

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER 1839.

---

No. IV.

---

---

*Samuel Miller*

- ART. I.—1. *The Intermediate State: a Sermon by the Rev. Reuben Sherwood of Hyde Park.* New York, pp. 18. Appendix, pp. 42.
2. *No Intermediate Place: a Sermon delivered in the Reformed Dutch Church in Hyde Park, by the Rev. William Cruikshanks,* pp. 22.

THE discourse of Mr. Cruikshanks is a brief, plain, straightforward, honest and manly illustration of the doctrine of an intermediate *state* of departed souls; with a refutation of the doctrine of an intermediate *place* of the dead. Mr. C. goes forth into the field to meet a challenge; and he goes with his sling and the smooth stones of the brook, although he is not a Goliath that he has to encounter. He goes forth with his Bible, and tells us what God's word has declared in reference to the state of departed souls.

That there is no intermediate *place*, he argues from the plain statements of the holy Scriptures; from the fact that it is contrary to all the desires and expectations of the people of God; that it is contrary to their approved faith; that it is in direct opposition to the case stated by our Lord, in his parable of Dives and Lazarus; and to the holy visions of the

ART. II.—*Ancient Fragments of the Phoenician, Chaldean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other writers; with an Introductory Dissertation: and an Inquiry into the Philosophy and Trinity of the Ancients.* By Isaac Preston Cory, Esq., Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge. Second Edition. London: William Pickering. 1832. pp. 361.

OF the history of the earlier ages of the human race our knowledge is very defective. In relation to the period before the flood not a single document worthy of confidence exists, except those contained in the Hebrew scriptures. But the Bible makes no other historical pretensions than as respects the line of which the Saviour was to be born, and the records of the Jews as the people among whom it existed. Any other historical information it gives is only accidental. Nevertheless we find little else to rely upon concerning the history of the world during not only the age anterior to the flood, but also during more than one half of the period which has elapsed since that epoch. A cloud rests upon the beginning of our race—a cloud of fiction as well as of ignorance. Here, as in other subjects, we find ourselves bounded by the *inscrutable*, but more immediately by what we may call the *indefinite*, in which some things partially discovered lead out imagination, in the absence of realities, to construct a fabric of her own. And as, in most cases, where other minds have preceded, so here we are not made to feel, immediately upon reaching it, the limit of accurate knowledge, but become gradually sensible of it as the mists of theory and fiction part asunder and vanish away before stern inquiry. And it is no slight matter to resist the tendency to theorize upon the facts with which we may be furnished, and where these are defective, to supply the hiatus from fancied analogy. Truth we so much love, that where she is herself unattainable, we will worship even the image we have so conjured up to represent her. Fiction is pleasing only as the resemblance of truth, and theory is attractive only until discoveries are made to disprove; but the natural love for system and for completeness lead to it whenever knowledge is defective. As the imagination cannot be said to create otherwise than by re-producing, modifying, and combining into new connexions, the materials collected in various times and circumstances, and by lending its own character of spirituality to all. It therefore

can call up nothing radically new, but must carry out from the known all the materials of that with which it would people the unknown. In every tradition, however wild its character, it is our opinion there lie hid some seeds of truth. The tales of chimeras, of centaurs, &c. are most probably relations of real occurrences distorted by the multitude of hands through which they have come, and the arabesques with which imagination, playing with the vague and wonderful, has chosen to adorn them. Indeed the perfection of knowledge alone could prevent such from being the fate of all that is committed to the memory of man. For as darkness will magnify fear, not only by the addition of those terrors arising from obscurity and doubt, but also by affording place for the imagination to people with creatures of its own, so ignorance will often exalt to the supernatural, and invest with astonishing attributes what the light of knowledge would strip of all its wonder, by making it perfectly understood. Tradition generally long retains the more prominent features of the original story, but never without many modifications in the minor details;—and when no written records are preserved, many important transactions must come, in the course of time, to be forgotten altogether, from the crowding in of other things of later occurrence and more engrossing interest. Thus is excluded from the pale of authentic history, a large number of the earlier generations of mankind; as it could not be until after considerable advances had been made in civilization and the arts, that any other method of preserving the records of the past than oral tradition could be invented. The earliest fragment of a historical form, dates not farther back than the fourteenth century, B. C.; and even of that there is considerable doubt. This, however, is not altogether owing to the want of writing, but very much also to the fragile nature of the writing materials, and the limited number of copies which could possibly be published in those early ages, when the process of transcribing was so laborious, and readers so few. Frequent allusions are made by the oldest authors extant to others who had written before them. And strange indeed does it appear to us, who possess so many means of perserving literature, that all those works which we are told of as existing before the time of Homer, should have so completely gone the way of those transactions whose memory they vainly endeavoured to perpetuate, that scarcely one genuine fragment now remains. Thus has oblivion passed upon more than one half of the period of the existence of our

