in my opinion, certainly erroneous, are usually assumed to be as certain as the facts themselves. This is one. From the circumstance that Denmark, and perhaps Switzerland (although this is by no means certain), was occupied successively by races which used stone, bronze, and iron for their tools and weapons, it has been inferred that in the history of mankind a stone age everywhere preceded a bronze, and a bronze preceded an iron age. But this is a quite unauthorised generalisation, and, so far as I know, entirely unsupported by facts. I am not aware of any traces of a stone age in Egypt, or in any of the ancient Eastern empires. No celts or kitchen-heaps have been found in those countries, which appear to have been the earliest abodes of man. No argument has been adduced against the hypothesis that, at the very time when the inhabitants of Denmark were forming their kitchen-heaps, and those of Switzerland dwelling in their lake villages, the Egyptians and Assyrians had already attained a high state of refinement and skill in the arts. As has been remarked, the stone age has continued here in Australia even to our own day, and lake villages are mentioned by Herodotus to have existed in his time. The fact, therefore, of a people using only implements of stone or bronze does not prove them to have been more ancient than others which had learnt the art of smelting and manufacturing iron. Again, it has been inferred that the ancient people, who at the first only used stone implements, gradually advanced in their knowledge of the arts—first finishing more highly their tools of stone, then discovering the art of manufacturing bronze, which as bronze is a compound of two independent metals, would require no small degree of knowledge and skill, and afterwards became artificers in iron. But I have found no evidence whatever of any such gradual progress. The lake villages of Switzerland were certainly destroyed by a hostile race; and the earlier races in Denmark may have been in like manner exterminated by others more warlike, and more skilled in the arts than themselves. Of a similar character is a third inference, which in my opinion is utterly groundless—viz. that all the most highly-civilised nations of the world emerged from the same original state of barbarism, and gradually advanced to their present condition of civilisation. Of this, the facts that I have stated afford no proof whatever. So far as we learn from science, there never was a period at which the Egyptian and the Chinese were ignorant of the arts; nor would such ignorance, if it existed, necessarily imply a state of barbarism. It would not imply any moral or intellectual deficiency. We might as well speak of our great Alfred as a barbarian because he was ignorant of the use of the compass, and the art of printing, and the manufacture of gunpowder; or describe Bacon and Newton as living in a barbarous age because men were then unacquainted with the use of gas, the power of steam, and the electric telegraph, as infer that a race of men were barbarians because they could not manufacture iron or bronze. I can see no reason, therefore, for determining with certainty what was the moral and intellectual condition of man, or what knowledge of the arts he possessed, when he first appeared upon the earth. It does not enable us positively to decide whether the savage races who have hitherto existed, or who now exist, have gradually sunk into their present low condition, or whether the civilised nations of the world have gradually risen out of a state of barbarism. For myself, however, I should have no doubt, even if I had only the light of science to guide me, that the former alternative contained the true explanation of the phenomena. The indications of ancient civilisation in America and other parts of the world, the traces which many existing savage tribes exhibit of having formerly held a higher rank in the human family, the instances which history has recorded of the degeneration of nations—all appear to show that the natural tendency of man is to fall rather than to rise. I have dwelt at some length upon this question, because the view which we take of the condition of primeval man has a direct bearing upon his antiquity. If we assume that man originally was in the condition of the aboriginal Dase, or, to make the nature of the assumption more clear, the aboriginal Australian, we may certainly conclude that it must have taken many thousands of years for him to raise himself to the condition of the ancient Egyptian. I do not believe that he ever could have so raised himself. On the other hand, if we believe that man in his primeval condition was a being of high in-

tellectual power, then there is no difficulty in conceiving that within comparatively a few years—so soon as the races had begun to multiply upon the earth—the cities and empires, like those of Egypt and China, were built and established. The inferences which have been deduced from geological calculations respecting the age of the relics in the caves at Brimham in England and Abbeville and Amiens in France, and those in the mounds and peat bogs of Denmark, and the lake villages of Switzerland carry with them more authority. But the calculations from which they are drawn are based upon hypothetical data of a very uncertain nature, so that even they cannot claim to be regarded as certain conclusions which we are bound to accept as science. At the best they are only probable conjectures. One other circumstance I wish you particularly to observe, viz. that science, although it traces up the characteristic differences which now exist between the various races of man, and the languages spoken by them, to an unknown antiquity, does not enable us to discover the origin of these differences. In respect to language, Max Müller appears to have traced out with wonderful skill the affinities which exist between them, and the modifications which some of them have experienced in the lapse of years; but, so far as I can learn, from so many years' information (for I have not been able to find time to read his works), he has not established the possibility, still less has he proved the fact, of having grown out naturally