

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LVI.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1924.

THE 660TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, JANUARY 21ST, 1924,
AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

At the beginning of the proceedings the CHAIRMAN announced that we met under the shadow of a great bereavement, the death of the President, Dean Wace of Canterbury, and called upon the Hon. Secretary to propose a Resolution already drafted by the Council :

“ This Meeting of Members and Associates of the Victoria Institute hereby expresses its profound sorrow at the death of Dean Wace, President and Trustee of the Institute. For a long period of years the Dean was a tower of strength to the Institute and held in honour by all its supporters. In common with the entire Evangelical world, this Meeting expresses its deep sense of loss, and places on record its sincere sympathy with Mrs. Wace and other relatives who have been so sorely bereaved.”

This was put to the Meeting and passed *nem. con.*, Members signifying their assent by rising from their seats.

The business of the Meeting was then begun by the reading and signing of the Minutes of the previous Meeting, and the Hon. Secretary announced the Election of the following :—William C. Edwards, Esq., as a Member ; and Mrs. Charlotte A. Boyd, Mrs. Mary L. Gough Griffiths, the Rev. D. M. McIntyre and W. R. Lane, Esq., as Associates.

Then, in the absence of the Gunning Prize Essayist, Mr. E. J. Sewell, the HON. SECRETARY was called upon to read the essay on “ The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah.”

GUNNING PRIZE ESSAY.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE BOOK OF JONAH.

By E. J. SEWELL, Esq.

THE Book of Jonah purports to relate facts. It is a narrative of an episode in the life of a known man, Jonah-ben-Amittai of Gath-hepher, who was a prophet of the northern Kingdom in the reign of Jeroboam II, King of Israel (781-740 B.C.).*

(2) But many Biblical critics deny that the book is a real history of facts or was meant to be such a history. They regard it as a Haggādah, or edifying story—"a narrative with a purpose, homily." Such haggādoth form a large part of Rabbinical literature; they are usually attached to historical names and events, but their value lies, not in the facts which they relate, but in the ideas which they embody. They are a branch of "Midrash."

(3) Other advanced Biblical critics describe the book in various ways, as an allegory, a prose poem, an actual poem written in metre, as a mixture of "Midrash" folklore and allegory, a narrative founded upon historical incidents, but greatly altered, and, finally, as pure fiction.

Conservative Biblical critics regard it as genuine history, containing miraculous events, but not, on that account, incredible.

* Many different dates are given for Jeroboam's reign: e.g. G. A. Cooke, in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary* (ii, 583 b), gives 790-749 B.C.; Cheyne, in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, p. 2406, gives 782-743 B.C.; Driver, in *Authority and Archeology*, assigns the reign to c. 786-746 B.C.; and so on. Dr. Sanday, in his *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, appends a table of dates representing "so much of the conclusions of criticism as he feels that he can honestly and fairly assimilate." I have, in the text, taken the date given by him in this "Table," p. 450.

Clearly, then, there is room for difference of opinion, and we are at liberty to form our own conclusion on the evidence.

(4) It seems to the writer that there can be little doubt that the very general unwillingness to accept the story as history, arises, to a great extent, from the miracles described in it.

Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Perowne says :—* “The question whether this book is not rather to be regarded as an allegory or parable or romance . . . than as a history of what actually happened, really (it can hardly be doubted) owes its origin to the miraculous character of the book. Among the principal advocates of the non-historical theory of the book are those who deny the possibility of miracles.” . . . “But” (he continues) “may not even the most devout Christian hold the book to be a divinely-originated parable or allegory? Even in this form, many would consider that the question is really suggested by the miracles with which this book abounds. . . . But for them, it may well be doubted whether anyone would ever have taken the Book of Jonah to be anything but history.” But this was written in 1893. Since that date advanced Biblical critics have gone much further in describing as fiction, or mostly fiction, what has usually been regarded as history.

(5) One may, perhaps, even now, go so far as to say that if the narrative had been told without the miraculous events (the “swallowing” by the “great fish” and Jonah’s escape alive and uninjured, and the events connected with the “gourd”) there would not have been so general a hesitation in accepting the narrative as history, nor would the other reasons put forward for doubting its “historicity” receive so much attention.

(6) However, such reasons are alleged. It is said that it is certain, from linguistic evidence, that the book cannot have been written in the 8th century B.C., when Jonah lived and prophesied, but must have come into existence in the 3rd or 4th century B.C. after the return from the Exile to Babylon. It is also said that the language used in the book about Nineveh shows that the writer of the book lived long after the date

* *Introduction to the Book of Jonah* in the Cambridge Bible (1893), cap. ii, paras. 2 and 4. See also on the general question, Dr. Gore in *Belief in God*, p. 173.

(607 or 608 B.C.)* when that city was destroyed, for he speaks of it as fabulously great, implying that his readers (in 300 or 400 B.C.) did not know much about the city.

Other instances, of less importance, are also put forward as showing that the story rests upon imagination rather than fact.

(7) The writer proposes to discuss these questions before taking into consideration the miraculous element in the book. For, if it can be shown that the book was written at some date, varying from 350 to 450 years, after the time when Jonah lived, there could be little reason to think that the narratives of the book owed their origin, either directly or indirectly, to Jonah himself. But most of the details of those narratives could only have been known to Jonah himself. That he was "swallowed" by a "great fish" might be known to the sailors who threw him into the sea and saw what followed, but that he remained alive inside the "fish" for "three days and three nights," and was not only alive but conscious, so as to compose the Psalm in chapter II, and that he was thrown up alive and uninjured on the sea-shore: these facts, together with some of the details about the "gourd," as well as the divine communications received by the prophet from time to time, could only have been known to Jonah himself. If we have not got them on his testimony, the evidence for them, as far as we are concerned, is very weak, and taken solely by itself is insufficient to warrant belief in such stupendous miracles. (But see, on this, paras. 49-53 *seq.*)

(8) The question of the date of the book becomes, therefore, of considerable (or even vital) importance in weighing its claim to be historical. The writer will, consequently, begin by scrutinizing the evidence put forward to justify the conclusions set out in para. 6 above and also in para. 11 following.

But here he is met by a grave difficulty. These conclusions deal with the usages of the Hebrew language and are urged by very eminent Hebrew scholars, while the writer does not possess, and does not claim to possess, more than a very moderate knowledge of Hebrew, acquired, late in life, in the course of the

* This has hitherto been the accepted date for the fall of Nineveh. But the writer has to thank Mr. Harold Wiener for a reference to a recent book by Mr. C. J. Gadd—*The Fall of Nineveh*—which shows, on the evidence of a newly-discovered Babylonian chronicle, that the true date was 612 B.C.

endeavour to understand and weigh the arguments put forward and the conclusions arrived at by advanced Biblical critics.

The question may well suggest itself: Is the writer justified in attempting to weigh the evidence and arrive at conclusions on points on which very eminent Hebrew scholars have agreed in pronouncing decisions expressed in confident language? Is it not presumptuous on his part to do so, and ought he not "with bated breath and whispering humbleness" to accept those decisions as beyond his competence to question?

(9) He thinks his action not presumptuous, and for the following reasons:—

- (a) These eminent Hebraists are by no means agreed on many points relating to the language of the Book of Jonah. They differ widely, and in some cases go so far as flatly to contradict one another. In such cases some of them must be right and some wrong. But it is essential to know which are right and which wrong. How can this be decided except by weighing against one another the grounds which they themselves urge in support of their assertions?
- (b) The writer does not suggest that any weight be given to anything which he puts forward unless it is supported by the evidence adduced, and by valid reasoning based on that evidence. Even great Biblical critics must yield to results obtained by strictly valid reasoning based on facts well established. The writer has done his best to obtain full evidence and to deal with that evidence with strict attention to the laws of reasoning, and to be absolutely fair and impartial in deciding. He gives his reasons; if he is mistaken in his facts, it is easy to point out the mistake; if his reasons are inconclusive, that also can be made to appear.
- (c) The writer is encouraged by such opinions as that stated by Dr. Gore (*Belief in God*, p. 2). "The only satisfactory way for a man to save his own soul or to become capable of helping others is freely to use his own real judgment in the fullest light that he can come by."

- (d) The writer has adopted the Horatian motto,
 “ Si quid novisti rectius istis,
 Candidus imperti ! si non his utere mecum.”
 and he hopes to be allowed to act on it.

(10) He will, therefore, proceed to discuss the linguistic evidence put forward as to the date of the Book of Jonah.

(11) There are, among many others, five advanced Biblical critics of recent date, all also eminent Hebraists, who have expressed in very strong language their decision as to the date of the language of the Book of Jonah. They are Driver, Cheyne, König, Cornill and Bewer.

*Driver says :—“ The Book of Jonah *cannot*† have been written until long after the life-time of Jonah himself. This appears from the style which has several . . . marks of a later age.”

‡ Cheyne says :—“ The phase of Hebrew which meets us in the Book of Jonah is not that of the 8th century . . . such words and forms as the following are *conclusive* as to the post-exilic date of the book.”

The other three, König,§ Cornill|| and Bewer¶ use language quite as confident and to the same effect. All five give lists of words and constructions in the Hebrew of the book which they consider bear out their opinion. They by no means agree in these lists. A full and candid consideration of their arguments would require an examination of all the words detailed by any one of them. This would mean the full and careful discussion of fourteen Hebrew words. The writer has made such an examination, but, in this Essay, he is strictly limited as to space and cannot find room for the whole discussion. He can only deal with three typical cases, and then state the conclusion to which a similar examination of all the cases has led him.

But, before dealing with these three cases separately, it seems requisite to say a little about considerations of linguistic style used to fix the date at which a book was written.

* Driver, *Intro. L.O.T.*, p. 322.

† The italics are the writer's.

‡ See Cheyne ; *Encycl. Bib.*, p. 2566 (1).

§ König, *Einleitung*, Sec. 77 (3), p. 880 ; also *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, pp. 745-753.

|| Cornill ; *Introduction to the Historical Books of the O.T.*, translated by Canon Box (1907), p. 337.

¶ Bewer ; *International Critical Commentary : Jonah*.

(12) There are (at least) three distinct elements of linguistic style. The first is that which may be called the idiosyncrasy of the author. *Le style c'est l'homme*, and every man who writes with any freedom and emphasis has his own peculiar characteristics.

The author of this book is no exception to this rule. Short though the book is, certain peculiarities of style are very marked in it. The narrative is characterized by great brevity. The author omits everything that does not bear directly on the purpose of his story. Notice, in this connection, the abrupt beginning and the even more abrupt close of the book. The author scorns to record the obvious, and entirely refrains from drawing any moral, still more from enforcing one. His language is vivid. God hurled (הִטִּיל הַיָּם *hēṭil, i, 4*) a storm upon the sea; that sea will sink to a whisper (יִשָּׁתֵק *yis^e tōq, i, 11*); the rowers dig at their oars (יִחַתְרוּ *yaht^e rū, i, 13*); Jonah does well to be angry "even to death" (עַד־מָוֶת *'ad māvet, iv, 9*); in speaking of the "gourd" he says: "Which existed the son of a night, and perished the son of a night" (שֶׁבַן־לַיְלָה הָיָה וּבֹן־לַיְלָה אָבָד *(š^ebbin-lay^elāh hāyāh ūbin-lay^elāh 'ābād, iv, 10*), and so on. He is very dramatic and seems to preserve the actual words used by the Phœnician sailors in conversation with him and one another, and the words used by the King in Nineveh.

He uses, in the 48 verses of his short book, four Hebrew words used by no other Biblical writer (קְרִיאתָ *s^efīnāh, i, 5*; קְרִיאָה *q^erī'āh, iii, 2*; קִיָּוֹן *qīqāyōn, iv, 6*; and חֲרִישׁוֹתָ *ḥarisit, iv, 8*).

The second element of style depends on the character of the work, *e.g.* prose narrative, as distinguished from impassioned prophecy in rhythmical prose or in metre. This difference somewhat invalidates any comparison between the Book of Jonah and the prophecies of the 8th century prophet, Hosea.

The third element of style depends upon the country and epoch of the writer. Here, again, Hosea, though he prophesied about Israel in the 8th century, wrote in Jerusalem. A prophet of Northern Israel in the 8th century B.C. would write differently from a writer of narrative (or pious fiction) in Palestine of the 3rd or 4th century B.C. Compare the "memoirs of Ezra" with the "prophetic" narratives in the Books of Kings.

(13) Bearing these things in mind, as we are bound to do,

we come to consider some of the words used in the book which are cited as *conclusively* showing its post-exilic date.