race, broken only in one direction by the writings of Moses. And even after this period, what is recorded, is but the annals of a small portion of the world, and that so mixed up with fable, as to make it difficult to know what to believe, and what to reject. Nor is it until the five hundredth year, B. C. that we meet with more than a distracted fragment of credible history.\* Knowing, therefore, so little of the early history of mankind, there is interest in every hint which adds, in the slightest degree, to our ideas on the subject. And the task performed in the volume which has suggested these remarks, although adding nothing to what we knew before, is one which lays us under considerable obligations, inasmuch as it brings together, into something like connection, the fragments of the literature of those olden times which lie scattered among various writers of a late date. Many of the pieces, as they stand here, it must be acknowledged, do not seem to possess the same degree of importance as they do in the connexion in which they are found quoted; and some to the mere general reader must appear unmeaning from the same cause. But it must be no little lightening of labour to the student of theology and of ancient history, to have thus spread before his eye, and put at once into his hands, what he otherwise must have obtained, if obtained at all, by long and persevering investigation. From our previous remarks, we should expect to find those remains of the past much mingled with fable; as most of the writers relate not the transactions of their own times, but what had come down to them remarkable from previous ages: and those having been long committed wholly to tradition, had, undoubtedly, received many modifications from the imaginations of the various relators. The most of the historical fragments are accordingly either allegorical genealogies, or tales of wonder concerning beings who seemed to partake, at the same time, of the passions of men, and of the power of Gods. We have every reason to believe that many of these writers did their

\* Herodotus did not write until about 430, B.C. The period of authentic history among the Chinese extends not farther back than the time of Confucius, who died, B. C. 477, and who must, therefore, have been nearly contemporary with Herodotus. The period of fable among the Hindoos comes down even later than the Christian aera. According to Klaproth, the authentic history of the Georgians commences in the third century, B. C.; of the Armenians in the second; of the Thibetians in the first century of the Christian aera; of the Persians in the third; of the Arabians in the fifth; of the Mongols in the twelfth; of the Turks in the fourteenth. Few European nations can state any thing with certainty of their ancestors before the time of Cæsar.



best to arrive at the truth, but how was that truth to be obtained which lay behind some fifty or sixty generations, and obscured by the fiction which all these had combined to throw around it? Sanchoniatho, the earliest Gentile historian of whom we possess any remains, is indeed expressly stated to have been remarkably scrupulous with regard to the truth of what he related; but even with all his care, he seems to have been unable to gather the truth from the heaps of traditional rubbish with which it had become confounded. Yet he certainly had access to the most trust-worthy authorities which the Gentile world could afford. He was a Phoenician, and is generally supposed to have lived somewhere about the thirteenth or fourteenth century, B. C. A native of Tyre, some say Berytus, and the chief priest of his nation, thus possessing the most authentic sources of information. He is said to have written several works, both historical and theological, in the Phoenician language, of which none are now extant. Whatever we have of his, we owe to those Greek writers who have quoted from him, and to Philo Biblius, who, in the second century, A. D., translated his Phoenician history into Greek, from which again only a few fragments have been preserved to the present time in the quotations of Eusebius. These are concerning the history and theology of Phoenicia, and are evidently possessed of much of that spirit which we have stated as characterizing all early historical compositions. Here, however, it is proper to remark that as we are not certain that we have his own words, so we cannot be confident that his statements have not been perverted. For not only is the original language of the author irretrievably lost, and the remains transmitted to us through several hands, but in addition to all this they are mingled with the remarks of the author by whom they are quoted so much and so inseparably, that it is often difficult to tell what is ancient and what belongs to the transcriber. And even sometimes it is not very clear that the expressions are those of the ancient writer at all, but rather a general statement of what he has recorded. And this remark applies to the majority of the fragments contained in the volume.

