

**THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN
PHILOSOPHY, VOL. II, NO. 3, APRIL,
1883, PP. 339-364; THE JOURNAL OF
CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, VOL. II,
NO. 4, JULY, 1883, PP. 471-486**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649280759

The Journal of Christian Philosophy, Vol. II, No. 3, April, 1883, pp. 339-364; The Journal of Christian Philosophy, Vol. II, No. 4, July, 1883, pp. 471-486 by John A. Paine

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

JOHN A. PAINE

**THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN
PHILOSOPHY, VOL. II, NO. 3, APRIL,
1883, PP. 339-364; THE JOURNAL OF
CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, VOL. II,
NO. 4, JULY, 1883, PP. 471-486**

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

EDITED BY JOHN A. PAINE

VOL. II

APRIL, 1883

No. 3

CONTENTS

ART.

- I. INSPIRATION
By Professor GEORGE T. LADD, New Haven, Conn.
- II. THE RECENT SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIETY
By Professor BENJAMIN N. MARTIN, New York City
- III. MIRACLES AND THEIR PLACE IN CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE
By Professor GEORGE P. FISHER, New Haven, Conn.
- IV. THE GENESIS OF THE IDEA OF GOD
By Professor FRANCIS L. PATTON, Princeton, N. J.
- V. THE LAMP OF THE BODY
By JESSE B. THOMAS, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- VI. THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED
By Professor GEORGE RAWLINSON, Oxford, Eng.
- VII. THE TRUE MOUNT LEBANON—THE NAME AN INDEX TO THE PLACE
By THE EDITOR, Tarrytown, N. Y.
- VIII. PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

"So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ."—*Romans*, x, 17.

NEW YORK

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR
ROOM 30 BIBLE HOUSE, ASTOR PLACE.

Two Dollars and a half a Volume Seventy-five Cents a Number

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as Second Class Matter.

The Journal of Christian Philosophy

IS DESIGNED,

Through the engagement of highest Evangelical scholarship of our own land and of other countries :

1. To present anew the various branches of the Theistic argument, with special reference to the multiplied proofs afforded by the progress and discoveries of Science, Natural History, Biology, and Psychology in late years, for the existence, character, and plan of God.

2. To discuss the relations of the Supernatural to the Natural, particularly in regard to Providence and Revelation.

3. To restate the Evidences of Christianity in the light of modern criticism, making prominent the fact and the perfection of Christ himself as an exposition of the Divine, as a power for awakening a faultless moral life, and as a demonstration in his resurrection of Immortality.

4. To bring to the confirmation and elucidation of the Bible the gainful results of contemporary study in its history and languages, together with the constantly increasing light furnished by the monuments of antiquity and by geographical exploration.

5. To promote a more general culture in the Reasons of our Hope, the increase of positive religion, and the application of the principles of the Gospel to political, social, and private life.

6. To adapt such essays to the restoration of Belief in Christ among those whose faith may have been shaken by the destructive speculations and materialistic theories of our day, and to counteract all tendencies toward doubt, scepticism, unbelief, atheism, agnosticism, and the many forms of current infidelity.

In short, directly to Build the Foundations and Strengthen the Defences of the Kingdom of God.

An enumeration of the articles contained in the First Volume may be found on the last page of Cover of the Number for January, 1883.

The Second Volume presents the following articles :

No. for October, 1882.—1. *Anniversary Address*, by Charles F. Deems, D. D., of New York.—2. *The Validation of Knowledge*, by Prof. Henry N. Day, D. D., of New Haven, Conn.—3. *Christ and Our Century*, by Rev. A. H. Bradford, of Montclair, N. J.—4. *The Duality of Mind and Brain*, by Prof. Noah K. Davis, LL. D., of the University of Virginia.—5. *Nature and the Supernatural*, by Prof. George T. Ladd, D. D., of New Haven, Conn.—6. *God and Man Mutually Visible*, by Howard Crosby, D. D., of New York.

No. for January, 1883.—1. *The Arguments for the Being of God*, by Prof. George P. Fisher, of New Haven, Conn.—2. *Christianity and Social Science*, by Washington Gladden, D. D., of Columbus, Ohio.—3. *Revelation*, by Prof. George T. Ladd, of New Haven, Conn.—4. *The Incarnation, and the Problem of Modern Thought*, by A. J. F. Behrens, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.—5. *Mind and Matter, their Immediate Relation*, by President John Bascom, Madison, Wis.—6. *The Spiritual Life, a Fact and a Testimony*, By Giles H. Mandeville, D. D., Harlem, New York.

