



# PRE-HISTORIC NATIONS

JOHN D. BALDWIN

## **Pre-Historic Nations**

***Or, Inquiries Concerning Some Of The Great Peoples And Civilizations Of Antiquity, Their Probable Relation To A Still Older Civilization Of The Ethiopians Or Cushites Of Arabia.***

**John D. Baldwin, A.M.**

### **Contents:**

#### Pre-Historic Nations

I. Introductory Generalities.

li .Preliminary Suggestions Concerning The Current Chronologies, The Relation Of Hellas To Civilization, And The Meaning Of Pre-Historic Times.

The Current Chronologies.

Hellas And Civilization.

Pre-Historic Times.

lii. Pre-Historic Greatness Of Arabia.

An Early Civilization In Arabia.

Arabia Was The Ancient Ethiopia.

Ignorance And Misapprehension Concerning Arabia.

The Two Races In Arabia.

Concerning The Old Race.

Ancient Arabian Ruins And Inscriptions.

The Ancient Arabian Language.

Concerning The Origin Of Alphabetical Writing .

Ancient History Of Arabia.

Greek Notices Of Arabia.

Arabian Recollections Of The Past.  
Fragments Of Old Arabian History.  
The Cushite System Of Political Organization.  
Cushite Science, Astronomical And Nautical.

Iv. The Phoenicians.

Origin Of The Phoenicians.  
The Immigration Doubted.  
Renan's Theory.  
Their Cushite Religion And Architecture.  
Antiquity Of The Phoenicians.  
The Periods Of Phoenician History.  
The Building Of Gades.  
Extent Of Phoenician Influence.  
The Pelasgians.  
Mixos And His Conquests.  
The Phoenician Language And Literature.

V. Arabian Origin Of Chaldea.

Chaldean Civilization And Learning.  
History Of Chaldea By Berosus.  
Chaldean Antiquities And Traditions.  
The Chaldean Ruins And Inscriptions.  
The Origin Of Chaldea.  
The Cushite Language In Chaldea.  
Political Changes In Ancient Chaldea.  
The Year 2234 B.C.  
Concerning An Old Chaldean Temple.  
Assyria And The Semitic Race.  
A Theory Of The Chaldeans.  
Concerning Chaldean Ancient History.  
Hypothetical Scheme Of Chaldean History.

Vi. India, Sanskrit And Ante-Sanskrit.

The Indo-Aryans Preceded By The Cushites.  
The Dravidian Race And Their Language.  
Aryan History And Antiquity.  
The Veda And The Vedic Age.  
Religious History Of Sanskrit India.

Modern Brahmanism.  
Indian History And Chronology.  
The Ancient Malayan Empire.  
VII. Egypt Previous To Menes.  
Origin And Antiquity Of Egypt.  
The Old Sanskrit Books Of Egypt.  
Dionysos, Called Osiris And Bacchus.  
Mythology And Mythological Personages.  
The Ages Before Menes.  
Antiquity Of Writing In Egypt.  
Attempts To Measure Egyptian Antiquity.  
VIII. Africa And The Arabian Cushites.  
The Races In Africa.  
A Brief Essay On Races.  
The Arabian Cushites In Africa.  
Traces Of African Ancient History.  
Northern Africa In Pre-Historic Times.  
The Berbers.  
Navigation Around Africa.  
IX. Western Europe In Pre-Historic Times.  
An Ancient Civilization In Western Europe.  
The Age Of Bronze In Western Europe.  
The Ancient Race Of Western Europe.  
The Ancient History Of Italy.  
Western Europe, Anciently Called Africa.  
The Old Sanskrit Books On Western Europe.  
The Ancient History Of Ireland.  
The Keltic Language.  
Ancient Communication With America.

*Pre-Historic Nations , John D. Baldwin*  
*Jazzybee Verlag Jürgen Beck*  
*86450 Altenmünster, Loschberg 9*

*Germany*

*ISBN: 9783849641801*

*www.jazzybee-verlag.de*  
*www.facebook.com/jazzybeeverlag*  
*admin@jazzybee-verlag.de*

## **Pre-Historic Nations**

### **I. INTRODUCTORY GENERALITIES.**

THE origin of man, and the date of his first appearance on earth, have always been subjects of speculation. We see this in the cosmogonic myths and legends of antiquity, and in the dogmatic chronologies that have been allowed currency in modern times; but, so far as we know, it is only in very recent times that visionary speculation on these topics has given way to enlightened inquiry. The cyclical schemes of the ancient Eastern world, which computed by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands the years of man's existence on earth previous to the regular beginnings of history, may be treated with small ceremony now; but they are quite as scientific as Archbishop Usher's scheme of chronology, for the men who invented them were skilful astronomers; and whoever undertakes to show that they are not quite as reasonable, may discover that something can be said on the other side of this question.

These cyclical estimates of the past may turn out to be as near the truth as Usher's system of chronology, but neither

the one nor the other can now be accepted as an intelligent and truthful exposition of the antiquity of the human race. The whole tendency of scientific investigation and discovery, at the present time, is to class them together as alike unwarranted and worthless. We moderns have underrated the antiquity of man. This is shown more and more clearly in two departments of inquiry, where the greatest results are yet to be realized geology and the science of language. Conscientious geologists are forced to say, " The date of man must be carried back farther than we had heretofore imagined;" and accomplished scholars and thinkers respond from the field of linguistic science, " Late discoveries are showing us that the antiquity of the human race upon earth must be much greater than has been generally supposed."