With whatever accuracy history may be written, it will, in the course of time, become obscure in many passages, as those contemporary circumstances which concentrated their light upon it, begin to fade away from the minds of men—things too, which, when the work was produced, were so

well known, that it would scarcely have been pardoned in the historian to have repeated them. His allusions also to things elsewhere, related in works so well known when he was writing, that it required only an allusion to call them up before the mind of the reader, and that in a more pleasing manner than by relating the whole—all conduce, as those contemporary works drop into forgetfulness, to darken the narrative. Explanation becomes necessary: but those who assume the task, under such circumstances, cannot always possess the means of correctly explaining every passage; and most commonly, they will be more willing to have recourse to conjecture than to confess their ignorance. And what is worse, they will not always distinguish their conjectures from the truth. Other passages they may honestly believe that they have explained, while they have themselves been completely mistaken. And sometimes a mistaken view of the general object of a work may lead to a perversion of the whole. All this taking place in times when the commentator did not content himself with annexing his views to the text, but most commonly mingled them up with it, came often with the best intentions in the annotator, to throw an impenetrable obscurity about some ancient writings. Thus it is stated of Sanchoniatho, that “he wrote his history of the Jewish antiquities with the greatest care and fidelity, having received his facts from Hierombalus, a priest, and having a mind to write a universal history of all nations, from the beginning, he took the greatest pains in searching the records of Taautus. But some later writers had corrupted his remains by their allegorical interpretations and physical additions. For the more modern priests or explainers of the Sacra, had omitted to relate the true facts as they were recorded, instead of which, they had obscured them by invented accounts and mysterious fictions, drawn from their notions of the nature of the universe. So that it was not easy for one to distinguish the real facts which Taautus had recorded from the fictions super-added to them. But he, (that is Sanchoniatho) finding some of the books of the Ammonei which were kept in the libraries or registries of the temples, examined every thing with the greatest care; and rejecting the allegories and fables which at first sight offered themselves, he at length brought his work to perfection. But the priests who lived after him, adding their comments and explanations to his work, in some time brought all back to mythology again. Notwithstanding all this, we are not inclined to reject these fragments,

perverted as they thus undoubtedly are, as altogether useless. But when we meet with one coinciding in important points with a professedly historical account, given elsewhere by another hand and in another country, we are disposed to allow considerable weight to its evidence. This, at least, it would seem to prove; that it was not a fiction of their own, but a tradition, common to both countries, which they related. Thus, Sanchoniatho's account of the creation, as given by Eusebius, is as follows: "He supposes that the beginning of all things was a dark and condensed windy air, or a breeze of thick air, and a chaos turbid and black as Erebus; and that these were unbounded, and for a long series of ages destitute of form. But when this wind became enamoured of its own first principles, (the chaos), and an intimate union took place, that connexion was called Pothos—and it was the beginning of the creation of all things. And it (the chaos) knew not its own production; but from its embrace with the wind was generated Möt; which some call Ilus, (mud) but others, the putrefaction of a watery mixture. And from this sprung all the seed of creation and the generation of the universe.

"And there were certain animals without sensation, from which intelligent animals were produced, and these were called Zophasemin, that is, the overseers of the heavens; and they were formed in the shape of an egg; and from Möt shone the sun, and the moon, the less and the greater stars.

"And when the air began to send forth light, by its fiery influence on the sea and earth, winds were produced, and clouds, and very great defluxions and torrents of the heavenly waters. And when they were thus separated, and carried out of their proper places by the heat of the sun, and all met again in the air, and were dashed against each other, thunder and lightning were the result: and at the sound of the thunder, the before mentioned intelligent animals were aroused, and startled by the noise, and moved upon the earth, and in the sea, male and female."