The first I will take is the word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, used in Jonah i, 5, for a ship. Driver and Cornill say, very decisively, that the use of this word in the 8th century B.C. is "on linguistic grounds quite impossible." Now it is to be noted that Cheyne is not of this opinion. He says: * "We need not lay stress on סְפִינָה s^efīnāh which, though more Aramaic than Hebrew, might perhaps have been used by the non-maritime Israelites before the Exile."† And Beyer‡ goes much further, saying: ". . . סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, which occurs only here in the Old Testament," has "been regarded as an Aramaism. But סְפִינָה s^efīnāh means here evidently" (mark *evidently*) "the lower deck, and is derived from the good Hebrew root סָפַן sāfan." König, in his article in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, omits this word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh from his list, and the omission seems to be deliberate and significant, for in discussing the word in his Introduction (Einleitung, *Jona*, p. 78) he speaks of the word as properly used instead of אֲנִיָּה 'anīyyāh, to indicate a ship which was decked and covered in. It is to be remembered that the ship on which Jonah embarked was a "Tarshish ship," *i.e.* a large vessel intended for long sea-voyages in rough weather and therefore certain to be decked.

The preponderance of authority of advanced Biblical critics is therefore to the effect that the word סְפִינָה s^efīnāh, instead of being an instance of late Hebrew which goes to prove decisively that the book of Jonah could not have been written in the 8th century, is "formed from a good Hebrew root," and is rightly used here to describe the particular kind of ship on which Jonah embarked, a detail which is necessary for the understanding of what follows in the narrative. Not only does it fail to show that the language of the book decisively stamps it as post-exilic, but

* *Encyclopædia Biblica*, ii, col. 2566.

† Cheyne cites Siegfried and Stade as reading סְפִינֹת s^efīnôt instead of שְׂכִיּוֹת s^ekiyôt,* (so also Canon G. H. Box), in Isaiah ii, 16, a reading which corresponds with the LXX translation και ἐπὶ πᾶσαν θέαν πλοίων κάλλους. It would seem to follow that these two eminent Hebraists did not regard סְפִינָה s^efīnāh as stamping the book in which it occurred as post-exilic.

‡ *Intern. Crit. Comm.: Jonah*, p. 12.

does, in fact, go some way to show exactly the opposite. That it is not used by early Hebrew writers is probably due to the fact that the Hebrews had very little to do with ships either decked or undecked.

And it is to be noted, in passing, that such Hebraists as Driver and Cornill may be entirely wrong in the inference they draw from the use of the word in Hebrew, so that one may take courage and have one's own opinion even on such subjects.

(14) Another word cited by Cheyne, König and Bewer, as proving a late date for the book, is רִבּוֹ *ribbô*, for ten thousand (Jonah iv, 11). Driver and Cornill do not include it in their lists; it may, perhaps, be inferred that they do not regard it as furnishing evidence of a late date (see para. (15) following). Bewer describes רִבּוֹ *ribbô* as "used in late literature for the earlier רִבְבָה *rēbābāh*"* (p. 12), implying, of course, that if the author of the Book of Jonah had written in the 8th century B.C. he would have used רִבְבָה *rēbābāh*.†

If, however, the sixteen instances‡ in which the word רִבְבָה *rē ā āh* is used in the Old Testament be examined, it will be seen that in all of them (with the possible exception of Judges xx, 10) the word is used (like "myriad" in English) for a very large indefinite number. Take, for example, Gen. xxiv, 60, where Rebekah's mother and brother express, on her approaching marriage, the wish for her—be thou the mother of thousands of ten thousands!—לְאַלְפֵי רִבְבָה *l'alfê rē ābāh*. In all the other cases the word is used in a similar way.

* The wording of this statement is a little misleading. It implies that רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used in early literature and רִבּוֹ *ribbô* in late literature. But רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used in late literature as well as in early. (See Cant. v, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7; and, if you like, Lev. xxvi, 8.)

† The word רִבּוֹ *ribbô* does occur once in the consonantal text of a book of the 8th century, viz.: Hos. viii, 12. But the Masorites propose a different pointing in Hos. viii, 12, reading רִבּ *rubbê*. And it is possible that they are right.

‡ They are:—Gen. xxiv, 60; Lev. xxvi, 8; Num. x, 36; Deut. xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 2, 17; Judges xx, 10; 1 Sam. xviii, 7 and 8; 1 Sam. xxi, 11 (12); xxix, 5; Ps. iii, 6 (7); xci, 7; Cant. v, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7; Mic. vi, 7.

Note that רִבְבָה *rēbābāh* is used by late writers as well as by early ones. If its use was a matter of date there was nothing to prevent the author of Jonah from using it, even though he wrote in the 3rd and 4th century B.C. But it appears to be a matter of meaning not of date.

On the other hand, the word רבו *ribbô*, which occurs elsewhere nine times in Hebrew (once in the Aramaic of Daniel),* in the Old Testament is nearly always (two exceptions) used for a definite number, ten thousand. Take, for example, Neh. vii, 66: "The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand three hundred and three score," where רבוא ארבע *'ar'ba' ribbô*, etc., stands for the definite number forty thousand. In the other six cases the word is used in the same way.

(15) This distinction between the use of רבבה *r'babāh* and רבו *ribbô* is not specifically mentioned in the *Oxford Hebrew Dictionary* nor, as far as the writer knows, anywhere else. However, the passages are all given (see notes † on p. 48 and * below), and anyone who has a Hebrew concordance and will look at it can see for himself whether the distinction exists or does not. It plainly does. But the author of the Book of Jonah clearly meant in iv, 11, to give the actual number of the inhabitants of Nineveh who could not discern between their right hand and their left hand.† He gives it as more than sixscore thousand persons (literally more than twelve ten-thousand), רבו אדם *har'bh mis'tēm- 'eṣ'reh ribbô 'ādām*. רבו *ribbô* was, therefore, exactly the right word to use; if the author had used רבבה *r'babāh* he would have run the risk of conveying the idea of a large indefinite number which clearly was not his intention. It follows that the use of רבו *ribbô* here is no certain sign of late date.

(16) The writer has only room to refer to one other word. That is the word טעם *ta'am* (iii, 7) given as part of the language of the King in Nineveh as describing the "decree" of himself and his grandees.

* They are:—1 Chron. xxix, 7; Ezra ii, 64, 69; Neh. vii, 66; vii, 72; Dan. xi, 12; Hos. viii, 12; Neh. vii, 7 (pl.); Ps. lxxviii, 17 (18) (pl); and in the Aramaic of Dan. vii, 10. In this Aramaic it is a large indefinite number, *not* as it is used in Jonah.

† The advanced critics treat this as only referring to children, and children under three years of age. This is by no means certain. Many adult Orientals do not use the distinction, and in consequence children much older than three years of age would not be taught it. Of course, *all* children have to be taught it.

In the Old Testament this word only occurs, elsewhere in the sense of "decree" in passages written in Aramaic. It is therefore treated by all the five advanced Bible critics mentioned above (para. (11)) as a decisive proof of the late date of the book.

But there seems good reason to think that the word טַעַם ta'am is an Assyrian word. A word תַּאמַר ta'amu = command, rule, but written with ט t (= tau) not ט t (= teth), is given in Mr. L. W. King's glossary to his *First Steps in Assyrian*. I also learn from the eminent Assyriologist, Mr. T. G. Pinches, that there is an Assyrian noun tēmu, meaning, among other things, "command." Mr. Pinches says,* in comparing Hebrew words with Assyrian:—"The occurrence of the form tēmu, is due to the phonetic rule that ayin changes into a mere breathing or even disappears altogether, whilst the vowels accompanying it are usually e e, or a contraction into a single vowel ê." Thus an Assyrian noun tēmu would seem to correspond to the Hebrew noun טַעַם ta'am used by the author of the Book of Jonah.

The word טַעַם tēem is used many times in the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel for "decrees" of Cyrus, Darius, Artaxerxes and Belshazzar made in Babylon. It would seem, therefore, that the Jews brought home the word on their return from the Babylonian Exile. But the ascription of the word to the King in Nineveh in the 8th century B.C. may well be taken as a report by Jonah of the actual language used by the King in announcing his "decree" for fasting, mourning and prayer. At all events, it is, in the circumstances, no proof at all of a post-exilic date for the book.

(17) There are other words like these, such as מִנְהָה minnāh, the Piel of מָנַח, עֲמַל, שָׂתַק, mānāh, 'āmal, sātaq and others. The writer thinks it possible to show that all these were used in Hebrew which some advanced Biblical critics allow to have been early. But to do so would require far more room than the writer can use, for this purpose, in this essay. It is, however, true that these words are used very seldom in early Hebrew, and frequently in late Hebrew. But it must be remembered that the occurrence of a few (say three or four) words of this description is not sufficient ground for assigning a late date to the Hebrew in which they occur, especially if the Hebrew is that of a writer of Northern Israel.

* In a letter *penes me*.

(18) In the days of Ahab-ben-Omri (877–855 B.C.), who married a Tyrian* princess, Jezebel, there must have been many Phœnician-speaking people in the Court of Samaria, and Phœnician is an Aramaic language. The relations between Syria and the Northern Kingdom were frequent and close; there must have often been embassies from Damascus to Samaria and from Samaria to Damascus, and much intercourse in periods of alliance between Syria and Israel. The language of Syria, of course, was typical Aramaic. That all this must have had a considerable linguistic influence is clear: attention is drawn to the fact by Driver (*L.O.T.*, p. 188 *n.*) where he says of the *narratives* of Kings: "These narratives are written mostly in a bright and chaste Hebrew style, though some of them exhibit slight peculiarities of diction," and he appends in a note twelve examples, "due doubtless in part to their North Israelitish origin. Their authors were, in all probability, prophets—in most cases prophets belonging to the Northern Kingdom. . ."

This passage, read with what Driver says (p. 322) about the language of the Book of Jonah, shows that his very strongly worded assertion as to the date of that book rests upon the instances quoted by him "taken as a whole." If the eight instances quoted by him are reduced to three or four, themselves somewhat doubtful, there is reason to suppose that he would have greatly modified his language. This may also be gathered from what he says about the Book of Ruth, p. 454 and note †, and in the passages, pp. 455 and 459. In speaking of Aramaisms and late expressions, he says:—"It may be remembered that words with Aramaic or late Hebrew affinities occur, at least, sporadically in passages admittedly of early date . . . it is possible that the book," *i.e.* the Book of Ruth, ". . . was written in the Northern Kingdom and preserves words current there dialectically," p. 455. And on p. 449 he says, speaking of Northern Israel, "where there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Judah."

The result of all this is that, in the writer's opinion, not one of the words and phrases adduced can be regarded as *decisive* of a late date for the Book of Jonah.

(19) But there is another side to the argument based on linguistic considerations. The Book of Jonah is assigned by different advanced Biblical critics to different post-exilic dates

* Or Zidonian.

from about 450 B.C. to about 300 B.C. Most seem to favour a date in the 4th century B.C. How do the words and idioms in the book fit *that* date? There are abundant means of judging. The Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah and the Book of Esther are, like the Book of Jonah, narratives, and are written at various times after the Exile. They often rest on older documents incorporated in them. Now they are *full* of words and idioms used only by very late writers. There is no need to dwell very much on this. It will be universally admitted. Driver, dealing with the Books of Chronicles, catalogues (pp. 535-539) forty-six instances of such linguistic usage and says the list is not exhaustive. Indeed, he adds many more on pp. 539 and 540, and gives on pp. 505 and 553 a description of the style of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Nothing in the least resembling all this is to be found in the Book of Jonah, and, speaking generally, nothing could be found more unlike the linguistic style of these books than the style of the Book of Jonah. Driver himself says:—"The diction" of the Book of Jonah "is, however, purer generally than that of Esther or the Chronicles."* It appears to the writer, in view of the facts just noted, that this should be expressed in much stronger language.

How, then, can the Book of Jonah have been written at any time when the development of the Hebrew language had reached such a stage as to make the style of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and Esther the natural form for a narrative to take? Such a supposition is opposed to the history of the course of development of Hebrew.

(20) The conclusion to which all these considerations point is that, as far as its linguistic style goes, it is highly improbable that the Book of Jonah was written at any date after the Exile, and not at all improbable that it may have been written at some such date as 750 or 760 B.C. when Jonah was alive and prophesying.

(21) But it is quite possible to go one step further. Many critics, both conservative and advanced (*e.g.* Perowne, Ellicott, Driver, Cornill, Budde), have noticed the resemblance "in form and content" between the Book of Jonah and the "prophetic narratives" of the Books of Kings. It appears to the writer that a similar resemblance exists between the vocabulary

* See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 2566, to the same effect.

and phrases of the two. There are about 260 different Hebrew words used in the Book of Jonah. Of these there are only 30 which are not used in the Books of Samuel and those of Kings. And if it be remembered that these 30 words include the four words (mentioned in para. (12)) which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament, as well as a number of poetical words in the Psalm in chapter ii, 2 (3); 9 (10) which could hardly occur in prose narratives, it will be seen that the 30 words are reduced to about 20. No doubt many of these 260 words, like דָּג, גְּדוֹל, עֵיר, יָם, נָתַן, נֶפֶשׁ, dāg, gādōl, 'ir, yām, nātan, nefes, and very many others, are common words, to be found in the books of all Hebrew writers of every age. But there are others not of this kind, *e.g.* סֶעַר sō'er (Jonah i, 11; 2 Kings vi, 11), סוּף sūf (Jonah ii, 6; 1 Kings ix, 26); נָקִיא nāqī' (Jonah i, 14; 1 Kings xv, 22); קָדָם qādām (Jonah iv, 2; 2 Kings xix, 32); אֲדַרְתָּ 'adderet (Jonah iii, 6; 1 Kings xix, 13, etc.); קֶשֶׁב qeseb (Jonah ii, 7; 1 Kings vii, 37) and others, quae nunc perscribere longum est.