These two sciences bring important aid to the study of pre-historic times, by compelling us to throw off the trammels of false chronologies, and by showing us room in the past for those great pre-historic developments of civilization, and those long pre-historic ages of human activity and enterprise, which are indicated by the oldest monuments, records, and mythologies. It is impossible to study faithfully the ancient mythologies, or the results of exploration in the oldest ruins, or the fragmentary records in which the ancients speak of what to them was misty antiquity, without feeling that, to accept all they signify, we must enlarge the past far beyond the limits of any scheme of chronology known to modern times. If we lack strength and boldness to break down the barriers of unreason and pursue inquiry with unfaltering reverence for truth, we may find refuge in the oracular cave of historical skepticism, where little or nothing is seen beyond the first Greek Olympiad save barbarism, lying fables, and general chaos. But human intelligence cannot remain imprisoned there, especially in this age, when so much is constantly added to our

knowledge of the past, and when increasing means for a careful and hopeful study of antiquity so stimulate inquiry as to make it irrepressible.

The oldest writings in existence are inscriptions found in the ancient ruins of Egypt and Southwestern Asia. The oldest books, leaving out those of China, are those preserved by the Indian and Iranian branches of the Aryan family the Rig Veda, a translated fragment of the Desatir, and portions of the works of Zoroaster; next to these come the Hebrew Scriptures; then follow the works of Homer, and some other books and fragments of books, in the Greek language, representing the culture of the Ionians of Asia Minor. These books show us the civilization of the communities in which they originated, but they do not tell us when or where civilization first appeared. The mythologies, the ruins, the discoveries of linguistic science, and the general voice of tradition, lead us to the conclusion that, so far as relates to the Cushite, Semite, and Aryan races, its first appearance was somewhere in the southwestern part of Asia; but we can not describe the agencies and methods of its first development, nor give the date of its origin.

We nowhere find a continued and permanent advancement of any nation or community of these races, but we see a constant progress of civilization from lower toward higher degrees, from the few to the many, and from limited and special toward many-sided and all-embracing development. Nations rise, flourish, and sink again to obscurity. The Egypt of to-day is not that Egypt which we see in the monuments of its Old Monarchy; Chaldea is not now the ancient Chaldea which we study in its ruins; to-day we inquire in vain on the coast of Asia Minor for that Ionian confederacy whose marvelous culture, passing over into the Hellenic peninsula, illumed Athens, and made that city

the glory of Hellas. It is long since Carthage and Rome ceased to exist. But, while communities and nations have disappeared, this old civilization has remained; sometimes checked and lowered for a succession of ages, but always reappearing with new developments of its forces and new forms.

The Reverend Dr. Lang, in his "View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation," is led by the subject to make this observation: "In Tuscany and in Egypt, in India and in China, and, I will add, even in the South Sea Islands and in both Americas, we behold the evidences of a primitive civilization, which, in some instances, had run its course anterior to the age of Homer, but which, at all events, acknowledged no obligation to the wisdom or refinement of the Greeks." Few will question the fact he states, so far as relates to Italy and Asia, although not many who carefully study the past will describe all that civilization as "primitive." Dr. Lang himself is not quite satisfied with this description; for, in attempting to explain the origin of the ancient civilization which had nearly run its course in different countries previous to the time of Homer, he adopts the notion of Bailly and others, that it was originated by the antediluvians, and brought through the Deluge to their successors by the family of Noah. Without fully exploring it, he saw a fact that was much too large for his chronology a fact for which there was not sufficient room in the past, as he measured it.

The great civilization, so apparent in various nations of antiquity that present themselves to view just beyond the borders of regular history, was not the work of a single people nor of a single period of national existence. Those nations were preceded by others no less great and important, although more hidden from observation by their greater distance from us in time. The civilization of the



Phoenicians, Egyptians, and other nations of the East passed to the Greeks, the Romans, and the magnificent empire of the Caliphs, making some losses and receiving new developments. Without speaking of what we received from the Kelts, whose civilization was greater than history has admitted, the civilization of modern Europe has grown partly out of that of Greece and Rome, and also out of that of the Saracens to a much greater extent than is generally recognised. So has the mental and social cultivation, first seen in Western Asia, flowed on through the ages, from people to people, from the civilizers of Egypt, Chaldea, and India to Europe and America, never defeated entirely, and always surviving the "dark ages" that obscured it. We have the highest and widest development it has ever reached. To find its starting-point and write its early history, we must be able to explore the obscurest deeps of antiquity.