The No. for July, 1883, will embrace:—*The Theistic Discussion, an Historical Sketch*, by Professor Francis L. Patton, of Princeton, N. J.—*What the Bible is, and Why I believe It*, by Lyman Abbott, D. D., of New York.—*Mind and Matter, their Ultimate Reference*, by President John Bascom, of Madison, Wis.—*The Mosaic Cosmogony, or Ancient Thought on Life, Time, and the World*, by Professor Francis W. Upham, of New York.—*The True Mount Lebanon, Scriptural Testimony to the Place*, by The Editor, Tarrytown, N. Y.—and other articles.

Issued Quarterly, at \$2.50 per Year.

An active interest in the Aim and Circulation of *This Journal* is desired everywhere.

Address **J. A. PAINE, Editor and Publisher,**

ROOM NO. 30 BIBLE HOUSE, ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

[Present Day Tract No. 9, of the R. T. S., London, England.]

By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A.,

Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford.

I.

THE problem of the antiquity of man has to the historian two stages. In the first, it is a matter wholly within the sphere of historical investigation, and capable of being determined, if not with precision, at any rate within chronological limits that are not very wide, *i.e.*, that do not exceed a space of two or three centuries. In the further or second stage, it is only partially an historical problem; it has to be decided by an appeal to considerations which lie outside the true domain of the historian, and are to a large extent speculative; nor can any attempt be made to determine it otherwise than with great vagueness, and within very wide limits—limits that are to be measured not so much by centuries as by millennia.

The two stages which are here spoken of correspond to two phrases which are in ordinary use—'Historic man' and 'Prehistoric man.' 'Historic man' means man from the time that he has left contemporary written records of himself, which have in any shape come down to us, and are intelligible. 'Prehistoric man' means man anterior to this—man during the time that he wrote no records of himself, or none that are intelligible, or none that have reached our day. History proper deals with the later stage, the stage for which written records exist; but the

historian has always to acknowledge a precedent time, to take it into account, and retrospectively glance at it.

In pursuing the present inquiry, we shall, first of all, examine the question, to what length of time history proper goes back—for how many centuries or millennia do the contemporary written records of historic man indicate or prove his existence upon the earth?

And here, in the first place, the inquiry may be restricted to the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere. The New World, at the time of its discovery by Europe, possessed nothing that deserves the name of history. The picture-writings of the Aztecs were not records, but symbolic representations capable of being variously interpreted, and only supposed to become intelligible by the application to them of oral tradition.¹ Thus the native races of America, prior to the Spanish conquests, belong to the category of 'prehistoric' and not of 'historic man,' and therefore do not come under our present head of inquiry.

Of the Old World we possess abundant records, thoroughly intelligible, which are universally admitted to go back to a period not far short of three thousand years from the present time. One record, equally easy to read, carries back the origin of one nation, the Hebrews, at least two hundred years earlier. The Hebrews had at that time been living, according to their own belief, for more than four centuries under subjection to another much more powerful nation, the Egyptians, whose existence is thus thrown back to a date more than three thousand six hundred years from to-day. The native records of Egypt, which are not, however, allowed on all hands to be intelligible, confirm this view, and are even thought to indicate for the Egyptians a still higher antiquity. The cuneiform inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria, the intelligibility of which is also disputed, in the opinion of those who profess to read them, begin about B.C. 2400. On the whole, it may be said to be the general opinion of scholars that history proper can be traced back a space of at least four thousand years; though the sceptics, who refuse to believe in hieroglyphic or cuneiform decipherment, would contract the period, and deny that any history exists, on

¹ See PRESCOTT, *Conquest of Mexico*, I, 82.

which we can rely, or to which we can attach definite dates, earlier than about B.C. 1000—the time of Sheshonk I. in Egypt, of Solomon in Judea, and of the Dorian conquests in Greece.

It is not our purpose to entrench ourselves within the lines traced out by Sir Cornwall Lewis in his two principal works, *The Astronomy of the Ancients*, and *The Credibility of Early Roman History*. We desire to conduct the present inquiry in a fair, candid, and impartial spirit. We shall, therefore, accept hieroglyphical and cuneiform discovery as *faits accomplis*; we shall reject the extreme sceptical view; and we shall proceed to inquire what contemporary literature, or other valid authority, teaches as to the age of those nations of the Old World which are clearly the most ancient, and which alone dispute among themselves the palm of antiquity.

These nations, according to the general consent of modern historical critics, are the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Israelites, the Iranians, the nations of Asia Minor, the Phœnicians, the Indians, and the Chinese.