Then, too, there are a good number of phrases and forms not in universal use in Hebrew, but common to Jonah and the Books of Samuel and Kings. Among these are the following:—

1. אָנִי 'anī (5 t.) and אֲנֹכִי 'anôkī (2 t.) side by side. In Kings the proportion is 44·5, but אֲנֹכִי anôkī is hardly to be found in late narrative.
2. אוּלַי 'ūlay (Jonah i, 6; 9 t. in Sam. and Kings, but very seldom in post-exilic writers.
3. מַאֵין mē 'ayin (Jonah i, 8; 2 Kings v, 25, etc.), but very seldom in undoubtedly later writers.
4. אֵי מִצֵּה תָבוּא 'ê mizzeh tāv'ō (Jonah i, 8; 2 Sam. i, 3, etc.). In no late writer except Job ii, 2.
5. מִמְּוִמָּה m'ūmāh (Jonah iii, 7; Sam. and Kings 14 t.; a few times in Num. (P); 2 Chron. and Eccles., but not apparently common.
6. עֲבָרִי 'ib' rī (Jonah i, 9; often in 1 Sam., later only Jer. 3 t.).
7. Perhaps מִנְּגֵד min-neged (Jonah ii, 5), Sam. and Kings 5 t.; rather infrequent.
8. There is also the phrase אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ 'īs 'el-rē'ehū (Jonah i, 7; 1 Sam. x, 11, etc.; 2 Kings vii, 3, etc.).

This list might no doubt be extended.

This resemblance between the linguistic phenomena of the Book of Jonah and those of the Books of Samuel and Kings seems to the writer striking. He does not wish to press the argument too far lest he is being misled by an insufficient knowledge of Hebrew language and idiom. But he cannot think that he is altogether wrong.

(22) The next point to be considered is the relegation to a late date of the Book of Jonah based upon the references in it to Nineveh. The first of these is that the tense of the Hebrew verb used in chap. iii, 3, about Nineveh הָיְתָה (*hāy^etāh*) shows that that city had ceased to exist when the Book of Jonah was written. König emphatically says this, and Cheyne (p. 2566, sec. 1, 5) and Bewer (pp. 13 and 53) follow him. The latter says (p. 53), "The perfect הָיְתָה *hāy^etāh* shows* that Nineveh is a thing of the past to the narrator."

This language can only be justified if such a signification is inherent in the perfect tense of הָיָה *hāyāh*. And of this the writer will, with due respect but quite confidently, affirm that it is not the case. And this confidence is due to the fact that he can support his denial on the clear statements of eminent Hebrew grammarians, on very numerous examples taken from the Hebrew writers of the Bible in books of all ages, and on other evidence.

It is, of course, true that if a narrator is speaking of something long past, the perfect tense is an appropriate one to use. There is, in Hebrew, no pluperfect tense, and so, if the author of the book intended to say, Now Nineveh *had been* an extraordinarily great city, הָיְתָה *hāy^etāh* would be a suitable word to use.

But this is not the argument at all. The argument is that the word הָיְתָה *hāy^etāh* of itself conveys that meaning and could not be used without conveying it. This is, beyond all doubt, not true.

Gesenius (Heb. Gram., sec. 106, 1, d.) says :—" More particularly the use of the perfect may be distinguished as follows : . . . (d) as a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek aorist) in narrating past events " (all the facts of the Book of Jonah were, of course, past when its story was told). He gives examples, but the

* The italics are mine.

following is more to my point:—Gen. iii, 1 ; וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם מִכֹּל הַיַּיִת׃ וְהָאָדָם הָיָה כְּחַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה׃ w^e hannaḥas hāyāh ‘ārūm mikkōl ḥa-yyat, &c., “Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field,” &c. Does this mean that in the opinion of the Jews, when this was written, the serpent was more subtil in the Garden of Eden, but had long ceased to be so ?

Gesenius goes on to say (sec. 106, 1, d., remark):—“As the above examples indicate, the perfect of *narration* occurs especially at the head of an entire narrative—or of an independent sentence—but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative ו waw by one or more words. In other cases, the narrative is continued by the imperfect consecutive according to sec. iii (a).” The section iii (a) mentioned runs:—“. . . as a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with ו waw consecutive, e.g. Gen. iii, 1.” This exactly describes the Hebrew of Jonah iii, 3 (following). The co-ordinate sentence begins:—“וַיִּקַּם יוֹנָה . . . וַיִּנְיָהּ . . . וַיִּקְרָא . . . וַיִּהְיֶה . . . וַיִּהְיֶה עִיר־גְּדֹלָהּ . . . וַיִּהְיֶה . . . וַיִּקְרָא . . . w^eNin^weh hay^etāh (perfect) ‘īr g^edōlāh . . . wayyāḥel (imperfect with ו waw) . . . wayyiq^{rā} (imperfect with ו waw) . . .”

See to the same effect Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, ii, 8, 9, 10 and 12,* and Robertson's translation of Müller's *Hebrew Syntax* (I, i, 1).

Examples can be quoted by the dozen from the Old Testament writers of all ages of the use of the perfect of הָיָה hāyāh without any implication of something long past which had ceased to be. The following are a few such cases:—Gen. xviii, 12; xxxvi, 12; Exod. xvi, 24; Deut. iii, 4; Exod. xvi, 13; xxxvi, 7; Judges xxi, 3, 5; Ruth i, 7; 1 Sam. iv, 7, 17; v, 11; xiv, 20; xiv, 38; 2 Sam. xiv, 27; 1 Kings ii, 15; Mal. i, 9; Eccles. vi, 3; Esther ii, 20; Ezra viii, 31; and there are many others.

(23) These authorities seem to the writer conclusively to establish that there is nothing in the use of the perfect tense of הָיָה hāyāh in Jonah iii, 3, which goes to show that, in the view of the

* Driver has exhaustively scrutinised the use of the tenses in Hebrew and thrown great light on their exact meaning. It is to be noted that though he thinks the language of the Book of Jonah points to a date after the Exile, he does not use the tense of הָיָה hāyāh as in any way supporting that opinion.

narrator, Nineveh had long ceased to exist. If this meaning is to be fastened upon the words used it must be got from the description of Nineveh as an exceeding great city of three days' journey (or walk = מַהְלָאֵךְ *mahaḷāk*, chap. iii, 3); or from the language about it ascribed to the Deity:—"Nineveh that great city; wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle" (Jonah iv, 11).*

As regards the first of these descriptions, König insists in the most magisterial way that the "three days' walk" must be the diameter (*durchmesser*) [Einleitung, sec. 77; 2 (p. 380)], and not the circumference of the city. He assigns no reason for this decision, but simply says that Schrader, who held the opposite view, is wrong.†

The *Oxford Dictionary*, to a certain extent confirms König's view, for it speaks of מַהְלָאֵךְ *mahaḷāk* as meaning a journey in "diameter or length," *i.e.*, I suppose, that the movement indicated is progressive and not circular.

It seems to the writer that there is no sufficient reason for saying at all positively what the "three days' walk" stands for, whether "measure through" or along the straight sides, or something else. All that we can be really certain of is that it was used to indicate an area of large size. But as Jonah's task evidently was to make known to all the persons to whom the doom was threatened the fate that awaited them, it would seem only reasonable to suppose that the "three days' walk" described the amount of walking necessary to bring the knowledge of the message to all whom it was likely to affect. This is the deliberate opinion of Commander Jones, who made a trigonometrical survey of the district. He says (*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. xv, p. 315) that this language describes "the character of the Ninevite abodes, separate yet contiguous to each other; for the term 'journey' . . . implies a going out from one to the other, for the necessary visitation demanded by the mission of the prophet." And he further records (p. 315, note (1)) :—From Nineveh "to Nimrūd in

* The advanced critics treat this as only referring to children, and children under three years of age. This is by no means certain. Many adult Orientals do not use the distinction, and in consequence children much older than three years of age would not be taught it. Of course, *all* children have to be taught it. (See note, p. 49.)

† See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 2566, to the same effect.

round numbers is 18 miles ; thence to Khorsabad about 28, and back to Nineveh by the road 14 miles." The total of these distances is just 60 miles, or three days' journey.

The whole area governed by these cities he gives as 350 square miles which, as he says, could easily accommodate 600,000 people, together with great herds of sheep and cattle. The area of Greater London is said to be 315 square miles.

(24) The advanced Biblical critics appear to insist that anyone writing or speaking of Nineveh in the 8th century B.C. *must* be taken to refer to the fortified area surrounded by a wall. This area is shown by Commander Jones's survey to have been 1,800 acres, rather less, that is, than three square miles. This area corresponds accurately with the circumference of the walled city spoken of in Sennacherib's inscriptions (see Cuneiform Tablets from the British Museum, L. W. King). This is about half the area of the Rome surrounded by a wall by the Emperor Aurelian in the end of the 3rd century, A.D. It would indicate a population of about 100,000, to say nothing of much cattle, and could under no circumstances be described as a phenomenally large city. And, further, this fortified area did not exist until after 705 B.C., the year of Sennacherib's accession to the throne of Assyria. He tells us expressly that his predecessors had not walled in Nineveh, but that *he* built the walls, taking in some of the surrounding country.

Anyone who before 705 B.C. referred to this walled area would be convicted of ante-dating the building of the walls.

(24A) The question therefore, is this. Could anyone writing in the 8th century B.C. speak of Nineveh as of huge size ? As to this we have evidence. Gen. x, 11, is part of the document known to Biblical critics as J. The dates assigned to it by different Biblical critics vary from the reign of Solomon (977-937 B.C.) to about 760 or 750 B.C. At all events, no one puts it later than 750 B.C.*

In or before 750 B.C., therefore, it was stated (Gen. x, 11 and 12), "Out of that land" (*i.e.* Shinar) "he" (*i.e.* Nimrod) "went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh and Rehoboth-Ir and Calah and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)." הָעִיר הַגְּדֹלָה Hū' hā'ir haggē'dōlāh are the Hebrew words used, and they are the exact words used three times in the Book of Jonah (i, 2 ; iii, 2 ; iv, 11). It is quite probable that the words were taken from J.

* Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, pp. 67, 73 and 74.

(25) We come next to the prophecy of Nahum. It is agreed by Biblical critics of all schools that the part of this prophecy which relates to Nineveh (ii, 1, 3—end) was delivered in the latter half of the 7th century B.C. The point with which we are concerned is that all Nahum's references to Nineveh describe it as a city of great size and importance. Nineveh is expressly compared to No-Ammon, the Egyptian Thebes (Nahum iii, 8), which was renowned for its size, the magnificence of its buildings and the multitude of its inhabitants.* The fortresses of Nineveh are spoken of (iii, 12 and 14), and she is said to have "multiplied her merchants above the stars of heaven," and the inhabitants are compared to the countless numbers of a locust swarm [*The International Critical Commentary on Nahum* says, on p. 15:—"The prophet now turns . . . towards the almost innumerable mass of the population within Nineveh"] . . . while the "crowned" are said to be "like locusts" (iii, 17) and the marshals (or scribes) like swarms of grasshoppers (*ibid.*).

(26) All this language is impossible as regards the fortified citadel of Nineveh, comprising 1,800 acres. It seems plainly to refer to the fortified cities (or fortresses) of Nineveh, Nimrūd, Khorsabad, etc., with the population and herds of cattle of the territory between them.

The nature of the proclamation itself supports this meaning. Nineveh was to be "overthrown." Critics have noted that the word and conjugation are the same as that used in Gen. xix, 29 (P entirely dependent on J), of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. It was to be some universal catastrophe, earthquake, subterranean fires, pestilence, or the act of a devastating invader. None of these could be confined to a small part of the area known as Nineveh and not extend to the others also.

It was, therefore, quite possible, both before and after Jonah lived and prophesied, to speak of Nineveh as of very great size and with a very numerous population. So to speak of it does not require that the Book of Jonah should be relegated to a date when it may be supposed that all real remembrance of it had faded out of men's minds. Such a description might very well have been written in the middle of the 8th century B.C.