And yet what seems in these inquiries to be the obscurest antiquity becomes extremely modern when considered in connection with what geology says of the antiquity of man. Those familiar with the later discoveries of this science know how slowly, and against what persistency of incredulity and doubt, geologists themselves have been brought to admit the evidence which shows the existence of the human race in the latter part of the geological period which Lyell and others describe as Post-pliocene. This period, which next precedes the "Recent," or that in which we live, seems as modern as yesterday in relation to the countless geological ages that went before it; but some tentative efforts at computation make us feel how far away it is from yesterday. Sir Charles Lyell's lowest estimate of the time required to form the present delta and alluvial plain of the Mississippi is more than 100,000 years. It belongs almost wholly to the Recent period. The lower portion of the peninsula of Florida has been created by a constant growth of coral reefs toward the south, and this

growth is still in full activity. " The whole is of Post-tertiary origin," say Agassiz and Lyell, " the fossil zoophytes and shells being all of the same species as those now inhabiting the neighboring sea;" that is to say, the commencement of the growth was later than the beginning of the Post-pliocene formation, and probably not much older than the beginning of the Recent period. Agassiz, having ascertained as nearly as possible the average rate of this coral growth, estimates that the gradual formation of the southern half of Florida must have filled a period of not less than 135,000 years.

It is no part of my purpose to discuss geological questions. The questions presented in this volume, and the conclusions reached, do not in any way depend on geological estimates of past time. It may, however, be observed that the discoveries of geology show plainly that the prehistoric ages in "Western Europe were not wholly barbarous. They show us the remains of a very remote "Age of Stone," in which there is no trace of civilization; but they also bring to light manufactured articles, sepulchral customs, and old structures, the remains of other remote ages when civilized peoples inhabited that part of Europe; such are the monuments of the " Age of Polished Stone" and the " Age of Bronze." Western Europe has its ancient ruins that invite careful study. Its antiquities of this kind are not as grand as those at the East, although the old temple at Abury was not destitute of grandeur in the days of its glory. They have nothing to rival the amazing architecture or the multitudinous inscriptions found in the old ruins of Egypt and Chaldea, but they show us remains of civilized peoples of whom history gives no account.

We must turn to Asia to discover the earliest manifestations of civilized life, and ascertain how far they can be traced back into the past. Here we see two great developments of

ancient civilization, entirely disconnected from each other, and, so far as we can see, nearly equal in age. The origin of each is hidden by the shadows of very remote antiquity. At the East is China, with literary records claiming to be more than nineteen centuries older than the Christian era, and with a culture in science, industry, literature, and the arts of civilized life scarcely inferior to that of the most enlightened nations that have appeared in history. Tried by the standards of modern Europe, it takes a very high place in the respect and admiration of those best acquainted with it. Professor Whitney, in his "Language and the Study of Language," says very justly, " No race, certainly, outside the Indo-European and Semitic families, and not many races of those families, can show a literature of equal value with the Chinese."

This Chinese culture is one of the most remarkable facts in the world's history. Instead of passing from nation to nation, and taking new forces and new forms in a grand progress round the globe, it has neither wandered far from home, nor shown any remarkable variety of development. It has remained chiefly in the country where it grew up, and in the hands of the people by whom it was originated dwelling apart from what we call history, as if China were a world by itself.

At the West arose another civilization, that seems to have originated somewhere near the waters of the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. Unlike the Chinese in character and history, it was enterprising; it went forth into the world; it established communication with all peoples within its roach; it colonized and occupied other lands; its influence became paramount "from the extremity of the East to the extremity of the West;" it changed its seat from nation to nation, ever developing, more and more, a wonderful power of life; it created India and Egypt; its light was kindled all

around the Mediterranean; and, finally, by way of Western Europe, it travelled to America, where it seems likely to have its widest and richest development.

It is not in our power to explain with certainty those primitive groupings of mankind which determined the origin of diverse races, and created distinct families of language. The diverse races exist, although, at the present time, there are not anywhere on the face of the globe many communities where any original race is found entirely free from mixture with some other; and the separate families of language exist, so radically and absolutely unlike that we find it impossible to believe they all proceeded from a common source. The essential unity of mankind in all the peculiar characteristics of humanity is an incontestable fact which cannot be affected by any differences of race or language. Whatever theory denies this fact, or makes it uncertain, is false to human nature, as it appears and speaks for itself in every race and in every language. This is not questioned by those who attempt to solve the problem by adopting the hypothesis that the human race came into existence, originally, at different points on the earth, by simultaneous or successive creations, each primordial group being the source of a separate race and a separate family of languages.

Those primeval traditions of the Hebrews, which Moses deemed truthful and worthy of record in the sacred books of his nation, relate almost entirely to the Semitic, Cushite, and Aryan families, which, on any hypothesis, must have had a common origin. Their languages constitute three distinct families, for linguistic scholars are making the discovery that the Cushite tongues are a family by themselves, although they more closely resemble the Semitic language than that of the Aryan race. Neither of these families differs from the others as they all differ from

the Chinese. Between these three races there is no physiological difference whatever; and their differences in other respects are not so great as to exclude entirely the possibility of their having issued from a common primordial source, and separated in the early infancy of their first dialects. They have played connected parts in the work of human development; and now the Aryan race, enriched with the acquisitions of their combined influence, seems destined to possess and rule the whole planet on which we live.