Afterwards he adds, "that these things were found written in the cosmogony of Taautus, and in his commentaries, and were drawn from his observations and the natural signs which, by his penetration, he perceived and discovered, and with which he has enlightened us." Now, however fabulous this account may appear, that there is a ground work of truth in it, we are assured, not only from the coincidences here and there with the Mosaic accounts, but also from the evidence of modern science, that the earth, as is here stated, must have

lain long in a state unfitted for any of those beings who now inhabit it, is demonstrated by the undeniable facts of geology; which, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, is not in opposition to the account given by Moses. For he does not say that God created either man or the other animals at the beginning of the world. He merely states, that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; but as his business is only with the history of man, he enters not into any account of the length of time which the earth lay without form and void, or how long the darkness was upon the face of the deep before the sun and moon were called into existence, and the land and water were separated and both fitted for the habitation of those beings who now occupy them.\*

The next fragment, namely, the Generations, has much of the same character. Snatches of truth, evidently forming the ground-work; and the genius of Sanchoniatho, or more probably his commentators, having so connected and modified them, as to give them a symbolical meaning.

After Sanchoniatho, we have no historian of these countries until the fourth century, B. C., when the writings of Berosus and Manetho appeared. They were contemporaries. Berosus was a Babylonian, and in the time of Alexander the Great, was priest of Belus. Having obtained a knowledge of the Greek language, most probably from the Macedonians who accompanied Alexander, he removed to the Island of Cos, where he taught astronomy and astrology, and acquired so much celebrity among the Greeks, that a statute is said to have been raised to him at Athens, with a gilded tongue, as expressive of his accurate and wonderful predictions. Besides several other works, he wrote a history of Babylonia, in three books, which included also the history of the Medes. This work was extant in the time of Josephus, who has made considerable use of it in the compilation of his work upon Jewish antiquities, but nothing now remains except the quotations of Josephus, Abydenus, and later writers. He professes to have taken his facts from public records, and from chronicles, preserved in the temple of Belus. And doubtless, his office gave him access to authorities

\* The authority of Berosus is also to the point—"There was a time in which there existed nothing but darkness and an abyss of waters, wherein resided most hideous beings, which were produced of a two-fold principle."



the most trust-worthy to be found, since in all countries and ages the priesthood have shown themselves the most faithful guardians of literature. Notwithstanding the leaven of fiction has no less modified the facts in these than in the preceding fragments. Thus, "he mentions that there were written accounts preserved at Babylon with the greatest care, comprehending a period of above fifteen myriads of years;" which piece of information certainly does not conduce to strengthen our belief in what he is about to draw from them. But not to judge of facts a priori, we shall exhibit a specimen of those accounts, and allow it to speak for itself. He tells us that "in the first year, there appeared from that part of the Erythraean sea, which borders upon Babylonia, an animal destitute of reason,\* by name Oannes, whose whole body was that of a fish; that under the fish's head, he had another head, with feet also below, similar to those of a man, subjoined to the fish's tail. His voice, too, and language, was articulate and human, and a representation of him is preserved even to this day."

This being was accustomed to pass the day among men; but took no food at that season; and he gave them an insight into letters, and sciences, and arts of every kind. He taught them to construct cities, to found temples, to compile laws, and explained to them the principles of geometrical knowledge. He made them distinguish the seeds of the earth, and showed them how to collect the fruits; in short, he instructed them in every thing which could tend to soften their manners and humanize their lives. From that time, nothing material has been added by way of improvement to his instructions. And when the sun had set, this Oannes retired again into the sea, and passed the night in the deeps; for he was amphibious. After this there appeared other animals like Oannes of which Berosus proposes to give an account when he comes to the history of the kings.