* *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xxvi, 740 (b). See also Cheyne, *Encycl. Bib.*, col. 3428. See also Pusey, *Minor Prophets* (1906), vol. v, pp. 299-309. The passage is too long to quote, but it ought to be read to realize what the comparison implied.

(27) The result of what has been advanced in paras. 12-22 and then in paras. 22-26 seems to the writer to establish that neither the linguistic style of the book, nor the size ascribed in it to Nineveh, at all require that we should carry the date when the book was written down to the 3rd or 4th century B.C. On the other hand, they are quite consistent with a date in the 8th century B.C.

(28) It is open to us, therefore, to look at the book with fresh eyes and to consider how its details appear if it be assumed to be a work of Jonah's time.

This has not been done by any of the critics mentioned in para. 11, nor, as far as the writer knows, by any other advanced Biblical critic who has treated of the book. Starting with the assumption that the book must be post-exilic, they seem to the writer to have overlooked or failed to notice many important indications.

(29) Let us begin with Jonah's embarkation on a "ship of Tarshish" and the account of the storm which soon followed.

The references in Ezek. xxvii as well as those in 1 Kings ix, 26, and x, 22, and in Psalm xlviii, 7, indicate that "ships of Tarshish" meant large, well-appointed ships, fitted for undertaking long sea-voyages and manned and navigated by Phœnician sailors. The long dissertation on the "Ships of the Ancients" in Mr. Smith of Jordanhill's volume on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* is still the chief source of information on the subject. It is, of course, true that the ships there chiefly dealt with were Alexandrian corn-ships of many hundred years later than the 8th century B.C. But the information obtained since he wrote, though scanty, goes to show that the "Tarshish ships" were of the same general type. They were of from 700 to 1,000 tons burden, and were rigged with one chief mast with a very long yard and one large sail, and were steered by two great oars, one on each side, at the stern.

The rig of one mast and one large sail threw a great strain on the planking of the ship, so that, in a heavy sea and with a strong wind, the planks were apt to open and the ship to go to pieces and founder. This was what was feared in the case of the ship on which Jonah had embarked. It was anticipated that she would break up (i, 4, הִשָּׁבֵר הַשִּׁבְרִי *hissābēr, LXX συντριβήραι*).

They had apparently started with a favourable wind; their course to pass between Sicily and Africa was about W. by N., so that their wind must have been east of N.* A frequent

* Since it is believed that they could not sail nearer the wind than about 7 points.

wind in the Eastern Mediterranean is E.N.E. With such a wind they could sail seven knots an hour, and the narrative suggests that they had gone some five or ten miles, as they afterwards attempted to row back to shore against the wind and sea. Then the Lord "hurled" a great wind upon the sea. The word used for the resulting tempest רָעַר (sa'ar) and its cognates are often translated "whirlwind" (see especially 2 Kings ii, 1), so that the storm was probably a cyclone, for cyclones are frequent in the Eastern Mediterranean (see *Encycl. Britan.*, 11th edn., vol. 10, 68 (c)). The narrative contains not a single detail unconnected with the main purpose of the story, but it dwells very much upon the "tempestuous" character of the sea and the lightening of the ship (by throwing overboard the spare gear and deck cargo), and implies that they had little or no hope of saving the ship; then in v. 13 we find the ship no longer under sail and heading for the shore. It can hardly be doubted that what happened was that the great sail had been either furled or blown to ribbons by the wind. Having very little way on her, the ship would be difficult to steer and, if kept before the wind, would be in danger of being "pooped," as the following seas would travel faster than she did and break over her stern. The ship was, therefore, brought head to wind so that she might ride over the great seas and was being rowed against the wind to give her steerage way.

(30) This, then, is the background of the picture: the sky dark with cloud, the wind blowing not less than a whole gale, and screaming through the rigging, the ship rolling and pitching furiously in a tremendous head-sea which every now and then rose high over the bows and poured down tons of water upon the deck, washing away everything and everybody not securely fastened, and the excited and panic-stricken sailors gathered round Jonah, who proclaimed himself a Hebrew who worshipped Jehovah,* God of Heaven (the storm came from the sky), but was fleeing from His face in disobedience to His command.

* The writer is aware that Jehovah is no word at all, being the consonants of one word and the vowels of another. The ugly and unfamiliar words Yahweh, or Yahwè, or Jahve, etc., are commonly used by advanced Biblical critics apparently as representing what is generally believed to be a probable pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton. But the same critics invariably use the forms Jesus, John and Jacob. Yet these words were both written and pronounced Yēshū' in Aramaic and Ἰησοῦς, pronounced Yēssōos, in Greek, Yōhānān in Aramaic and Yōannēs or Yōanēs in Greek, while Jacob is always written Ya'aqōb in Hebrew. Yet these forms are never used, no doubt because the ordinary forms are familiar to us all from their use in English. That same reason seems quite sufficient to justify the use of the name Jehovah.

(31) The criticisms on this part of the narrative of various German advanced critics such as Müller, Kohler, Bohme, Budde, Kleiner, Winckler, Eichhorn, Sievers, Kuenen, Erbt and Schmidt [recorded by Bewer (sec. 5, pp. 13-21)], seem to the writer (he can find no other words) very wooden and unimaginative.

They find fault with the language, grammar and logical arrangement of the questions of the sailors, apparently forgetting who the men were (Phœnician sailors) and the situation as described above. That a mob of excited and angry sailors gathered round Jonah and feeling themselves in danger of being drowned and of losing their ship, through his fault, should one put one question and another another, not in strict logical sequence and not expressed in accurate literary grammar, and not logically following one upon another, is a "difficulty" that could hardly have occurred to anyone but a German professor who had, perhaps, never had any experience of a great storm at sea.

(32) Further, there seems a good reason why when Phœnician sailors heard that Jehovah, God of Heaven, had cause of displeasure with them, they *should* be "exceedingly afraid" (v. 10). Assuming that Jonah's voyage was somewhere about the middle of the 8th century, the wonderful scene on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii), when Elijah, in the presence of King Ahab and all Israel, put the rival claims of Jehovah and the Phœnician Baal to the test, and was answered by fire sent by Jehovah from heaven, with the subsequent slaughter of 450 Phœnician prophets of Baal, and the furious anger of the Zidonian (or Tyrian) princess, Jezebel, must have lived long in the memory of the Phœnicians of Tyre, and would hardly fail to paint itself in vivid colours on their minds.

(33) As regards the story of Elijah and Mount Carmel. The writer is, of course, aware that advanced critics regard the whole narrative as mere legend. Their choragus, De Wette, speaks of it repeatedly as mythical [Einleitung, sec. 184 (b), pp. 243 and 244] and Cornill (*Hist. of Israel, Eng. Tr.*, p. 102) calls it "pure legend." The writer does not accept this judgment, but for the purpose of his contention it need not be questioned. For that it is enough, if the sailors on the Tarshish ship had heard the story and thought that it might be true. Sailors are apt to be superstitious, and anyone who likes may put their belief down to that. The point is that they were not at all sure that it did not happen, and that a god who sent down fire from heaven might very well be pursuing a disobedient servant of his with a

tremendous storm from the same place. The phrase, God of Heaven, occurs, but is not common, in the Old Testament. Perhaps the reason why its use on this occasion is recorded arises out of what was in the sailors' minds as to the events on Mount Carmel. The advanced critics have not failed to object to the phrase as uncommon and therefore unlikely in the mouth of Jonah.

(34) The sailors, we are told, found themselves unable to make any way by rowing against the wind and the tremendous and rising seas. They were, therefore, compelled reluctantly to follow the advice of Jonah and throw him overboard. Of them we hear nothing more at that time; their action as regards the story having come to an end, they are, according to the author's manner, dismissed from the narrative without another word.*

(35) Jonah, then, was thrown into the raging sea; whether he could swim or not would not make the least difference. In such a sea no swimmer could live, and he must have expected that he would be drowned immediately. This brings us to the account of the "swallowing" of Jonah by the "great fish" and what followed.

(36) The words used (בָּלַע *bāla'* = Greek *καταπιεῖν*), (רָמַעַי *me'eh*, *κοιλία*) can only mean that Jonah was swallowed up and entered the intestines of the "fish." If this is taken in its strict literal sense, we have here to do with a miracle utterly inexplicable and entirely at variance with any known natural process. Sea animals are known which could swallow a man, but none in which a man who had been swallowed could remain alive and conscious for more than a minute or two. So considered, the narrative is either a pure fiction or the account of a miracle of the most stupendous character; there is nothing else to be said about it. But it appears to the writer that, granted a reasonable latitude in regard to the words "swallow" and "belly," what happened can be explained in strict accordance with the statements contained in two monographs on the Cetacea, written from a scientific standpoint by men of recognized standing as anatomists and physiologists. The first is *A Book of Whales*, by F. E. Beddard, M.A., F.R.S., and is a volume in the Progressive Science Series. The second is by A. W. Scott, M.A., and is entitled *Mammalia, Recent and Extinct*, Sec. B, Cetacea. These are the best and most recent scientific authorities on the structure and habits of whales that the writer can find. Reference is also

* Except that they offered sacrifices and made vows.

made to vol. vii of the *Naturalist's Library*, by Sir W. Jardine, F.R.S.E., dealing with Cetacea.

(37) Resting his statements down to the most minute detail upon the information contained in these works, the following is an outline of what the writer believes to have happened. Jonah when thrown overboard was washed by the rush of the storm waves into the open mouth of a huge Cetacean, one of the whalebone whales known to exist in the Mediterranean. These animals obtain their food by swimming slowly on or near the surface of the water with their jaws open; the water containing great numbers of small crustacea, medusae; etc., washes into their mouth. This is possible because the screen of whalebone opens inwards and admits solid objects to the animal's mouth. But the screen of whalebone is very fine and does not allow the egress of any solid matter but only of the water. The gullet of the animal is very small, from two to six inches in diameter, and does not allow any but very small objects to pass. Jonah was therefore imprisoned in the animal's mouth. It could not swallow him, and his egress was rendered impossible by the whalebone screen. While the whale moved with its jaws open the sea-water rushed in over Jonah and then out again through the whalebone, but at frequent intervals the whale closed its great overlapping lips, excluding the water and outer air, and "sounded," *i.e.* it settled slowly down in a horizontal position, or dived head downwards even to the bottom of the sea. The whale is an air-breathing, warm-blooded animal and could only dive in this way because of the reservoir of air in its gigantic mouth. When this air becomes unfit to breathe the animal must, and does, rise to the surface and get a fresh supply of air. As long as the diving whale had in its mouth air to breathe, Jonah, of course, had it also. During these periods he was in perfect darkness, but was warm and dry. When the whale rose to the surface he had fresh air and light, but was washed over by the sea-water which in the Mediterranean is fairly warm. These alternations of light and darkness, etc., soon showed him that he was not in danger of immediate death, though he had no water to drink and very little food that he could eat. But his faith in God, who had so wonderfully preserved him so far, gave him confidence that he was not intended ultimately to perish, and these feelings led him to utter the Psalm in chapter 2, where his physical position is exactly described, and his thanks to God and hopes for his future

alternate with one another, and are expressed in religious phraseology used by all pious Hebrews.

There is no natural reason why the situation should ever come to an end, except by the death by thirst of Jonah, or the death and stranding of the whale. But the story says that God commanded the fish (וַיֹּמֶר יְיָ לַדָּג wayyō'mer Y' laḏ(dāg) and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.

This seems to the writer a reasonable and consistent account. As usual with the author of Jonah, there is not a word more about the "fish." Whether it died, as stranded whales often do,* or slid back into deep water is not told. As it had nothing further to do with the purpose of the story, there is not another word about it.

(38) The writer will now give his authorities for all the assertions made in the last paragraph.

Whales are not only the largest of living mammals, but the largest of all animals, mammalian or otherwise, which have ever existed (Beddard, p. 2). The accounts of their length vary. Beddard, who is very careful to avoid the possibility of exaggeration, allows a length of 85 feet to *Balænoptera Sibbaldii* (Beddard, p. 1). This is a Mediterranean whale (Scott, p. 121), so is *Balæna Australis* (Beddard, p. 124). Scott (p. 121) and Jardine (p. 137) contend for a measured length of 102 feet and 105 feet. The length is important because the length of the head is given as a fraction of the whole length. That length varies from one-third in the case of *Balæna*, to two-sevenths or one-quarter in the case of *Balænoptera*. If we take a length of 85 feet and a mouth of one-quarter the length, we obtain a length for the mouth from back to front of 21 feet. The height of the mouth, when open, is obtained from the length of the whalebone, which varies from 15 feet to $10\frac{1}{2}$ feet in *Balæna*, and 8 to 10 feet in *Balænoptera Sibbaldii*. The breadth of the mouth is given (Jardine, p. 77) as 10 to 12 feet. Taking all the smallest figures, we have for the dimensions of the mouth 21 feet \times 8 feet \times 10 feet. Of course, this space is not rectangular, and room has to be allowed for the gigantic, almost immobile (Jardine, p. 81; Scott, p. 132) tongue. But the empty space cannot

* A whale's body is from 36 to 40 feet in circumference. It would therefore require over 12 feet of water to float in; to eject Jonah on to dry land it must approach a sandy shore in much less than 12 feet, and would therefore have been stranded.

well be less than 1,000 cubic feet. The body of a man weighing $11\frac{1}{2}$ stone occupies about $2\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet. It is, therefore, no exaggeration when Scott states (p. 132) that the whale's mouth is "capable of containing a ship's jolly-boat full of men."