The Cushite race appeared first in the work of civilization. That this has not always been distinctly perceived is due chiefly to the fact that the first grand ages of that race are so distant from us in time, so far beyond the great nations of antiquity commonly mentioned in our ancient histories, that their most indelible traces have long been too much obscured by the waste of time to be readily comprehended by superficial observation. In the earliest Hebrew traditions, older probably than Abraham, and immediately connected with a description of the "land of Eden," where "the Lord God planted a garden" for Adam, Cush (translated Ethiopia) is mentioned as a country or geographical division of the earth; the Hebrews saw nothing geographical more ancient than this land of Cush. In the tenth chapter of Genesis, the names recorded are professedly used, for the most part, as ethnical and geographical designations; but this ethnical geography of Genesis, which, excepting the interpolations, was probably more ancient than even the Hebrews themselves understood, must be referred to a period anterior to that great immigration of Cushites from Arabia into the valley of Mesopotamia, the primeval home of the Semites, which brought civilization and gave existence to the old cities of Chaldea.

It seems to me impossible for any free-minded scholar to study the traditions, mythologies, fragmentary records, mouldering monuments, and other remains of the pre-historic ages, and fail to see that the people described in the Hebrew Scriptures as Cushites were the original civilizers of Southwestern Asia; and that, in the deepest antiquity, their influence was established in nearly all the coast regions, from the extreme east to the extreme west of the Old "World. This has been repeatedly pointed out with more or less clearness, and it is one of those incontestable facts that must be accepted. In nearly all the recorded investigations of scholars for the last two centuries, it has appeared among those half-seen facts which dogmatic criticism could treat as fancies without troubling itself to explain them. It could not be otherwise; for, to see and fully comprehend the significance of Cushite antiquity, we must have greater freedom in the matter of chronology, and a more accurate perception of the historic importance of Arabia, than have usually appeared in such investigations. Neither Usher's chronology, nor the little country known to the Greeks and Romans as Phoenicia, will suffice to explain that mighty and wide-spread influence of the Cushite race in human affairs, whose traces are still visible from Farther India to Norway.

Here, as well as everywhere else in the advancement of learning from the old to the new, from the explored to the unexplored, the investigator must settle his relations with the professional conservatism of what passes current as "orthodox" scholarship. This conservatism, like all other conservatisms, has its eminent oracles, whose influence is too frequently allowed to limit inquiry and shape its results. It is less malignant than some other conservatisms, but no less self-assured, and no less ready to chastise bold inquiry. In the history of mankind, it has been common to see wig mistaken for wisdom, while authority usurped the place of

reason; but nothing else has the force of truth; it may wait for recognition, like Boucher de Perthes on the field of geological science, and, while waiting, be rudely treated as a visionary; yet it will surely sweep all obstructions out of its way, and constrain the oracles to pronounce in its favor.

The influence of what is accepted as "orthodox" learning sometimes deals very summarily with both the work and the reputation of venturesome innovators, who flout its oracles, question its wisdom, criticise its methods, and undertake to show that important additions can be made to its stock of knowledge. Controversies with such all-wise conservatism, however, are incident to all inquiry by which progress is maintained. Each profession instinctively disallows and resists any interference with its established creed, and becomes a castle where the old is vigorously defended against the new. So it is in theology, in law, in politics, in medicine, in science of every kind, and in every department of learning. "We can not reasonably expect our archaeological and historical studies to escape this influence; nor should we very much desire it. If conservatism needs movement, innovation needs to adjust its relations with whatever truth is already established. The innovator proceeds by means of the sharpest methods of criticism; therefore he can afford to endure criticism. Soon or late, whatever investigations sweep away venerable rubbish and open the way to progress in knowledge will enforce their claim to respectful consideration; and nowhere is this surer to be realized than among enlightened scholars, where no ardor of feeling can become fanaticism, nor any prejudice or pride of opinion be transformed into cureless bigotry.

One purpose of this volume is to point out what may be known of the ancient Cushite people, and of the great part they played in developing and spreading civilization. In

doing this, it becomes necessary to criticise and discredit some influential theories, speculations, and methods of investigation, which I find to be obstructions in the path of inquiry; and also to show that Usher's chronology is a very false measure of the past, that the antiquity of the human race is much greater than he supposed, and that there can be no intelligent study of antiquity where his or any similar scheme of chronology, or any other dogmatic falsification of the past, is allowed to paralyze inquiry and dictate conclusions.

I do not write for learned archaeologists. They have written for me. It is possible, however, that those most deeply learned in archaeology and the science of language may find in this volume suggestions worthy of their attention. Perhaps it will enable them to discover a more satisfactory solution of certain ethnical and linguistic problems with which they are familiar. It can hardly fail to do this if it shall succeed in convincing them that the original Ethiopia was not in Africa, and that the ancient home of the Cushites or Ethiopians, the starting-point of their great colonizing and civilizing movements, was Arabia. I do not write for historical skeptics. Their use of reason is so poor and their credulity so great, when they deal with antiquity, that no common influence is likely to break the spell that makes them incapable of looking wisely into the past, and studying pre-historic times with any hope of enlightenment. Their habit of accepting preposterous and monstrous absurdities, in order to deny the historical significance of myths and traditions, and discredit the discoveries of linguistic and archaeological science, must be left to play out its comedy without interference.