Of this passage the Editor remarks. "Unconscious that Noah is represented under the character of Oannes, Berosus describes him, from the hieroglyphical delineation, as a being literally compounded of a fish and a man, and as passing the natural instead of the diluvian night in the ocean, with other circumstances indicative of his character and life,"—probably as good as any other explanation which could now

\* Certainly a very calumnious epithet when applied to a being who seems to have taught the Babylonian the use of reason, but so it is *αγγελος*.

be given, though its worth may be judged of from the following passages, in which Noah is introduced under quite a different character, and at a different period. "This is the History which Berosus has transmitted to us. He tells us that the first king was Alorus of Babylon, a Chaldean. He reigned ten Sari:\* and afterward Alaparus and Amelon, who came from Pantibiblon: then Ammenon the Chaldean, in whose time appeared the Musarus Oannes the Annedotus from the Erythraean sea. Then succeeded Megalarus from the city of Pantibiblon; and he reigned eighteen sari: and after him Daonus the shepherd from Pantibiblon reigned ten sari. In his time appeared again from the Erythraean sea a fourth Annedotus, having the same form with those above, the shape of a fish blended with that of a man. Then reigned Euedorachus from Pantibiblon, for the term of eighteen sari; in his days there appeared another personage from the Erythraean sea like the former, having the same complicated form between a fish and a man, whose name was Oadcon. Then reigned Amempsinus, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he being the eighth in order, reigned ten sari. Then reigned Otiartes, a Chaldean from Laranchae, and he reigned eight sari. And upon the death of Otiartes, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari: in his time happened the great deluge. So that the sum of all the kings is ten, and the term which they collectively reigned an hundred and twenty sari."

The following extract, which is interesting from its remarkable similarity to the Mosaic account of the deluge, is decisive against the above mentioned remark concerning the Oannes. "After the death of Ardates, his son Xisuthrus reigned eighteen sari. In his time happened the great deluge; the history of which is thus described. The Deity Cornus, appeared to him in a vision, and warned him that upon the fifteenth day of the month Daesius there would be a flood, by which mankind would be destroyed. He therefore enjoined him to write a history of the beginning, procedure and conclusion of all things; and to bury it in the city of the sun at Sippara, and to build a vessel, and take with him into it his friends and relations, and to convey on board every thing necessary to sustain life, together with all the different animals, both birds and quadrupeds, and trust himself fearlessly to the deep. Having asked the Deity, whither he was

\* Saros.

to sail? he was answered, 'To the Gods,' upon which he offered up a prayer for the good of mankind. He then obeyed the divine admonition; and built a vessel five stadia in length, and two in breadth. Into this he put every thing which he had prepared: and last of all he conveyed into it his wife, his children, and his friends.

"After the flood had been upon the earth and was in time abated, Xisuthrus sent out birds from the vessel; which not finding any food nor any place whereon they might rest their feet, returned to him again. After an interval of some days, he sent them forth a second time; and they now returned with their feet tinged with mud. He made a trial a third time with these birds; but they returned to him no more, from whence he judged that the surface of the earth had appeared above the waters. He therefore made an opening in the side of the vessel, and upon looking out found that it was stranded upon the side of some mountain, upon which he immediately quitted it with his wife, his daughter and the pilot. Xisuthrus then paid his adoration to the earth: and having constructed an altar, offered sacrifices to the Gods, and with those who had come out of the vessel with him, disappeared.

"They who remained within, finding that their companions did not return, quitted the vessel with many lamentations, and called continually on the name of Xisuthrus. Him they saw no more; but they could distinguish his voice in the air, and hear him admonish them to pay due regard to religion, and likewise informed them that it was upon account of his piety that he was translated to live with the Gods; that his wife and daughter, and the pilot, had obtained the same honour. To this he added, that they should return to Babylonia; and as it was ordained, search for the writings at Sippara, which they were to make known to all mankind: moreover, that the place wherein they then were, was the land of Armenia. The rest, having heard these words, offered sacrifices to the Gods; and taking a circuit, journeyed towards Babylonia.