The highest antiquity to which any of these nations ever pretended would seem to be that which was claimed for themselves by the Babylonians. Their astronomers, they said, had observed the heavenly bodies for a space of above 450,000 years. Their first king had ascended the throne 467,581 years before the accession of Pul, or about B.C. 468,330. Babylon had had seven dynasties during this space. The first, consisting of ten kings, had reigned 432,000 years, or an average of 43,200 each. The next, in which there were eighty-six kings, had occupied the throne for 34,080 years, which would give an average of 396 years to each. The remainder had filled a space not much exceeding 1500 years, and had had short reigns, not averaging so much as thirteen years apiece.

Historical criticism has at all times rejected this chronology as incredible. There is no historian of repute who has not set aside the first dynasty as mythical, and but one¹ who has found anything historical in the second. Critics generally draw a sharp line between the second and third dynasties of Berosus, and regard the Babylonian history of this writer as properly com-

¹ The late Baron Bunsen.

mencing with his third or Median dynasty, about B.C. 2250, or (according to an amended reading) B.C. 2460.

It was pointed out long ago by Eusebius,¹ the Church historian, that no events were chronicled as belonging to the enormous space of 466,080 years, by which Babylonian chronology exceeded the ordinary reckoning, and that a chronology which is unsupported by facts of history is worthless.

The allegation, that sidereal observations had been made at Babylon for above 450,000 years is sufficiently met by the fact that when Aristotle commissioned his disciple, Callisthenes, to obtain for him the astronomical lore of Babylon, on Alexander's occupation of the city, the observations were found to extend, not to 450,000 years, but to 1903.

If we turn from the reports of what Babylonian writers of a comparatively late period declared concerning the antiquity of their nation, to the native records which modern research has recovered from the Mesopotamian regions, we shall find them favor a very moderate date for the commencement of Babylonian sovereignty. The earliest Babylonian date contained in a cuneiform document is that of 1635 years before the seventeenth year of Asshur-bani-pal, which gives for the first Elamitic invasion of Babylonia the year B.C. 2286. Only about five monumental kings can be placed in the period which preceded this conquest,² whence it would follow that the monuments require no earlier date for the commencement of the Chaldean monarchy than B.C. 2400. There is a tolerably near agreement between this date and the chronology of Berosus, if we reject his first and second dynasties as fabulous.

An antiquity, almost as remote as that claimed for themselves by the Babylonians, has sometimes been ascribed to the Sanskritic conquerors of India. But the latest researches of the best scholars are completely adverse to all such pretensions. M. François Lenormant, in his *Manual of Ancient Oriental History*, which is used widely as a text-book in France, assigns the first entrance of the Sanskritic Indians into the peninsula of Hindustan³ to no earlier a date than B.C. 2500, and regards their

¹ *Chron. Com.*, Pars I, c. 2, s. 7.

² G. SMITH, *History of Babylonia*, p. 10.

³ *Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne*, III, 431.

history as commencing with the "War of the Ten Kings,"¹ somewhere between B.C. 1600 and B.C. 1500. Professor Max Müller scarcely goes back so far. In his *Ancient Sanskrit Literature* he lays it down² that four periods of composition may be traced in the Vedas, and that the earliest of these—the Chandas period—to which the most ancient of the Vedic hymns belong, covered the space between B.C. 1200 and B.C. 1000. Of authentic Indian history before this time he does not find in the native literature any trace.

The Iranians had in primitive times a close connection with the Sanskritic Indians, and the earliest glimpses that we obtain of them reach back to about the same date. But *Iranic history* cannot be regarded as commencing before B.C. 820, when the Medes first came into contact with the Assyrians. Portions of the Zendavesta may be six or seven centuries earlier; but Dr. Martin Haug, the best living *Iranic* scholar, does not postulate for the most ancient of the "Gathas" a higher antiquity than B.C. 1500.³

The Phœnicians are regarded by some writers as having migrated from the shores of the Persian Gulf to those of the Eastern Mediterranean about B.C. 2500. The mention of Sidon in the Book of Genesis certainly favors the view that their settlement in Syria was of early date; but we have nothing that can be called authentic history in connection with the Phœnician people much more remote than the reign of David in Judea, or B.C. 1050. The Egyptian monuments, which are copious for the space between B.C. 1600 and 1280, contain no distinct mention of them; and one important authority (Josephus⁴) places the foundation of Tyre—which was an event very early in the history of the nation—as late as B.C. 1252. It is not at all clear that the emigration from the Persian Gulf, if it be a fact, preceded B.C. 1500; and it is tolerably evident that the nation enjoyed no great distinction till two centuries later.

The Israelites, as a nation, date from the Exodus, which can scarcely be placed later than B.C. 1300, or earlier than B.C. 1600.

¹ *Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne*, III, pp. 473-475.

² Pages 301-305.

³ *Essays on the Sacred Language, etc., of the Parsees*, p. 225.

⁴ *Ant. Jud.*, VIII, iii, 1.