In Sir Michael Foster's handbook of physiology (chap. ii, p. 581) it is stated that a man requires 2,000 litres of fresh air an hour for breathing. Two thousand litres would measure two cubic metres or $70\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet. The ordinary time a whale remains under water is 10 minutes (Beddard, p. 128), but it may extend to an hour. Even in that case, the presence of a man helping to consume the air in the mouth would make no appreciable difference. Attempts made to swim across the Channel have often failed owing to the chilling of the swimmer's body by long continued immersion in the cold water of that part of the sea. But the mean surface temperature of the water of the Eastern Mediterranean is over 70° F. (*Encycl. Brit.*, edn. 11, vol. 18, p. 68 (c)), while the blood temperature of whales is very high, viz., 104° F. (Jardine, p. 52).* This would be the temperature of the air in a whale's mouth when the animal was under water. The temperature, therefore, would be quite consistent with a man's existence, even though often immersed in water.

(39) The following description of the whalebone and the manner in which whales feed is taken from Scott (pp. 132, 133 and 134). It relates to the *Balæna Mysticetus* or Right Whale, but Beddard (pp. 6 and 135; see also pp. 124, 127, 129, 131) points out that the differences between it and *Balæna Australis* are very slight. The differences between it and *Balænoptera Sibbaldii* are small and structural only, so the following description applies to them as much as to *Balæna Mysticetus*, about which it was written [see also *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. 5; 771 (b)].

Scott says (p. 60):—"The blood of all Cetaceans is warm, and consequently they are compelled to breathe the atmospheric air by means of true lungs, placed within the cavity of the chest, and have to rise periodically to the surface of the water in order to respire; should any accident frustrate this indispensable requirement they would literally be drowned."

Beddard says:—"This whale . . . swims slowly, usually at the rate of four miles an hour; but when diving they reach a velocity of seven to nine miles. This velocity is so great that

* See also the figures in *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. v, p. 770 (c), which are slightly lower.

whales have been found to dive to the bottom of water a mile in depth and to break the lower jaw by the violence of the impact [pp. 127 and 128. (See also the Badminton Library volume on *Sea Fishing*, pp. 481 and 491.)].

Scott says, speaking of *Balæna Mysticetus* (p. 132):—"The plates of baleen" (*i.e.* whalebone) "proceed from each side of the narrow upper jaw, and, spreading outwards, enclose at their lower ends the huge, soft, immovable tongue, presenting an ideal resemblance to the canvas falling from a tent-pole over a monster feather-bed."

(40) Two more extracts must suffice:—"The small marine animals on which these Cetaceans feed cover in the aggregate" (*i.e.* in the Arctic Ocean alone) "some 20,000 square miles of the surface of the open ocean. They are also very abundant elsewhere. . . . In feeding, the lower jaw is let down and the rate of speed increased; the huge cavity thus urged along secures, like a fisherman's net, a rich harvest of insect game. This operation being often repeated, the combined proceeds of the several hauls serve at length to satisfy the capacious maw of the monster" (Scott, p. 133.)

The structure and action of the whalebone is thus (pp. 132 and 133) described by Beddard:—"The length and delicate structure of the baleen provides an efficient strainer or hair sieve, by which the water can be drained off . . . the long slender brush-like ends of the whalebone blades, when the mouth is closed, fold back, the front ones passing below the hinder ones in a channel lying between the tongue and the bone of the lower jaw. When the mouth is opened, their elasticity causes them to straighten out like a bow that is unbent, so that at whatever distance the jaws are separated, the strainer remains in perfect action, filling the whole of the interval; the mechanical perfection of the arrangement is completed by the great development of the lower lip, which rises stiffly above the jaw-bone, and prevents the long, slender, flexible ends of the baleen being carried outwards by the rush of water from the mouth, when its cavity is being diminished by the closure of the jaws and raising of the tongue.

"The food thus filtered off by the action of the whalebone and the raising of the tongue and shutting of the jaws is left stranded upon the gigantic tongue and then swallowed down the narrow throat. It is accordingly not advantageous that this tongue should be mobile and muscular; it is, as a matter of

fact, mainly formed of a mass of spongy fat intermixed with sinewy flesh."

(41) There is one other detail which, comparatively unimportant in itself, acquires great importance from a verse in the Psalm in chap. ii, viz., v. 5, which runs: "The deep was round about me; the weeds were wrapped about my head."

All the critics find this line very difficult. Cheyne calls it "odd and certainly corrupt" (*Studia Biblica* (Jonah)), and proposes, as his manner is, to alter nearly all the Hebrew words. But it appears to the writer that the following observations of a naturalist on the food of the whale furnish a simple and appropriate explanation.

The American naturalist, Dr. Gray, says of a great whale which he calls *Megaptera Americana* . . . "they feed much upon grass (*Zostera*) growing at the bottom of the sea; in their great bag of maw he found two or three hogsheads of a greenish grassy matter" (Scott, p. 130), and Scott himself says:—"These huge Cetaceans derive their sustenance by preying upon the vast hordes of small beings of diversified natures congregated within and around the large area of Gulfweed (*Sargassum bacciferum*) collected midway in the Atlantic (p. 129) . . . (p. 130) by feeding upon the sea-wrack (note: *Zosteraceæ* seen at low water on the rocks of all countries in the world) or may be upon the floating Gulfweed itself. . . ." Scott is, of course, correct in speaking of the "floating Gulfweed" as the food of any whale. That, like other vegetation, requires light and could not grow "at the bottom of the sea." Nor could any whale feed upon anything "at the bottom of the sea." It has to keep its mouth shut tight when under water.

But there is no reason to doubt Dr. Gray's observation, though his explanation is not correct in its details. And both *Zostera marina* and *Sargassum bacciferum* are abundant in the Mediterranean [see *Encycl. Brit.*, art. Malta, vol. 17, p. 508 (b)].

The observation, of course, only refers to a whale of the genus *Megaptera*. But Beddard says that *Megaptera*, which is one of the *Balænopteridæ*, is not widely removed in its structural character from *Balænoptera* (p. 162), and the details which he gives about it (pp. 162-168) give no reason to suppose that it differs from *Balænoptera Sibbaldü* or even *Balæna Australis* in its feeding. The only difference is likely to be in the quantity of gulf-weed swallowed by a whale living on the outskirts of

the Sargasso Sea, which would probably be larger in amount than that which would be carried into the mouth of a whale in the Mediterranean, where the weed would be floating in smaller patches. But it would be quite likely to be taken into the whale's mouth for the reason assigned above by Scott, and when so taken in would be certain to settle on or near the head of a man almost submerged in the sea-water in which the "weed" was floated in.

(42) The very great difficulty found by all the critics in explaining this line makes it the height of improbability that such a detail should be introduced by anyone who had not undergone the experience.

(43) We are now ready to apply all these facts to the narrative and especially to the Psalm in chap. ii. When Jonah was thrown overboard into the raging sea, he must have expected to be drowned immediately (see para. (35)). He found himself instead swept inside a huge "fish" where he would soon realize that he was no longer in danger of drowning. The sailors on board the ship saw him disappear into "the fish" and never at that time reappear. Neither they nor he need be credited with any knowledge of anatomy; it cannot be surprising that they, and even he, thought, and perhaps said, that he had been "swallowed." As the whale moved along with its mouth open the water came rushing over him in torrents and rushed out again; but the whalebone screen kept him from going out with the water, and the whale's gullet being very small, two to four or six inches wide, he could not be swallowed.

This situation closely fits the verse (ii, 3):—

“For Thou didst cast me into the depth, in the heart of
the seas,
And the flood [literally the stream (נָהָר *nāhār*)] was round
about me;
All Thy waves and Thy billows passed over me.”

The word נָהָר *nāhār* accurately describes the inflow and out-flow of the sea-water. The words used for wave (מִשְׁבָּר *mis̄bār*) and billow (גַּל *gal*) are specially used of the billows of the sea (*Oxford Heb. Dict.*, s.v.).

All this time, however, Jonah was in the fresh air and light. Then the whale "sounded"; its great lips closed tight, the light and outer air was shut out with the water and Jonah felt himself sinking, sinking down, possibly to the very bottom of the sea.

He would estimate the depth by the time taken in sinking and possibly by the whale's grounding on the sea-floor. Now שְׁאוֹל s'ôl, to the Jews, was the underworld of darkness.

“Out of the belly of Sheol, cried I,
And Thou heardest my voice.” (v. 2.)
and again—

“The abyss (תְּהוֹמוֹת t'hôm) was round about me.” (v. 5.)

“I went down to the bottoms (clefts) of the mountains;
Yet hast Thou brought up my life from the pit, O Lord
my God.” (v. 6.)

Bewer says (p. 46):—“The Hebrews believed that the earth was founded upon the subterranean ocean (Ps. xxiv, 2) and that the ends of the mountains, the pillars of the earth, went deep down to its foundations” (cf. Ps. xviii, 16).

And then the whale rose again to the surface and the fresh air and light flowed in:—

“I called by reason of my affliction unto the Lord,
And He answered me.” (v. 2.)

“When my life fainted within me,
I remembered the Lord:
And my prayers came in unto Thee,
Into Thine Holy Temple” (v. 7.)

And so the hours and even days went on and the prophet realized his wonderful deliverance and merciful preservation, and how useless it was to attempt to escape from Jehovah, who had his messengers in the storm from heaven, the waves of the sea and the monstrous sea-animal. But so great a deliverance made his faith strong that he would not be left to perish. The psalm ends on the key-note of faith and gratitude on which it began.

“I called by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord,
And He answered me” (in v. 1).

and the close and sum of all is:—

“But I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving,
I will pay that which I have vowed.”

(The critics complain that he has not told us that he has vowed anything!)

“Salvation is of the LORD.”

(44) Now let us hear the advanced critics. This psalm, they say, is one of thanksgiving, but thanks are quite inappro-

priate "in the belly of the fish" before Jonah was cast up on dry land. Possibly the writer of the book did not write any psalm, or if he did, he inserted it in the wrong place. If he did not write it, some one else saw that some thanksgiving was required by the story and he composed the Psalm (a mere cento from other late Psalms), but he, too, put it in the wrong place. It must be shifted to follow verse 10.

These writers call on us for gratitude because they enable us to understand the Bible better.

Let the reader judge!

It seems necessary here to say a little more about the Psalm. It contains some short Hebrew phrases which are also to be found in other Psalms. These are stated by advanced Biblical critics to be all post-exilic.

If this dating is correct—which is assuming a great deal, since the dating of the great majority of the Psalms as post-exilic rests upon very flimsy and subjective grounds—then, since the references in Jonah's psalm clearly fit the specific circumstances in which he found himself in the whale's mouth, his must be the original and the other psalms must be taken to be quotations from Jonah's psalm.

If, on the other hand, some of them (as seems probable to the writer) were before Jonah's psalm, what more likely than that Jonah, struck by the correspondence of phrases in them to his own wonderful experience, should clothe his own thoughts in their familiar and sacred phraseology. It has been the practice of pious men in all ages.

(45) There are several Psalms which strongly suggest that the author had Jonah's psalm in mind when writing. To bring out the resemblance would require a detailed comparison of words which the space allotted for this Essay renders impossible. The writer will only mention Ps. cvii, 23-31, where the thoughts are very similar, and there are 14 Hebrew words which correspond.

Other instances are Ps. lv, 6-8; cxxxix, 9; and cxlviii, 8. They are only mentioned as showing the impression made upon the minds of Hebrew poets by the narrative in the Book of Jonah.