Others, whose interest in these studies may be stimulated anew, or for the first time awakened, by reading this work, will perhaps desire to pursue the subject in a more minute



and elaborate way. If so, they can find in the works of German, Danish, French, and English explorers and scholars abundant materials to aid investigation; and in the department of linguistic science, which in these inquiries is of the highest importance, there are very valuable works by several American scholars, such as Whitney, Marsh, and others. On looking over what I have written, I find that I have criticised many of the linguistic and archaeological theories of that eminent and accomplished investigator, Ernest Renan, without properly expressing my sense of his great services in these departments of science. If his works relating to the subjects I discuss were not so rich and attractive, or if his style of writing were not so perspicuous and eloquent, it may be that I should have given him less attention.

## **II .PRELIMINARY SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE CURRENT CHRONOLOGIES, THE RELATION OF HELLAS TO CIVILIZATION, AND THE MEANING OF PRE-HISTORIC TIMES.**

HUMBOLDT says in his Cosmos, " What we usually term the beginning of history is only the period when the later generations awoke to self-consciousness." It requires an enlightened view of the past and considerable mental freedom to see and accept what this signifies; but the tendency of scientific studies at the present time is to make it clear and establish it as a commonly accepted truth. Our studies of Ancient History have been embarrassed by two strong but not very wise influences a false chronology, and a false estimate of the Hellenic people in their relation to civilization. These influences have been supported until lately by the theological training and the scholarship of modern times, and they have mutually supported each other; for those who maintain that enlightened civilization began in Hellas very easily accept the rabbinical notion

that man was created only about 4000 or 5000 years previous to the Christian Era, while those who uphold this unwarranted system of chronology very readily accept the belief that mankind did not get far away from barbarism previous to the literary and artistic development that brightened Athens. It is impossible to think correctly of the past, or to comprehend the testimony of its monuments, where these views are received as infallible oracles and allowed to regulate investigation; therefore it seems necessary to make them the subject of a few preliminary observations.

### ***THE CURRENT CHRONOLOGIES.***

Rollin, writing Ancient History, and giving his view of the time and greatness of Ninus and Semiramis, whom he described as the immediate successors of the first founder of the Assyrian empire, made this confession; "I must own that I am somewhat puzzled by a difficulty that may be raised against the extraordinary things related of Ninus and Semiramis, as they do not seem to agree with times so near the Deluge; I mean such immense armies, such a numerous cavalry, and such vast treasures of gold and silver, all of which seem to be of later date." According to Rollin's chronology, the Assyrian empire began its great career 2234 years before Christ, or about 115 years after the Deluge, and 235 years previous to the death of Noah. The Hebrew Scriptures inform us that "Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years." Rollin never doubted this record, and did not revise his chronology. Therefore he must have believed (although he carefully avoided saying so) that Noah outlived the founders of that empire, and saw its progress and grandeur during more than two centuries. It is not surprising that he was puzzled by chronological difficulties. His system afforded no relief from them. It is true that in writing of Ninus and Semiramis

he followed that ready fabler, the Carian physician Ctesias. The first princes of the celebrated Assyrian monarchy lived nearly a thousand years later. The great empire existing in that part of Asia at the date given by Rollin was Chaldean; but there is nothing in this to remove his perplexity, and later researches afford it no relief, for it is now certain that there were great monarchies in Asia much older than the year 2234 B.C.

Such embarrassments as that felt by Rollin multiply as we increase our knowledge of ancient times by a more careful study of the mythologies and traditions of the ancients, by investigating the monumental records of the older nations, by exploring the oldest ruins (the oldest now, because others that were much older have gone to dust), by comprehending the great revelations of linguistic science, and by searching intelligently the memorials of past time presented in the discoveries of geology. The absurd chronology by which they are created, not capable of serving as a guide, becomes an obstruction that must be removed.

Could we have the literary records of all the pre-historic nations, or even the lost libraries of the Phoenicians, Chaldeans, and Egyptians, its most confident supporters would become ashamed to urge its claim to respect, and scholars everywhere would hasten to disown the absurdities it has introduced into Ancient History. As it is, enough is known, without calling in the testimony of geology, to show that the period between the creation of man and the birth of Christ is much longer than any of the current chronologies are able to measure.

I can not wonder at the amazement, trepidation, and even rage with which some of the dogmatic chronologists behold the revelations of geology. My purpose, however, does not

require an appeal to what geology says of the antiquity of man. It is manifest, without such aid, that the time between the beginning of the human race and the Christian Era may have been, as Bunsen maintained in his work on Egypt, five times 4004 years, and even much longer than Bunsen supposed. The great past was certainly long enough for all that human existence and activity in pro-historic ages of which so many traces are found. There is nothing to require, indicate, or suggest that the current chronologies should be treated with the smallest degree of respect, while, on the other hand, there is much that demands for the pre-historic ages "the longest measure intelligent inquiry has ever proposed.