"The vessel being thus stranded in Armenia, some part of it yet remains in the Coreyrean mountains of Armenia; and the people scrape off the bitumen, with which it had been outwardly coated, and make use of it by way of an alexipharmic and amulet. And when they returned to Babylon, and had found the writings at Sippara, they built cities and erected

temples; and Babylon was thus inhabited again." Syncel. Chron. 28. Euseb. Chron. 5, 8.\*

Manetho, whom we have named as contemporary with Berossus, was an Egyptian of Heliospolis, also a priest and expounder of the sacred mysteries at Sebennytus. At the command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, he composed a history of Egypt from the records preserved in the temples, and from ancient inscriptions. The work was divided into three books, and brought down the history of that country from the earliest ages to the time of Darius Codomanus, the last king of Persia. It contained a list of thirty-one dynasties, consisting of three hundred and fifty-two kings, who reigned during a period of 5471 years, which duration, being inconsistent with scripture chronology, has given rise to considerable discussion. The difficulty, however, seems to be solved by Marsham, who shows that many of the earlier dynasties reigned simultaneously in different parts of Egypt, by which he reduces the period to very nearly a consistency with the septuagint.† Manetho wrote also a work on Egyptian theology, an astronomical work entitled the Book of Sothis, which he addressed to Ptolemy Philadelphus, and an Epitome of Physics.

Fragments of his history have been preserved by Eusebius and Syncellus, of which the most important is the dynasties.

The following is the account of this writer given by Eusebius. "It remains, therefore, to make certain extracts concerning the dynasties of the Egyptians, from the writings of Manetho the Sebennyte, the high priest of the idolatrous temple of Egypt in the time of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus. These, according to his own account, he copied from the inscriptions which were engraved in the sacred dialect, and hieroglyphic characters, upon the columns set up in the

\* From the preceding extracts it will be perceived that wherever there is no coincidence with any scripture narrative, the story is perfectly dark, and to its meaning we can find no key; but where the same occurrence is related, as in some passage of the bible, while we feel the confirmation which it affords of the sacred account, we have something like confidence in distinguishing what may be true in it, besides those points which coincide with the scripture history. In this manner alone can these remains, universally mingled with fable as they are, be of any account as historical documents.

† This, however, is not taking the testimony of Manetho, but bending it before that of the bible. If, therefore, it is more correct after this modification, it could by itself have only tended to propagate error; for nobody would have thought of such an artifice as Marsham's, had not a more credible account been opposed to this.



Siriadic land,\* by Thoth,† the first Hermes; and after the deluge, translated from the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue in hieroglyphic characters; and committed to writing in books, and deposited by Agathodaemon, the son of the second Hermes, the father of Tat, in the penetralia of the temples of Egypt. He has addressed and explained them to Philadelphus, the second king that bore the name of Ptolemaeus, in the book which he has entitled *Sothis*.”

Megasthenes, the author of the fragments upon Judea, was a Greek in the employ of Seleucus Nicator of Syria, by whom he was sent out to Palibothra in Judea, in order to complete some treaty with the inhabitants of that country. Here he remained for several years; and upon his return, wrote an account of his travels, and what he found worthy of note during his residence in Judea. Of this writer, also, we have only some fragments preserved by the same means as the foregoing. Megasthenes was contemporary with Manetho and Berosus, and but a little the senior of Abydenus, who afterwards wrote a history of Syria, and various other historical works. In his work upon Syria he has copied a few passages from Megasthenes, which by a singular fortune, are thus preserved, while the treatise into which they were copied has itself been lost.

The fragment of the Carthaginian historian Hiempsal, which Sallust has copied into his history of the war with Jugurtha, is too well known to need any remark. Such are the principal ancient historians of the gentile world of whom we possess any remains. And the meagerness of these would add but little to our knowledge, had we not some clearer light by which to distinguish, from their fable, their scattered and

\* Of the Siriadic columns here mentioned, Josephus thus writes: “All these (the sons of Seth), being naturally of a good disposition, lived happily in the land without apostatizing, and free from any evils whatsoever: and they studiously turned their attention to the knowledge of the heavenly bodies and their configuration. And lest their science should at any time be lost among men, and what they had previously acquired should perish (inasmuch as Adam had acquainted them that an universal aphanism, or destruction of all things, would take place, alternately, by the force of fire, and the overwhelming powers of water), they erected two columns, the one of brick and the other of stone, and engraved upon each of them their discoveries; so that in case the brick pillar should be dissolved by the water, the stone one might survive to teach men the things engraved upon it, and at the same time inform them that a brick one had formerly been also erected by them. It remains even to the present day in the land of Siriad.