(46) There remains the incident of the "gourd" (קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn*) in the fourth chapter. No one really knows what the name קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn* means. It is explained in the margin of the R.V. as the Palma Christi, botanically *Ricinus Communis* or Castor-oil plant. The grounds of this identification are chiefly

philological, seem very weak, and are rejected by Dr. Post, the writer of the article "Gourd" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. He believes that קִיקְיֹן *qiqyôn* meant a vine of some kind, and identifies it with the bottle-gourd, *Cucurbita lagenaria*, "which," he says, "it is quite customary to plant by . . . booths. It grows very rapidly and its broad leaves form an excellent shade." (See also *Encycl. Bib.*, art. "Gourd.") But this suggestion hardly satisfies the conditions. The description of the plant is given in words attributed to Jehovah. They are הָיָה שֶׁבִין לַיְלָה וְבִן לַיְלָה וְאָבָד בֵּין לַיְלָה (= which existed the son of a night) וְבִן לַיְלָה וְאָבָד בֵּין לַיְלָה (= and perished the son of a night). The question is what this phrase בֵּין לַיְלָה *bin-lay^elâh* means. Bewer says (p. 64) that it is idiomatic and translates it, as the R.V. does, "which had grown (or came up) in one night and in another night it perished." But this does not fit the facts of the story. Verse 7 says that the "worm" which God had prepared when the morning rose killed the plant which ceased to afford shade to Jonah when the sun grew hot. The "perishing," therefore, was between sunrise and mid-day and had nothing to do with the night. If, then, the word בֵּין לַיְלָה *bin-lay^elâh* in the second half of the phrase does not mean that the plant perished in the night, as it obviously did not, there does not seem any reason for supposing that in the first half of the phrase it meant that the plant grew up in the night. *And, in fact, plants do not grow in the night-time. The circulation of water, beginning with its absorption from the soil by the roots to its expiration by the stomata of the leaves, and the chemical changes which it causes in the protoplasm, only take place under the influence of the sun's light. The growth of the plant at all in the night, and still more its growth so as to cover the roof of the hut and shade it, in one single night, are quite opposed to any natural process. If we are to accept them it must be as an absolute and inexplicable "miracle." But the narrative (apart from the idiomatic phrase) does not require any miracle. The point of this incident in the story does not depend in any way upon any *sudden growth* of the plant. It is simply that the grateful relief given to the prophet by the leafy covering of the hut was suddenly and unexpectedly snatched away from him. He had been very grateful to GOD

* See Mr. E. J. Sewell's general answer in the discussion.

for the relief, and was deeply moved by the sudden and, as it seemed, gratuitous removal.

It seems, therefore, to the writer that the metrical and antithetic form of the description allows us to suppose that the phrase was a quotation or a well-known saying, and that the words meant that the relief was sudden and unexpected, and that its withdrawal was equally sudden and unexpected.

If, on the other hand, there was a miracle in the growth of the plant in one night, it is a miracle for the working of which no reason can be assigned either in fact or on the supposition that the story was a pious fiction.

This interpretation of what occurred is borne out by the use in this fourth chapter of the word יָמַן y^eman=prepared or appointed, three times, *i.e.* of the "gourd," the "worm" and the "sultry wind." When used about the whale, the word appeared to indicate that the whale was a natural object and acted as whales usually do. The point was that God brought it there at the necessary time and place. So, here, the "worm" and the "sultry wind" were natural objects functioning in their usual way. The point with them also is, that God brought them there to perform their natural functions at the necessary time and place. So when it is said that God "prepared" a gourd, the meaning seems to be that it grew up there in a natural way, and all that was "prepared" was that it should shade the prophet's hut just when that relief was required at that place.

(47) This brings us, therefore, to the general question of miracles.

That miracles are not *à priori* impossible is emphatically stated by Huxley (*Essays*, vol. v, p. 135 *et al.*) and acknowledged by Mill. Huxley, speaking as an expert in biological science, and as a philosophical thinker, condemns the definition of a miracle as a transgression or violation of the laws of Nature. "That definition," he says, "is self-contradictory" (*Men of Letters Series: Hume*, p. 133). And Mill, from the point of view of inductive logic, comes to the conclusion that miracles cannot be regarded as impossible.

The *à priori* possibility of miracles may, Huxley insists, be regarded as a closed question. The same conclusion is stated by a profound modern thinker, Dr. J. R. Illingworth. Speaking of the attempt to account for the universe by a process of purely material evolution, he says:—"And those who nowadays hold miracles suspect represent a survival of this opinion which is already," in 1915, "somewhat out of date, while the philosophy

which made it logical has been generally abandoned" (*The Gospel Miracles*, p. 165).

The space at the writer's disposal for this Essay is strictly limited, and the general question of miracles is somewhat beside the mark (see para. 50 *seq.*), but he cannot omit calling attention to this whole chapter (Miracles and Modern Thought) as well as to the argument in chapter viii, that man knows himself to be free to choose what he will do, and that *à fortiori* God cannot be anything else than free to decide what He will do. He would also like to call attention to Dr. Gore's statement of the same argument in his *Belief in God* (pp. 234-238).

(48) The writer will nevertheless dwell a little upon the opinions of Mill and Huxley on the principle of Cicero's legal dictum, "Habemus optimum testimonium confitentem reum." But we must carefully note what these two "accused" do "confess." It is that it cannot be asserted *à priori* that miracles are impossible, but, a miracle being defined as "a wonderful event transcending or contradicting ordinary experience," the evidence that it did occur must be strong in proportion to the quantity and frequency of the experience which it transcends or contradicts. In particular, both writers emphatically assert that there is no known alleged miracle which is supported by evidence sufficient to establish the fact of its occurrence. This assertion, of course, includes, and is intended to include, the Resurrection of our Lord.

(49) It follows that the ground is shifted from the possibility to the credibility of miracles. What we have to consider is the evidence on which any miracle and therefore all miracles ought to be believed. But the grounds for belief taken into account must be *all* the grounds for belief. This is where Huxley's argument seems seriously misleading and insufficient. He says (*Hume*, p. 134): "If a man assured me that he saw a centaur trotting down Piccadilly, I should emphatically decline to credit his statement," and then after considering some kinds of evidence of such a statement that might be adduced, he continues: "Indeed I hardly know what testimony would satisfy me of the existence of a live centaur."

It is to be observed that the instance taken is that of an isolated fact, a sort of laboratory experiment, entirely disconnected from anything that preceded or followed. And, further, it is to be noted that it ignores the case in which Huxley himself should have seen the centaur, closely examined it

live, feed, and act in his company over an extended period of time, and had learnt a long history as to how so unusual an animal came to exist.

To take this instance, so limited, as a typical specimen of a miracle is to ignore the facts. The Resurrection, for instance, cannot be separated from the history of the Jewish nation which led up to it, and the history of the church for nearly two thousand years up to the present day, which has followed it. The subject is a very tempting one, but, as will be pointed out, is apart from the special subject of this paper.

(50) Miracles have been divided by De Quincey (vol. vii, *Wks.*, 1862, pp. 231-237) into three classes. The first two of these are (1) Constituent Miracles which are bound up with Christianity, such as the Incarnation and Resurrection, and (2) Evidential Miracles which simply *prove* Christianity. To those who witnessed them their evidential character was absolute. The blind man whose eyes were opened, or the leper who was instantaneously cured, were as certain of the miracles as they were of the fact that they had been blind and leprous. To us, however, their evidential character is complicated by considerations as to the reliance which can be placed on the testimony on which we receive them.

The miracles narrated in the Book of Jonah belong to De Quincey's third class, which he names Internal Miracles, miracles for the individual, which go on within the consciousness of each separate man.

With regard to these miracles, it must be noted that while to those to whom they are vouchsafed their certainty is as great as in the case of the blind man whose eyes were opened, that certainty is absolutely incommunicable. It is of their essence to be so incommunicable. But that does not defeat their purpose. They are "meant for the private forum of each man's consciousness," and when they have served him they have discharged their whole purpose. Of this kind is the miracle detailed in the first verse of the Book of Jonah:—"The word of the Lord came unto Jonah, . . . saying, 'Arise, go to Nineveh, . . . and cry against it; for their wickedness is come up before Me.'"

There can be no doubt that this is an explicit announcement of a miraculous communication; but its truth could only be known to Jonah himself.

(51) The distinction so drawn holds of the other miraculous

events narrated in the Book of Jonah. They were not evidential and, in that sense, were not meant for us, for they rest upon the evidence of the prophet himself (either direct or communicated to another) and his certainty that they occurred cannot be transferred to us, nor are we explicitly told that the narrative comes from him. They were meant for the prophet himself, to make him certain of his message and unfaltering in delivering it. For it seems often to be overlooked that the outcome of delivering such a message must have appeared to Jonah to be a certain cruel death, as certain as death appeared to be when he was thrown by the sailors into the leaping waves of the sea in a violent storm. They were also intended to lead up to and exemplify the character of Jehovah in that He was, not only for His chosen people, the Jews, but for all the nations of the world, the Ninevites among them, "a gracious God, and full of compassion, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy," and One who repented Him of the evil.

It is one instance of the way in which the author of the book "scorns the obvious" that he says not a word about his own repentance of his fault in trying to evade God's command and escape from the duty laid upon him. The narrative, he thought, should make that quite plain. It has not done so, however, to some advanced Biblical critics, who blame the author for the omission.

(52) One part, and a very great part, of the "Historical value of the Book of Jonah" is that the glorious revelation about God contained in it was the starting point and keynote of all written prophecy; it was for that generation and many that followed it a ground for belief in the truth that the description of God just given represented the real character of Jehovah, the God of Israel.

That such a revelation should be authenticated to the prophet by "wonderful events transcending all ordinary experience" seems to the writer not at all improbable. He has endeavoured to explain those events by reference to known facts and processes of nature, so that what is miraculous was merely the coming together of these facts and processes at the exact time and place necessary to bring about the result.

(53) There is one further aspect of the Book of Jonah which must now be considered. According to the first Gospel, our Lord referred to the "three days and three nights" spent by Jonah "in the whale's belly" as a sign, a prophetic adumbration, of His "three days and three nights" in "the heart of the earth" between His death and Resurrection.

(54) The first question that arises is : Did our Lord say any such thing ? It is contended by Allen (*Internl. Critic. Com.*, Matthew, p. 139) that He did not. Allen's account of the composition of the first Gospel is that it had three sources. The first was the second Gospel, very much as we have it ; the second was a document, probably in Aramaic, containing chiefly sayings of our Lord, but with some connected narrative ; the third and final hand was that of an unknown editor (probably Palestinian) who added other "tradition," written and oral, and combined all three into the Gospel much as we have it. The Aramaic document was probably by the Apostle Matthew, and this accounts for the whole Gospel being attributed to him. This document, called Q, was also used by the Evangelist Luke. This being so, Allen says of the reference in the first Gospel to Jonah "in the whale's belly" that it was due to the final editor who, wishing to make clear the "parallelism of Jonah as a sign . . . because of his remarkable experience recorded in Jonah . . . and the Son of Man as a sign in virtue of His remarkable life's history from beginning to end" has done so "by *illustrating** it from one particular event in the life-history of Jonah in which there was *as it seemed to him** a striking coincidence.* Christ foretold that He would rise again on the third day. It might, therefore, be said that He lay in the grave for three days. The final editor of the first Gospel turned to the Book of Jonah in the LXX version and found (in chap. ii, 1) the words : *καὶ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας*. Here was material for a *comparison*.* Jonah's wonderful story of guidance and preservation culminated in his sojourn in the belly of the sea-monster, followed by his miraculous deliverance . . . The life-history of the Son of Man culminated in His sojourn in the grave, followed by His miraculous resurrection. This, as illustrating His whole life of wonder and marvel, constituted him a sign to the men of that generation. *Matthew has, of course, rather forced the analogy.*"*

(55) The writer is unable to understand this explanation except on the supposition that Christ did not Himself make any reference to Jonah's sojourn in the whale's belly, but that it was introduced by the final editor of the first Gospel as an appropriate illustration of the mention of Jonah as a "sign." It is quite incorrect, in speaking of that experience, to describe it as the culmination of Jonah's wonderful story of guidance and preservation. It is the whole story of his guidance and preservation,

* The italics are the writer's.

and it is not the culmination of the book but the introduction to it. In fact, Bewer describes it as merely the device adopted by the framer of the story for getting Jonah out of the ship and the storm safely on to dry land, and he points out that the author might easily have adopted another device for the purpose, which was, in fact, used in another similar story.

(56) How, then, are we to look upon Allen's account (in para. 54 above) of the reference made (in teaching attributed to Our Lord) to Jonah's wonderful deliverance? It is a very serious matter if the editor put his own words and thoughts into Our Lord's mouth, and one which cannot fail greatly to influence our judgment as to the value for us of the first Gospel. If it is a fact, we must, in all honesty, face the facts. But, before accepting a conclusion so serious and so far-reaching, we are entitled to demand evidence which shall establish it as a real fact, beyond any reasonable question. Now the evidence for it does not appear to the writer even to approach this degree of cogency. How, for instance, can it be known that the reference to the three days and three nights, etc., was due to the final editor and was not found in Q, the record of our Lord's sayings? Being a saying and a very emphatic saying, that would appear to be the most natural source to which it should be attributed. The only reason, rather hinted at than put forward, for supposing that this saying was not in Q is that St. Luke, who also had Q before him, does not mention it in his account of what took place at the time when the first Gospel gives it as having been spoken. But this is a very precarious inference. St. Luke had before him the second Gospel in which the solemn words of Christ when He instituted the Holy Eucharist are given (Mark xiv, 24 and 25). Yet in his own account (Luke xxii, 20) he varies v. 24, and omits v. 25. And there are many similar cases.* It is certain, therefore, that St. Luke in many cases, no doubt for reasons connected with the purpose he had in view in writing his Gospel, omitted words of our Lord's which he did not really doubt were spoken by Him.