The business of constructing systems of "biblical" chronology has furnished employment for a large amount of learned ingenuity which otherwise might have been led to write great folios on the word "Selah" in the Psalms, or to expound the natural history of ancient giants, or to interpret in a very marvelous way the prophetic mysteries of the Apocalypse. It has been chiefly the work of monks and rabbins, and its relation to historical science is very much like that of conjuring astrology to the science of astronomy. But it is not wholly useless. It has undoubtedly furnished many satisfactions to those whose calling did not afford a more profitable occupation for intellectual activity, or whose learning had not introduced them to a more enlightened study of antiquity. The authority of what is falsely called "biblical" chronology is no longer very potent. It can not maintain itself against that progress of science which constantly increases our knowledge of the past. It must soon disappear, and take its place in the rubbish of the ages with other legendary absurdities which in their time dishonored religion, oppressed the human intellect, and misled honest people by claiming immortal reverence.

Any system of chronology that places the creation of man only about 4000 or 5000 years previous to the birth of Christ is a mere invention, a scholastic fancy, an elaborate absurdity. There is nothing to warrant it, and not much to excuse it. Those who profess to find it in the Bible misuse and falsify that book. We may as well seek in the Bible for a perfected science of astronomy or chemistry. It is not there; and no such chronological scheme ever grew out of scientific inquiry. Moreover, there is a remarkable want of harmony among those who have constructed such schemes. The various systems of "biblical" chronology claiming attention are at variance among themselves. According to the Jewish rabbins, man was created 3761 years before Christ; the Greek and Armenian churches have been taught to say 5509 years; Eusebius said 5200; Panadoras, a learned Egyptian monk, having solved the problem with great care and exactness of demonstration, said 5493; we and the nations of "Western Europe have followed Usher, a romancing archbishop of Armagh, who maintained, with great particularity of dogmatic demonstration, that the human race began to exist on earth precisely 4004 years before Christ; others have argued, with ingenuity quite as marvelous, to establish the validity of figures different from any of these.

In all these attempts to construct systems of "biblical" chronology, nothing is more apparent than utter lack of scientific method and purpose. The aim has been, not to discover facts, allow their influence, and accept the result, but to compel facts to harmonize with a preconceived theory and support given conclusions. A point has been assumed in the past beyond which the date of man's first appearance on earth must not be carried; and this assumption, not having the support of science, has feloniously sought that of revelation. Thus chronological

dogmatism has perpetrated an atrocious outrage on the Bible by impiously claiming for itself the reverence due to religion. Even learned and religious men have sought to identify this false chronology with Christianity itself, and have pursued their investigations of antiquity with a purpose, deliberately expressed, to force every fact of science, and every date of ancient history, to agree with it. Maurice's "Indian Antiquities," and his "Ancient History of Hindustan," are valuable works. They were first published about eighty years ago, but no one can read them now without respect for the author's learning and ability; yet the style in which he upheld this dogmatism of the "biblical" chronologists is nowise likely to be imitated at the present time by any scholar having the same enthusiasm for archaeological researches. In his preface to the "Antiquities" he wrote thus:

" The daring assertions of certain skeptical French philosophers with respect to the age of the world (whose arguments I have attempted to refute arguments founded principally on the high assumptions of the Brahmins and other Eastern nations in point of chronology and astronomy), could their extravagant claims be substantiated, would have a direct tendency to overturn the Mosaic system, and with it Christianity." In his first volume of the "History," on page 276, he renewed the subject as follows: "I am not inclined violently to dispute any positions on this head (chronology) that do not tend to subvert the Mosaic chronology, and I am decidedly for allowing the Eastern historians, as a privilege, the utmost latitude of the Septuagint chronology. It is not for a century or two, more or less, that we wage the contest with infidelity, but we cannot allow of thousands and millions being thrown into the scale."

There was a time when it was deemed a sacred and incontestable proposition that Hebrew, given by miraculous inspiration, was the original language of mankind, and the primeval mother of all other languages. To assume, as a vital thing in religion, that linguistic inquiry must not be allowed to show any thing contrary to this proposition, would be just as rational as this violent assumption of Maurice in behalf of what he calls the "Mosaic" system of chronology; and yet with what lordly arrogance of authority his "Mosaic" system was set forth! It would condescendingly allow its own largest limits "as a privilege," but facts must take care to exist in submissive accord with its permission, or they would be treated as infidel heresies, for inquiry can have no legitimate aim but to show its infallibility!

What crimes against Christianity have been committed by some of its zealous friends! and not the least of these crimes is that which makes it responsible for such follies as this. Nothing can be more unwarranted than to assume that any scheme of chronology is "Mosaic" or "biblical;" nor does it seem possible to do infidelity a greater service than to use Christianity as the antagonist of honest inquiry and intelligent progress in knowledge, or to talk as if she were not sufficiently great and comprehensive to wear her crown of glory in presence of any development of science or any progress of civilization. Modern astronomical discoveries were at first treated as grave heresies that should be suppressed by the Inquisition. Geology, the most reverent of sciences, has been treated as an infidel. It is not surprising that discoveries relating to pre-historic times, which set aside the current chronologies, have encountered similar criticism; but it would be very surprising if this unchristian dogmatism could maintain itself anywhere much longer. At any rate, truth is not discovered by such methods as that indicated by Maurice.