† Thoth he computes to have lived in the beginning of the first dynasty. A singular source certainly from which to copy the history of all the succeeding.

imperfect exhibitions of truth. Although they do not come directly under the design of this essay, it may not be amiss in this place to take notice of one or two of the more ancient philosophical or miscellaneous fragments. As they will go to show that that vague and indefinite manner of writing, as also the habit of mingling the fabulous with the true, was in early times not confined to history alone. One of the most interesting relicts of antiquity, which the volume contains, is the *Periplus of Hanno*, which is an account of a voyage undertaken at the command of the Carthaginian government, with the view of discovering new countries, and planting new colonies. The date of this expedition, it is now impossible to ascertain with precision. Fabricius thinks that it must have been about 300 years, B. C. Campomanes places it about the year 407, B. C. Bougainville about 570 years before our era, and others again are for placing it as high as 1000 years before Christ. The only means of making even an approximation to the true date, seems to be that passage of Pliny which states that Hanno and Hamilcon were appointed at the same time, the one to the south, and the other to the north of the Carthaginian Republic, during the time when that state was in its highest degree of prosperity. Now it would seem to be necessary only to find when, under these circumstances, a Hanno and Hamilcon came together at the head of government. And this is the means used to obtain the desired date, which might be satisfactory enough if we could also be assured that only one Hanno and one Hamilcon of distinction ever existed in Carthage together. But when we know that these names were very common in Carthage (so much so that few as we know of her citizens we have the names of some half dozen Hannos of distinction,) it is but arriving at an uncertainty after all. There appears to us, however, most probability in that computation, which places it between five and six hundred years before the Christian era. It was written in the Punic language, but very early translated into Greek. The Punic original, which was deposited by Hanno in the temple of Saturn, has been lost in the universal wreck of Carthaginian literature, but the authenticity of the Greek translation has been supported by the ablest scholars. With regard to the Sybilline Oracles, controversy has long resulted in a conviction of their spuriousness. That some of these fragments called Sybilline verses, are of high antiquity, there can be very little doubt, since we find them cited by Heraclitus five hundred years before the Christian era; and on this account, they possess great

interest as being remains of the literature of those early times. These Sybilline books, are also cited by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and some of the early fathers, many of whom considered them to be genuine prophecies vouchsafed by the Almighty to the Heathen world as those recorded in the Scriptures were to the Jews. There can be very little doubt, nevertheless, that the most of them are forgeries, and that of a comparatively modern date. A few at least, certainly ancient, are inserted in this volume.

Zoroaster is one of the greatest names of antiquity, connected with which every fragment is interesting; but so little certainty can be obtained on the subject of either the man or his works, that critics differ even with regard to the age in which he lived, by little less than two thousand years. And some go even so far as to deny his existence altogether. While some place him upwards of 2500 years, B. C., others are for bringing him down as low as five or six hundred years before the same era. Others maintain that there were two of the name. The first of whom they say was an astronomer, who lived at Babylon, about 2549 years, B. C. The second, a Persian, who restored the religion of the Magi, they place, some 587 and others 519 years, B. C. Others again suppose that there were many lawgivers and philosophers of that name. What has been given to the world, in a French translation, as the Zendavesta of Zoroaster, is considered of but doubtful authority. The fragments contained in the volume before us, must be allowed at least the merit of antiquity; having been pressed in the quotations of several ancient writers. As to the Orphic fragments, that they are ancient is the most that can with certainty be said of them.