(57) There is consequently no ground for accepting Allen's account of the way in which these words came to form part of the first Gospel. This conclusion is strengthened by the comment of Plummer on Luke xi, 16, and xi, 29-32 (*Int. Crit. Comm.*, St. Luke, pp. 306 and 307). Plummer points out that the words *δοθήσεται* "will be given," and *ἔσται* "the Son of

* e.g. Luke vi, 5, compared with Mark ii, 27. Luke omits the whole of Mark vi, 45-47, 9, which the first Gospel has taken from Mark.

Man *will* be a token, etc.," require that the sign announced would be something then future, and could not refer to His own life and teaching, which were past and present.

(58) Assuming, then, that our Lord did say what is ascribed to Him in the first Gospel, what did He mean by those words? Do they not convey this? God, who inspired the prophets to utter His illuminating and revealing Word, also guided and controlled them in recording facts in the history of Israel which had a significance far beyond anything that could be learnt from them at the time when they occurred? These facts were part of a picture which, being imperfect, did not by itself convey its full meaning. When the course of history came to complete the picture, it displayed its full meaning* as a glorious manifestation of the purpose of the Almighty Creator from the beginning of the world. The facts were really an acted prophecy of

"That one, far off, divine Event
To which the whole Creation moved."

(59) We are now ready to answer the question implied in the title of this Essay, viz., What is the historical value of the Book of Jonah?

One part of the answer has already been given in para. (52).

In the second place, being a true narrative, it furnished a foundation of fact for the poet who wrote the 139th Psalm.

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there:
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold Thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall Thy hand lead me,
And Thy right hand shall hold me."

Of this part of this psalm Briggs says (vol. ii, p. 493) that "the doctrine of the Divine Spirit is in advance of anything" (? else) "in the Old Testament" and compares it with Amos ix, 2-3† "which probably was in the mind of the author."

In the third place, the book gave to the nation of the Jews not the imagination of a pious Jew, but a story of absolute fact, showing the compassion and loving-kindness of God to penitent wrong-doers, and that, in that respect, he was not the God of the Jews only, but of all other nations also.

* So that the narrative was said to be "fulfilled."

† Amos was contemporary with Jonah.

And its chief and final value is that it exemplifies the words of the Apostle James spoken to the Apostles and Presbyters of the nascent Church assembled at Jerusalem.

“ Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world.”

The book narrated a fact which had no special meaning to those who first read it, nor to its readers for hundreds of years ; its meaning in the counsels of the Creator of the World we learn from Him who was the Truth, the Way and the Life. It was a prophetic adumbration, an acted prophecy, of His Resurrection from the dead by which, as St. Paul tells us, “ He was decisively proved to be the Son of God ” (Rom. i, 4).

To Him bear all the prophets witness and, among them, the prophet Jonah.

(60) So this Essay may fitly close with the fine verses written by Shelley at the age of 30, nearly two years before his untimely death :—

“ A power from the unknown God ;
 A Promethean conquerer came ;
 Like a triumphant path he trod
 The thorns of death and shame.
 A mortal shape to him
 Was like the vapour dim
 Which the orient planet animates with light ;
 Hell, Sin, and Slavery came,
 Like bloodhounds mild and tame,
 Nor preyed until their Lord had taken flight.
 Swift as the radiant shapes of sleep,
 From one whose dreams are paradise,
 Fly, when the fond wretch wakes to weep,
 And day peers forth with her blank eyes ;
 So fleet, so faint, so fair,
 The powers of earth and air
 Fled from the folding star of Bethlehem :
 Apollo, Pan, and Love,
 And even Olympian Jove
 Grew weak, for killing Truth had glared on them ;
 . . . The moon of Mahomet
 Arose and it shall set :
 While blazoned high on heaven’s immortal noon
 The Cross leads generations on.”

The scheme adopted in this Essay for the transliteration of Hebrew words and letters is as given below. It is that approved and recommended by the Royal Asiatic Society, with a few trifling alterations.

ז	'	ז	ʒ
כּ	ḥ	ח	q
בּ	b	ב	r
גּ	g	ג	ʒ
דּ	g	ד	ʒ
הּ	<u>d</u>	ה	ʒ
וּ	d	ו	t
ז	d	ז	= ^e (or <u>ʿ</u>)
ח	h	ח	ā
ט	h (or hh)	ט	ē
י	v	י	é
כ	z	כ	î
ל	h	ל	ō
מ	h	מ	ū
נ	t	נ	a
ס	y	ס	a
ע	ḥ	ע	e
פּ	k	פ	i
צ	k	צ	o
ק	l	ק	u
ר	m	ר	o
שׁ	n	ש	o
ט	s	שׂ	o
י	'	י	= ^o
כּ	f	י	= ^o
ל	p	י	= ^o

Dagges forte = double letter

DISCUSSION.

MR. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: I recall reading many years ago, in Thomson's *Land and the Book*, some very interesting remarks on this subject. I do not remember ever having seen those remarks referred to by any recent writers on the subject of Jonah.

Mr. Thomson quotes from Pliny's *Natural History*. Now Pliny's period was A.D. 23 to A.D. 79, and his evidence seems to me to have some importance.

Pliny is, I think, *one* of our authorities for the great antiquity of the port of Joppa.

Pliny tells us that from this place there came some bones of a monster which was more than 40 feet long and had ribs higher than the Indian elephant. Well, I have ridden upon Indian elephants that were at least 9 feet high.

On the way to this meeting I called at a public library and got out the classic, and will read to you some extracts before sitting down.

Strabo, who wrote about 60 B.C., was possibly one of the sources of some of Pliny's information about Joppa. Strabo writes (Book XVI, chap. 11, s. 28): "Then Joppa—in this place, according to some writers, Andromeda—was exposed to the sea monster."

Ovid (died A.D. 18), Book IV, concerning the rescue of Andromeda by Perseus, has lines on the same subject of this monster and the death of same:—

"The mounting billows tumbled to the shore,
Above the waves a monster raised his head."

NOTE.—I cannot help thinking that some of Ovid's metamorphoses had their origin in tales told to the poet by Jews who narrated events taken from the Bible, e.g. the story of Baucis and Philemon seems to me to have had its source in the history of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Josephus does not give much information, except (*Ant.*, Book IX, chap. 10, s. 1) where he tells us that Jonah prophesied in the reign of Jeroboam II (son of Joash), say, 783 to 743 B.C.

Pliny's *Natural History*:—

"Joppe—a city of the Phœnicians, which existed, it is said, before the deluge of the earth" (Book V, chap. 14).

"Turranus—speaks of a monster that was thrown up on the shore at Gades (presumably Gibraltar), the distance between the two fins at the end of the tail of which was sixteen cubits, and its teeth one

hundred and twenty in number; the largest being nine, and the smallest six, inches in length."

NOTE.—Cuvier is inclined to think that the cachelot whale, *Physeter macrocephalus* of Linnæus, is the animal here alluded to.

"M. Scaurus, in his ædileship, exhibited in Rome, among other wonderful things, the bones of the monster to which Andromeda was said to have been exposed, and which he brought from Joppa, a city of Judæa.

"These bones exceeded forty feet in length, and the ribs were higher than those of the Indian elephant, while the backbone was a foot and a half in thickness."

NOTE.—Cuvier says that there can be little doubt that the bones represented to have been those to which Andromeda was exposed, were the bones, and more especially the lower jaws, of the whale.

Frank T. Bullen, in *The Cruise of the "Cachalot"* (Ch. VIII), writes:—

"When dying (the mate told me), the cachalot always ejected the contents of his stomach—and that he believed the stuff to be portions of big cuttle fish. . . . Sticking a boat-hook into the lump I drew it alongside.

"It was at once evident that it was a massive fragment of cuttle fish—tentacle or arm—as thick as a stout man's body.

"For the first time, it was possible to understand that, contrary to the usual notion of a whale's being unable to swallow a herring, here was a kind of whale that could swallow—well, a block four or five feet square, apparently; who lived upon creatures as large as himself."

NOTE.—The mention of these bones by Pliny reminds me that many years ago in Wartburg Castle I saw in Luther's room such a bone—a vertebra of some sea monster, presumably a whale, which was used by Luther as a footstool. If Luther got it from Rome—well, the improbable is yet possible. Visitors might do worse than inquire whether amongst the treasures of the Vatican there are any "sea monster" bones that may have more reason to be called *relics* than many of the things there shown.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: Mr. Sewell apparently starts out to defend the inspiration of the record in the Book of Jonah, and then proceeds, by a laborious argument, to account, on purely natural grounds, for things which are manifestly miraculous.

He persists, also, in speaking of a "whale," and tells us that the gullet of that animal is so small that it could not possibly swallow a

man ; and thereupon endeavours to prove that Jonah remained in the whale's *mouth*, and not, as the Scriptures declare, in fish's *belly*.

Now, seeing that the Bible never once, in this connection, speaks of a " whale," that argument falls absolutely to the ground. The word translated " whale " in Matt. xii, 40, should really be " sea monster " ; while in Jonah i, 17, we are told it was a " great fish," which " the Lord prepared."

But supposing, for the sake of argument, it had been a whale. Has Mr. Sewell never read the testimony of Frank Bullen, in his *Cruise of the " Cachalot " ?* The idea of a whale's gullet being incapable of admitting any large substance, Mr. Bullen characterizes as " a piece of crass ignorance " ! and he tells us, among other things, how, " on one occasion a shark, fifteen feet in length, had been found *in the stomach* of a sperm whale " !

But now " to the Law and to the Testimony." Four times over, in different ways, the Scriptures tell us that Jonah *was* in the fish's *belly*, not in its mouth :—

- (1) In Jonah i, 17, we read : " The Lord prepared a great fish to *swallow up* Jonah." And if " swallowed," Jonah could not have remained in the fish's mouth.
- (2) In the same verse we read, " Jonah *was* in the *belly* of the fish."
- (3) In Jonah ii, 10, we read : " It (the fish) vomited out Jonah," and to vomit is to eject the contents of the *stomach*.
- (4) Then in Matt. xii, 40, our Lord definitely declared " Jonas *was* . . . in the sea monster's *belly*."

Yet, in spite of all this, Mr. Sewell tells us definitely and repeatedly, that Jonah *was not*, and could not have been, in the fish's stomach !

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said : As regards the " three days and three nights," he could not see how our Lord's being in the tomb from Friday to Sunday morning, one whole day and two nights, could possibly accord with His own prophecy of three days and three nights (Matt. xii, 40). He thought it clear from the Gospel of John that our Lord kept the Passover a day before the regular time, and was accordingly crucified on the Passover day, and was thus in the grave from Thursday evening until Sunday morning. He believed that this Evangelist, writing last, intended to correct

mistaken inferences from the other Gospels—not mistakes of the Evangelists, for they were divinely inspired.

Mr. C. A. CARUS-WILSON expressed the hope that the reading of this interesting paper would not give rise to the impression that the Victoria Institute were anxious to dispose of the miraculous element in the story of Jonah. It was, of course, open to us to consider wherein the miraculous element lay, and he was prepared to maintain that there was no evidence in the original account in support of the traditional view that Jonah had been kept alive for three days. Jonah was drowned, and the miracle consisted in his being brought to life again. Herein we saw the point of our Lord's reference to this event: "As Jonah . . . so shall the Son of Man." Our Lord was not kept alive in the heart of the earth, neither was Jonah kept alive. If he had been, the reference would have been meaningless.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES: The word "stupendous," as applied to a miracle, is frequent in the paper. What does it mean? Are not *all* miracles, from the human standpoint, equally stupendous, and from the Divine standpoint equally simple? Mr. Sewell's information about whales is interesting; but it is quite superfluous. It is really an attempt (common nowadays) to help the Almighty out of difficulties of our making, and to render it easy for Him to work His miracles!

Our Lord declared that, like Jonah in the whale, He would be "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." How is this to be explained if Christ died on Friday afternoon and rose on Sunday morning? The Jews, like the Romans, reckoned inclusively, *e.g.* the Roman *Nones* fell on the eighth day before the *Ides*; but they called it the ninth day. So the Jews reckoned any part of a day as a day and a night. This is plain from several passages in Scripture. Esther, for instance (chap. iv, 16), proclaims a fast for herself and others; "neither eat nor drink three days, night or day." "On the third day" the fast was over, and Esther went in to petition the King; yet the fast had lasted only two days and a half. Some expositors maintain that Christ died on Thursday; but that will not solve the difficulty, for from Thursday afternoon to Sunday morning is only two complete days and a half. Others (I suppose, to save the situation) maintain that Christ died on Wednesday. But this leaves Esther v, 1, without any explanation, as well as other passages (such as Gen. xlii, 17, 18; 2 Chron. x, 5-12).