There are many considerations which should have checked the confidence with which dogmatic chronology has limited and falsified the past. The origin of nearly everything in our civilization is lost in the obscurity of ages that go back far beyond the oldest historic period. The arts of writing, building, spinning, weaving, mining, and working metals in a word, nearly all the arts and appliances of civilized life, came to us from pre-historic times. They were brought to Europe chiefly by the people known in history as Phoenicians, or through their agency; but, as I have already stated, neither history nor tradition can tell us when or where they originated. Evidence of the riches and magnificence they had created in very remote ages abounds in the records, ruins, and other remains of antiquity, but neither Chaldea nor Egypt could give a clear account of their beginnings and early history. One thing, however, is certain: they indicate the existence, in pre-historic times beyond the reach of tradition, not only of civilized communities and nations, but also of long periods of civilized life; and they give special significance to such statements of the old writers as the following from Diodorus Siculus: " Asia was anciently governed by its own native kings, of whom there is no history extant, either as to any memorable actions they performed, or so much as their names." He says this at the beginning of his account of Ninus, and applies it to the ages preceding Nineveh and Babylon!

The great antiquity of some of the sciences is incontestable. If there were no monumental records of ancient Chaldea, Egypt, Arabia, and India, we should still have convincing evidence of their great attainments in that knowledge which was " the excellency of the Chaldees" and " the wisdom of the Egyptians;" Euclid, an Egyptian, would still be recognised as one of the foremost writers on geometry,



and we should find it necessary to refer the origin of the science to an age more ancient than the oldest date of even Egyptian chronology. At the same time, it could be shown by authentic quotations from the literary remains of antiquity that some of the scholars of Ionia, which preceded Hellas in civilization, taught by the Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Chaldeans, had a knowledge of astronomy and of other sciences that was not retained by the scholars of Hellas, and seems to have disappeared from the Grecian world with the disciples of Pythagoras.

The most ancient peoples of antiquity, at the earliest periods in which we can see and study them, show us that civilization was older than their time. It is apparent in their architecture, in the varied possessions and manifestations of their civilized life, in their riches and magnificence, and in the splendor of their temples and royal palaces, that they had many of the arts and sciences, which we deem modern. Meanwhile, we can not easily deny their great attainments in astronomy, in presence of the general admission that the sphere filled with constellations, and the zodiac with its twelve signs, are at least as old as the Chaldeans.

Humboldt, stating the result of inquiry on this point, says: "The division of the ecliptic into twelve parts originated with the ancient Chaldeans." They had the zodiac, and gave it to the Western countries. So much is easily seen. But the Chaldeans themselves may have received the zodiac from the more ancient civilizers of their country.

During the present century, much has been added to our knowledge of the past by exploration in the ruins of Egypt and Chaldea. The researches in Egypt have given us dates as authentic as the monuments themselves, which confound the current chronologies, and open the past to our view somewhat as the discoveries of Columbus opened the world to the geographers of modern Europe. It is now

as certain as anything else in ancient history that Egypt existed as a civilized country not less than 5000 years earlier than the birth of Christ. The monumental and sepulchral records of that country, marvelously abundant, have substantially confirmed Manetho's history of Egypt. There was never any good reason for doubting the correctness of his dynastic list, as prepared by himself. He was an Egyptian of great learning and wisdom; he wrote with the libraries and monuments of Egypt "before him; his dates are as authentic as those of any other historian; and the only objection to them, of any account, comes from the dogmatism of that false chronology which assumes with oracular confidence that the past has not room for such dates. We meet here, much less awful than formerly, the same blind arrogance of old prejudice that could see nothing but heresy in the astronomical discoveries of Galileo. But prejudice is not reason; false chronology is neither science nor religion; and the lesson of every age is, that sure defeat awaits those who forbid progress in knowledge, and employ against it the menaces of any tribunal of intolerance.

The magnificent discoveries in Egypt, by confirming Manetho's history, have seriously troubled this dogmatism. How can it allow that Menes, who first united all Egypt under one government, began his reign not less than 3893 years previous to the Christian Era? And where can it find respectable logic to discredit such dates against the evidence by which they are supported? It is amusing to observe the effect of these discoveries on certain eminent and admirable English scholars who have given much attention to studies of this kind, one of them being an accomplished Egyptologist. They cannot deny the facts, and have no inclination to deny them; but their Oxford and English Church associations seem to have interfered to prevent a frank acceptance of the incontestable antiquity of

the Old Monarchy of Egypt. For a time they sought to reconcile it with the current chronology which orthodox churchmen hold in great reverence. When this became impossible, and compelled their acknowledgment of the impossibility, they adopted silence as the best policy under the circumstances, intimating that they could not solve this Egyptian problem in a satisfactory manner. Meaner men can sneer, deny violently, falsify the record, and, with godless infatuation, denounce the whole investigation as "business fit only for infidels." Christianity must be divine, for it is able to survive the championship of these meaner men.

It will not be questioned that blind reverence for this false method of chronology has been very powerful to discredit facts and dates against which there could be no valid argument, solely on the ground that they seemed disastrous to its authority. It has controlled the judgment of learned and conscientious men more than they could admit to themselves more than will seem credible a few centuries hence, when its character will be explained chiefly by recollection of its absurdities. It comes into every archaeological investigation, to mislead inquiry and hide the true explanation of every fact that implies great antiquity, too frequently sure of success because it has been incorporated with the investigator's thought and imagination from the moment when he began to think and acquire knowledge. Its influence grows weaker every day, and yet those who are sufficiently free in thought to disregard it entirely frequently find it moving them to utter apologies for doing so.

