

11 Strandford Square London Sep. 13. 1880  
Sir, Greaves  
I have just read your Book with  
extreme satisfaction, & I feel satisfied that  
you will accept what I say generously. I  
have given much attention to the history of the  
creation in Gen. I, & am convinced that all the  
visions I have seen are erroneous. What  
are treated as days there are certainly long  
periods of indefinite duration limited solely  
by the completion of their purpose. The Hebrew  
writes regularly narrated events in the true  
order, in which they happened, & that is especially  
the case in Gen. 1. The sentences "and evening &  
therefore apply to time after what is stated in the  
preceding verses, and their true rendering is  
"And evening was, & morning was, in the 1<sup>st</sup> (2<sup>d</sup>)  
period." That is, there was a succession of  
evenings & mornings after what is previously stated  
to have happened. How any one could  
suppose that all before the first statement  
about evening could be included in the  
evening & morning there mentioned passes my  
conception; for evening must necessarily be after  
a day, & you have a day & night previously  
mentioned. On a minute examination of  
the different terms used shows the necessity  
for long periods. The earth is ordered to  
bring forth herbs & trees; they are not said  
to be created, nor is it said that there was any  
miraculously accelerated growth; how  
then could any of them come to maturity  
so fast that the great beneficent Creator  
could see that they were good in an  
ordinary day. Everything that you have

so admirably described is perfectly con-  
sistent with the periods I have pointed out.  
Different species or genera might be created  
at different times in such long periods,  
& there is not a word to show that the  
creation of the things in one period was at  
one & the same time, Year,  $\text{D}^{\text{y}}$ , day, as  
in our version, has in Hebrew three  
meanings, & all occur in Gen. 1 & 2. The day  
light, a night & day,  $\text{Vayyiqen}$ , & a period of  
any duration as to length. Ch. 11 is only  
an expansion of Ch. 1. & v. 5 plainly shows the  
existence of time much longer than a week  
before the creation of Man.

I could say very much more, but I have  
pointed out what I hope may suffice to  
show you how completely in accord with  
the facts you have dealt with Gen. 1 & 2,  
are when properly understood.

I am a believer in the flood, & in the  
great age of the antediluvian, & as a  
result I conceive arts & sciences were in  
a state of great excellence at the flood, & I  
look on the ark as a proof of it. Surely  
"the great Bastani" is a proof now. And I  
have long thought the excellence at Nineveh,  
& was due to antediluvian arts, & I  
conceive that there was a manifest falling  
off in after times: and I was very pleased to  
see that you had the same opinion. Two  
instances have lately occurred. Ornaments of  
gold, & ware exhibited at our Arch. Institute  
from Ashantee, & they were held to be copies  
in moulds of work, previously of fine gold  
work, &c. evidently the result of modern

ancient civilization. The Basutos, the most degraded race in S Africa, paint beautifully animals on rocks.

One misconception I venture to point out. Lamprey and Lampern are different fish. The latter is the one you describe. A long thin wormlike fish, 10 or 12 inches long, & as thick only as a little finger, found in the Severn at Weston, & regularly steamed for eating. The Lamprey is a much larger fish, & like a shorteared eel. The Lampern has a mouth under its head, & I have seen it adhering by it to a stone whilst all the body was wrigg about in the stream. It has also several holes in the sides of the neck. I think its body is without bone, as I never remember any in it, & I have very often eaten it. The Lamprey is also in the Severn, & scarce; but I have eaten it, & I think it has a backbone like an eel, but not having attended to the point, I would not speak positively.

It may possibly interest you to learn that I have discovered the true origin of the Square Hebrew Alphabet. It originally consisted of less than ten figures, & the rest have been formed by variations or additions or unions of figures. I have no doubt that some one adopted figures for the sounds of the voice; at first the most marked alone would be noticed, but in a short time it would be found that these were divisible, & that would call for a change.  $\Pi$  would well represent the sounds of rough & smooth h, & be adopted originally, but it would soon be found that it represented both, & then it might well have  $\Gamma$  formed for the smoother sound.  $\Delta$  might well be adopted at first, & there

a line added to form P, & distinguish the  
sounds. Δ is a letter formed of J and I, as  
is shown by words beginning with being now  
commonly spelled J:

I consider this as strongly showing the  
great antiquity of the Alphabet: Older in  
fact than Phoenician, Sanscrit, Arabic  
Samaritan, & Chinese; but it is curious  
that the Chinese has only one figure for B &  
P, but that figure is from the Phoenician, &  
of course before the distinction between the  
Phoenician or Hebrew B & P. was made,  
I am satisfied that many of the errors  
in the present Hebrew Bible are due to the  
original having been written before the attention  
of the first invented letters, & afterwards  
copied so that one scribe used one figure &  
another another.

I am completely at enmity with all  
Darwinian absurdities

I dare say you have seen Schlessner's Lex.  
as to dew.  $\Delta$   $\Delta$   $\Delta$  the Jews render as the  
universe in their prayer book;

Recall the writing. I am in my 80<sup>th</sup> year &  
have long known how *diva podagra*  
*debilitat vires.*

I am well known in the States as a  
criminal lawyer, & added my name to the  
New York Code.

I am  
with much respect  
Very truly yours

C. S. Greaves

