Linden
Wellington Somerset
Oct. 12. 1879

My dear Sir

The publishers have forwarded your "Origin of the World" for which I am much obliged. I see that by putting the Deluge back toward 3000 B.C. you somewhat extend the time in the margins of our Bibles, to admit of the growth of

the Egyptian & Babylonian nations. But I am bound to say that even this seems to leave you face to face with an insurmountable difficulty. The Egyptian chronology which throws the first dynasty back to 3000 B.C. or beyond, is daily gaining strength by the discovery of new monuments belonging to the early dynasties and showing how real they are. There is much of this in Brugsch's important History of Egypt of

which I see no mention in your volume. But it is only beyond historical antiquity that the anthropological argument begins, which accounts by a long course of development for the rise of nations of special bodily type, language, and civilization. When you undertake to account for the nations of Egypt, Babylonia, Persia &c. as the descendants of one man who lived after 3000 B.C., their utter difference in language &c.

being the result of a few centuries of modification, I cannot think you will ever persuade anthropologists. They are more likely to carry the war into your camp, by asking why they should accept Genesis as a chronological authority at all, seeing that its writers are unknown, and the book as a whole shows how late it was compiled, by containing a mention of kings of Israel.

You will excuse my putting this issue plainly. For my own part I cannot but think that trying to compress man's life on earth into the limits of any written record will have to be given up as completely as the attempt to get geology into six thousand years has been.

It may interest you if I mention that Skertchly's case about interglacial man, which I

encouraged him to bring forward at Sheffield in order that at any rate it might get a fair hearing, had the effect of persuading several geologists who had before opposed it. There was hardly any opposition to it. However, if man in England is really older than any part of the undisturbed boulder-clay, there ought to be evidence coming in from other places.

I have only to thank you for writing to me in so friendly a way, and for sending me your recent book. The discussion going on about the Eozoon I follow with great interest, but do not yet see signs of the last word having been said on it

Believe me Dear Sir
Yours very sincerely
Edward B. Tylor

Principal Dawson F.R.S.

Zylm
Oct 19