from a common parent stock. Science, therefore, does not disallow the belief that the diversities both of race and language which now exist all originated at one and the same period, and not according to the order of nature but by a supernatural agency. Here let us pause, and before we turn to the Bible let us review the classes of facts that we have to deal with. First, there is the acknowledged existence of the Egyptian and Chinese, and the probable existence of other empires at a period of not less than, say, 2700 years B.C. Secondly, there are the visible remains of a race of men who lived before many species of animals had become extinct, and when the surface and climate of the earth, at least in the northern parts of Europe, were very different from what they now are; also the remains of one or more uncivilised races which inhabited Denmark and Switzerland in prehistoric times. Thirdly, there are the differences of races and languages which can be traced up as far as we have any knowledge of the human family. These are I think, the only facts which science has as yet established. The length of time since these several races inhabited the countries where their remains have been found, the condition of primeval man, and the origin of existing races and languages, are all matters only of more or less probable conjecture. And now what does the Bible tell us? It tells us first of all, that God said, "Let us make Adam" (so it is in the original Hebrew without the article) "in our image, after our likeness;" and in the following verse, "So God created Adam" (here the article is prefixed) "in his own image, in the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." In the next chapter of Genesis we have a more particular account of man's creation. "The Lord God formed the Adam of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the Adam became a living soul." I may here notice, in passing, that the Hebrew word for ground is Adamah, which, as you will observe, is closely allied with Adam. The Adam was formed out of the adamah. The narrative proceeds to tell of God placing the Adam in the garden of Eden, of the provision made for him, and the commandment imposed upon him; and then it relates how God brought all the various animals to him that he should name them, and how he gave them all their distinctive names. But it tells there was not found for Adam (not the Adam) an help meet for him, and therefore God took one of the ribs of the Adam, and of it He formed woman. From this account it is evident that Adam, or the Adam, was, according to the Bible, no savage, but a being of great intelligence, as well as of a perfect moral purity. Afterwards, as is related, by his transgression of the Divine commandment he lost his moral purity, and so sin entered into the world, and produced its baneful consequences on all his descendants. Cain, who, as we infer from the Bible narrative, was his first-born son, became a fratricide, the murderer of his brother Abel. Thenceforward the corruption of morals rapidly increased, until the wickedness of the Adam became so great upon the earth that God, we are told, destroyed the whole race, with the exception of Noah and his family, by a great flood of waters. This catastrophe, which in reference to our present subject is the second great event related in the Bible, took place, according to the chronology of the Hebrew text, which is retained in our authorised version, in the 1656th year after the creation. We are able to fix this date from the genealogical record in the fifth chapter of Genesis, and a similar genealogical record in the tenth chapter enables us to calculate the period from the flood to the birth of Abraham. According to our English Bible, this was 852 years, and from other data which the Bible supplies this period from the patriarch's birth to the commencement of the Christian era has been calculated at 1935 years. Thus, by this reckoning, it appears that less than 600 years have elapsed since the creation, and less than 400 since the deluge. Both these numbers make the origin of man to be of a much more recent date than the facts which I just now stated, in the opinion of some scientific men, indicate. Hence, as formerly in respect to the six days' creation of the world, different attempts have been made to bring the Bible narrative into agreement with the received theory of science. For effecting such an agreement two suggestions have been offered. One is, that in the account of the creation the word Adam, which appears to have been often used by the Hebrews of man in general, and is frequently rendered by man in our English Bible, denotes not an individual called by that name, but the human race; and that many years have elapsed, and that many countries of the world may have been peopled, before Cain and Abel were born into it. This is the hypothesis of my friend Dr. Bromby. The other, which has been proposed by M. Caussand, in a work called "Adam and the Adamite," and by an anonymous writer in a book entitled "Genesis of the Earth and Man," is of quite an opposite character. It supposes Adam and his descendants to have formed only one of the races of mankind—the Caucasian; and that the two other races—the Mongolian and the negro—existed long previously, but that of them the Bible tells us nothing. It besides others, which I need not now attempt to mention, there is one objection to both these hypotheses which appears to me quite conclusive, viz. that they are inconsistent with the doctrine of the New Testament Scriptures. For, first, in his epistle to the Romans and Corinthians, St. Paul makes the personal individuality of Adam, which he assumes as an acknowledged fact, to be the foundation of his argument, concerning our redemption by and resurrection with Christ. If you look at Romans v. and 1 Corinthians xv., you will see that not only the correctness of the apostle's statement, but the truth of his doctrine, would be invalidated by supposing that the first Adam by whom sin entered into the world, and death by sin, was not one Adam in the same sense as was the second Adam, our Lord Jesus Christ who redeemed us from sin and death, and obtained for us the gift