In reference to ancient history, these remains do little more than render more sensible the palpable darkness which surrounds the subject, whenever the light of inspiration has not shone upon the eye of the historian; and while the records of every other country are enveloped in extravagance, down to a comparatively late period, those of the Bible are clear, simple, and consistent, even from the creation. If from those nations, the remains of whose history we have been considering, we look to the Chinese, or the Hindus, both of whom pretend to records of great antiquity, we find those records so mingled up and perverted by fable, that it is almost impossible to secure a single historical truth really ancient, from the hideously distorted mass. Nay, so utterly inconsistent are they with themselves, that it requires no contending truth to prove their obscurity; and in extravagance so far

beyond the capacity of the most credulous, that even those who place faith in them, are compelled, out of respect to their own reason, to understand them allegorically. Amidst such masses of fable, the few sprinklings of truth which may exist, would never be discovered to be such, did we not possess some more trust-worthy coincident information. In such connection they are useful, but in such connection alone.

The Scripture record, on the contrary, not only is consistent with itself, but found to be confirmed and elucidated by every truth which bears upon the subjects of which it treats. And not the least wonderful thing connected with it is the perfectness of its preservation, in being entire and unperverted by interpretations, though, to all appearance, it had no better chance of safety than many other works of antiquity, also considered of divine origin by those nations who possessed them. But then many of the priesthood could not but be aware that their holy books, as well as their religion, were very much a fabrication of some of their own class, and intended only as an instrument in government, and therefore could feel no check upon them in making any change, or putting any construction upon them, which they found expedient; whereas the highest of the Jewish priests were those who the most thoroughly believed in the divine nature of their religious books. The care which the Jewish commentators, therefore, took to keep their annotations apart from the text, and the jealousy with which the religious parties among them guarded against the interpolation of the others, no doubt aided much in the preservation of their purity; but nothing short of a heavenly origin can account for the fact, that while the records of other nations pretending to high antiquity are exposed and shamed, as the light of science falls upon them, those very discoveries seem to have been reserved for these later days, to establish and elucidate such passages of the sacred volume as begin to grow dim from the shade of antiquity, the withering up of the delicacies of language, and the changes which are ever passing upon human things. Nay, it is not too much to say, that we, in this present day, better comprehend many passages of scripture, than the people could possibly have done to whom they were at first delivered. So that, if we are not favoured as they were, with the immediate presence of God, we know more concerning his works, and can more clearly comprehend his designs. The fulfillment of prophecy has revealed its meaning, the monuments of antiquity made to render up the



records long hid beneath their mystic symbols, have borne testimony to the accuracy of sacred history, and every science, as soon as it dawns upon the human mind, sends forth a ray to elucidate some statement of the inspired penmen. And even these imperfect relics, as far as their truth can be discovered, all conduce to render our religion more and more an argument to control the reason, even in its worldly wisdom.

---

*M. B. Hoop*

*Travels in South Eastern Asia, embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam and China, with Notices of Numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire, with Dissertations, Tables, &c.* By Howard Malcom. In two vols. Third Edition. Boston, Gould, Kendal & Lincoln, 1839.

WE are satisfied, on good grounds, that very inadequate, and even erroneous, views prevail in the Christian community, in regard to the character and condition of the heathen, and the nature and results of missionary labour. These misconceptions are much to be regretted in their bearing upon the feelings, the hopes, the contributions, and the prayers of the churches; but they are especially so in their influence on candidates for the work of missions. They lead to the adoption of plans, and beget expectations which cannot be realized, and which consequently produce sad disappointments. Instances might even be cited where individuals have been led to abandon in despair a service which they undertook under such great misapprehension; and, perhaps, almost every missionary has experienced more or less of the painful conflict of feeling, attendant on the overturning of his preconceived notions, before his zeal and his hopes, come to rest upon the true basis, which nothing can even afterwards shake. Not only is all this undesirable, but it is wholly unnecessary. By this we mean, that the cause of missions does not stand in need of all or any of the misrepresentations, which have become so current, especially in anniversary addresses. Some of the points on which we believe exaggerated views are entertained, are the cruelty and wretchedness of the heathen, the desire for Christian instruction, and especially for books, the change of feeling as it regards Chris-