A free-minded and accomplished archaeologist, speaking of the dates furnished by the chronology of Egypt (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, tome lvi., p. 666), says: "I know how appalling these figures are, and what grave apprehensions

they awaken. I have shared these apprehensions; but what can we do against the concurring lists furnished by Manetho, Eratosthenes, the Turin papyrus, and the Egyptian tablets of Abydos, Thebes, and Sakkara?" This tone of apology may have some good use, perhaps, but does it express anything that can actually be found in his own conviction or feeling? Such dates can alarm nothing but false chronology, for which he cannot feel much concern. Instead of being hostile to any thing else in which a human interest is possible, they are friendly and full of satisfactions.

It seems astonishing that the authority of false chronology should ever have been sufficient to secure toleration for some of the absurdities it has originated. Take, for instance, its very surprising representations concerning the time of Zoroaster. It was necessary to recognise Zoroaster as a real personage, representing a great religious epoch of the Iranian people. It was seen that all accounts of him placed the time of his appearance far back in the past, the Greeks saying that he lived 5000 years before the Trojan War, and 6000 years before the death of Plato. But facts must not be stubborn, for here, as everywhere else, the current chronology, being supreme, must read the testimony and construe the facts in its own way; therefore it was assumed falsely that Zoroaster lived in the sixth century before Christ, during the reign of Darius Hystaspes, or during that of his father, who, as we know, was not a king, and never reigned at all. And this absurdity, already inexpressible, was heightened by a miraculous operation of "Mosaic" zeal, which transformed the great Iranian teacher into a Jew. The Rev. Drs. Hyde and Prideaux (the former in his "Veterum Persarum et Medorum Religionis Historia," and the latter in his "Connexions"), with solemn gravity befitting the wonderful announcement, represented Zoroaster as a native of Palestine, born of

Jewish parents, who first appeared in Persia as a menial servant in the families of Ezra and Daniel.

Here was brilliancy almost equal to that of a Rev. Dr. Joshua Barnes, of the last century, who published an elaborate work to prove that Solomon wrote the Iliad. It is not common to see Zoroaster transformed into a Jew, even by those who refuse to see that he lived many ages before Abraham. Even a hundred and seventy years ago, when Dr. Hyde wrote, not many "biblical" chronologists. were "Mosaic" to this extent. Anquetil du Perron, and others who followed him, adhered to the incongruous chronological dicta already established, although larger information should have qualified them to apply the proper criticism and present a more intelligent view of Iranian antiquity.

According to the Desatir, the Dabistan, and the old Iranian histories, there was a great king of that branch of the Aryan people known as Kai Khusro, who was a prophet and an ascetic. He had no children, and after "a glorious reign of sixty years" he abdicated in favor of a subordinate prince named Lohorasp, also an ascetic, who, after a long reign, resigned the throne to his son Gushtasp. It was during the reign of Gushtasp that Zoroaster appeared. Gushtasp was succeeded by Bahman, his grandson; Bahman by Darab, who was slain by rebels; and Darab by Sekander, who restored order and became famous in Iranian history. These were not kings of Persia; they reigned at Balkh, and lived many centuries before Persia became an independent kingdom. The Desatir calls their realm the kingdom of Hiras, and their people the Hirisais, names that seem to be modifications of the word Arya.

All this implied that the time of Zoroaster was far away in the past. The current chronologies were "frightened" at the mention of its possible distance from us. Such antiquity

must be disallowed; therefore the kingdom of Hiras was transformed into the kingdom of Persia, Kai Khusro into Cyrus the Great, and Gushtasp into Darius Hystaspes or his father. And why was this done? The answer is, " Because this period is less subject to chronological difficulties than many others." This is the only reason that can be given for a stupidity that is well-nigh matchless. The chronological system used does not allow room in the past for the true period. The time of Darius Hystaspes or his father is the best it can afford, although the true period may have been several millenniums previous to that time. It was certainly many ages before either Media or Persia was heard of as a distinct nation. The kingdom of Hiras belongs to remote ages previous to Babylon and Assyria, and, it may be, previous to Chaldea and Egypt, so far as relates to its origin and the first periods of its history.

The time has come when our current chronologies must more definitely adjust their relations with the history of China. This has already been attempted without satisfactory results, and there have been efforts to discredit the great antiquity implied by the civilization and literary records of that country. It is nowise likely that a more complete acquaintance with Chinese historical literature will make the task easier. It seems evident now that actual harmony between our chronology and Chinese antiquity is impossible. Heretofore we have seen China from a distance, heard reports of its civilization from mariners and merchants who have been permitted to visit some of its ports, from missionaries who have seen something of the interior, and from embassies that have seen its magnificent roads and its royal court; and Chinese books collected and brought to Europe have engaged the attention of scholars. But the commercial intercourse with Eastern Asia now opening across the Pacific begins a new era in the history of the world, and China, withdrawn from a seclusion no