Mr. W. HOSTE said: As regards the theory that Jonah remained in the mouth of the great fish, the question has been asked whether the Hebrew word translated "belly" will bear the meaning of "mouth." Gesenius says that *מִעֵרָה*, only used in plural *מֵעֵיִם* = (1) intestines; (2) belly—specially of womb (once used of external belly (Cant. v, 14)); (3) breast, heart; figuratively, the inmost soul; "Thy law in the midst of my bowels" (Ps. xl, 9), *i.e.* set deeply in my soul. There is apparently, then, no authority, as far as usage goes, for understanding *בְּתוֹעֵי הַדָּג* to mean "in the mouth of the fish," as Mr. Sewell suggests, or, indeed, anything else but "in its true belly."

κοιλια, often the LXX equivalent of *בֶּטֶן* = belly, here represents *מֵעֵיִם*. According to Grimm, the word seems never to have the sense of mouth.

Now we may enquire whether *בָּלַע* (= here "swallow," Jonah i, 17) can mean simply "to take into the mouth." Gesenius gives (1) to swallow *down*, so devour, with the idea of eagerness, greediness, and he refers in this sense to Jonah ii, 1 (*cf.* proverbial phrase, "not to have time to swallow down spittle" = be in a hurry). Apparently there is no ground for giving the word the sense of "retaining in the mouth." This is borne out by the LXX *καταπίειν*, which always has the sense, when employed literally, of "drinking *down*," devouring.

As for the word used in chap. ii, 10, the LXX *εμβαλλειν* might have the sense to eject, spit out, but the Hebrew word *קָוָא* is onomatopoeic and is invariably to spue or vomit.

The attempt to get rid of the great miracle of the fish "swallowing" the prophet lands us not only in a position which the Hebrew will not support, but in scarcely a less miracle. How could Jonah have got through the whalebone screen expressly contrived to keep out big objects? How could the "whale" have reconciled itself to the presence of a considerable foreign object like the body of a man in such an abnormal position in its mouth? The idea of Jonah picking up a precarious livelihood by sharing the molluscs with his host approaches bathos.

As for the general question, what impresses one when reading the "critical" judgments on the book is the extraordinary differences

of these "assured results." To quote* only one instance, Canon Cheyne writes, almost mournfully: "Unfortunately we cannot hope to find even a trace of traditional material in the Book of Jonah." The case be it noted, is hopeless for the poor "traditionalist." But in contrast with this, Konrad von Orelli, the Zurich theologian, writes: "The marvel of the fish was *certainly* received from tradition." Even König admits that "the Book of Jonah may rest upon a tradition about Jonah." But what shall we say to the following? "No doubt the materials of the narrative were supplied to the author by tradition and rest ultimately upon a basis of facts. No doubt the outlines of the narrative are historical and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh (see Luke xi, 30-32)." Surely these must be the words of some hidebound traditionalist? No, they are Professor S. R. Driver's. May we not leave these "lean kine" to devour one another?

The same might be said† of the date, assigned to the book by the critics, which varies from Hitzig, second century B.C., back to Goldhorne, who ascribes it to Hezekiah's reign. The only thing they do not differ in is their superlative confidence that they are right in refusing it to the time of Jonah and in rejecting its historicity, in contradiction to the testimony of Him who is our Lord and Teacher (John xiii, 13).

Mr. WALTER MAUNDER writes: "I have read the Gunning Prize Essay on 'The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah' several times, and I listened to the discussion on it at the meeting. From the Essay and the discussion, it seems to me that the historical value of the book rests on two main points.

"The first is the position which the mission of Jonah to Nineveh holds in the religious history of the world. The Lord *had* revealed Himself to Moses as 'the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty' (Exod. xxxiv, 6-7). Of the subject of Jonah's preaching, we are only told that 'he cried, and said, Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.' But the result of that preaching shows clearly that

* See *Jonah's Critics Criticized*, pp. 10 and 11, monograph by present writer. Published by Bible League.

† *Idem*, p. 36.

the Ninevites recognized that their ways were evil, and their hands full of violence, and that God, who had sent a prophet to them with this warning, was full of mercy and desired that they should repent and be saved. Such a message preached by a prophet of God's chosen people, to a city of idolatrous Gentiles, was a new revelation of God's purpose toward mankind.

"The second point is the relation in the religious history of the world which Jonah's mission had to that of a 'greater than Jonah.' For when certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered Jesus, saying, 'Master, we would see a sign from Thee,' He replied, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall be no sign given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here' (Matt. xii, 38-41).

"We are not informed whether the Ninevites knew anything of the strange experience which Jonah passed through in his attempt to flee to Tarshish. In any case he could have offered them no confirmation of the truth of his statement. Jonah, like John the Baptist, did no miracle; his preservation after he was cast into the sea was a testimony only to himself; the Ninevites saw nothing of it.

"So the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ was not seen by the Jewish nation—nor by us—but only by a few chosen witnesses.

"But the Resurrection from the dead of our Lord Jesus Christ is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and the time came when the Apostles were commissioned to preach it to the Gentiles also: 'And they glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto Life."' But from that day onwards the Jews have closed their hearts against their Messiah, for to them, as to Jonah, the acceptance of the Gentiles was abhorrent."

Mr. A. GREGORY WILKINSON writes: "Mr. Sewell writes in defence of the historicity of the Jonah narrative, maintaining that the book gave to the Jews *a story of absolute fact*, and throughout the Essay he maintains a meticulous regard for the exact meaning of the terms used. But when he comes to the crux of the whole narrative, he shies like a frightened horse, and deliberately evades the admittedly clear meaning of words.

“I refer, of course, to his hypothesis that Jonah was retained in the *mouth* of the whale without any miracle ; that he would in such a position have abundance of air to breathe, and that he would be *warm and dry* except when occasionally washed by sea-water. The essayist gives the impression that if anyone could succeed in lodging himself in a whale’s mouth, he could spend a day or two there in moderate comfort, and if he could manage to take with him a supply of food and drink, he might stay on for an indefinite time without incurring any grave danger. This thesis certainly possesses the merit of originality, but, as such, it should be subject to criticism on its intrinsic merits.

“I definitely dissent from it for two reasons :—

“(1) As already pointed out, it is a deliberate evasion of the clear language of Scripture. Mr. Sewell admits that the words used for ‘swallow up’ and ‘belly’ can *only* mean that Jonah was swallowed up and entered the intestines of the ‘fish.’ Why, then, evade their *only* meaning? Simply to avoid a miracle. But, surely, such a shyness of miracle is one of the leading characteristics of the opponents of historicity! Besides, a later expression must also be evaded: ‘it vomited out Jonah’ would have to be interpreted as ‘it spued Jonah out of its mouth.’ Mr. Sewell contends that he is availing himself of a ‘reasonable latitude’ of interpretation. On that point I join issue. To my mind it is quite unreasonable latitude.

“(2) After discussing the matter with an expert biologist, I am of opinion that Mr. Sewell’s own interpretation will not ‘hold water.’ There are various physiological objections to the new idea which I cannot set forth in this short critique, but I am satisfied that if this view were submitted to the judgment of expert biologists, it would be turned down as impracticable.”

Dr. D. ANDERSON-BERRY writes: “I venture to suggest that Mr. Sewell’s statements as to the possibility of Jonah being kept in a whale’s mouth are not correct.

“(1) His measurements as to the capacity of the whale’s mouth are based on an *open* mouth. (2) Although its tongue is so fixed that it cannot be protruded, it is not so fixed that it cannot be pressed up towards the palate. Otherwise it could not swallow its food. (3) The mouth is not a reservoir of air. There is a network of large

vessels within the chest and in a region thereabouts which contains a copious supply of oxygenated blood sufficient for its requirements when 'sounding.' (4) When swimming on the surface its mouth is held widely open and is filled with water so that no one could survive whilst the whale is 'spouting.'

"On the other hand, Dr. Luther Townshend quotes from the *Literary Digest* the case of a sailor who was swallowed by a large fish and delivered alive when this fish was captured hours after.

"The case is verified by the captain of the 'Star of the East' and by the doctors of the hospital where the man was treated afterwards. Here is the case of a man *swallowed* as the Bible states, and states plainly that the prophet was in the 'belly of the fish.'

"But a miracle is a miracle and the more we can explain it the less a miracle it becomes; and certainly a great miracle is required to explain Nineveh's attitude; just as the miracle of the Church requires the miracle of Christ's resurrection!

"'Plants do not grow in the night time,' p. 30. Then how do seeds and bulbs grow in the darkness? and such plants as mushrooms?

"I remember planting bulbs 8 inches deep in the earth, and in my ignorance planting them upside down. Yet they grew, and in three or four weeks appeared above the surface of the soil, and bore flowers in due season.

"Some plants grow rapidly and darkness is no obstacle to their growth, and certainly Jonah's gourd is described as growing rapidly just as it perished rapidly.

"In fact, the more we seek to explain Biblical miracles the greater difficulties we fall into, for if they were explainable they would not be miracles!

"And the older we get and the more we face the mystery of life and death the more thankful we are that the Book that lights our path is sealed with miracles."

Mr. GEORGE ANTHONY KING said: It would be presumptuous to criticise an essay so clearly arranged and so evidently the result of careful research. I only venture to offer a single suggestion as to the point put on p. 71, "The question is what this phrase *hin-lay-lah* means." Is it not possible that the phrase is not chronological but characteristic? that it does not refer to the duration either of growth or of destruction, but to the peculiar effect of the

plant which Jonah first welcomed and then lamented when it was taken away, namely, its shade? If this is so, the conclusion drawn at the foot of p. 71 seems to be strengthened by the withdrawal of any objection based upon the supposed chronological content of the phrase.

I am not at all a scholar, but I personally feel some doubt whether the phrase could, even if it were supposed to be chronological, be rightly construed "the son of a (that is, of 'one') night." The use of the word "Son" in reference to age in other passages seems to require a numeral—but there is no *'ehād* here. The A.V. margin "*Heb. was the son of the night*" emphasises the absence of the article by its typography.

The Rev. J. M. TURNER writes: Mr. Sewell has given us weighty arguments for the early date of the Book of Jonah from the internal evidence of its language and style. He also has ably answered the critical contention that Nineveh had ceased to exist when the book was written, by his able illustration of the Hebrew tenses.

What I do emphatically protest against is Mr. Sewell's adopting the scheme of Schleiermacher, namely, endeavouring to get rid of the miraculous element in the miracle. Out of his own mouth I condemn him, for on p. 75 he admits that "He has endeavoured to explain those events by reference to known facts and processes of nature, so that what is miraculous was merely the coming together of these facts and processes at the exact time and place necessary to bring about the result." Mr. Sewell denies the miracle, but draws a decent veil over the denial. Like Schleiermacher, he throws a sop to the Cerberus of Rationalism.

Mr. Sewell wishes us to allow him to translate the word "belly" as "mouth," then he can unfold to us his unique and novel theory. We need not then discard the word "whale," as we have hitherto been most anxious to do. "Jonah," he says on p. 63, "was imprisoned in the animal's mouth. A plentiful supply of air is provided him and his quarters are roomy, warm and dry, and when Jonah is safely ensconced in these hitherto unheard of quarters the psalm can be adapted and accommodated to his position, the weeds wrapped round his head are the hogsheads of greenish grassy matter, the flood is the streams of water rushing through the whale-bone and so on. Moreover, according to Mr. Sewell, Jonah is so

ignorant of anatomy he cannot distinguish between a whale's belly and its mouth.

Would it not be much better to take the Word of God as it stands, and bend our theories to that, than to formulate our theories and make God's Word bend to them ?

Jonah prayed out of the fish's belly. His experiences in that prayer are in the past tense, therefore they are his experiences in the sea before he was swallowed by the fish.

Mr. Sewell says on p. 68, "The sailors on board the ship saw him disappear into the fish and never reappear." The Bible does not say so. As a matter of fact, Jonah sank down to the bottom of the sea, "all thy billows and thy waves passed over me," "the weeds were wrapped about my head," he went down to the bottoms of the mountains. In the sea he remembered the Lord; in the sea his heart turned towards God's holy temple. The fish was Jonah's salvation, therefore his psalm of thanksgiving from the belly of the fish and his acknowledgment that "Salvation is of the Lord."

Then came further deliverance, as is usually the case whenever God hears the voice of thanksgiving. "And the Lord spake unto the fish and it vomited Jonah upon the dry land."

The Bible stands or falls on the question of the miraculous. Miracles are given because the ruler of the supernatural world is the ruler of the natural world, and desires personal contact and communion with his rational creature man. The probability is that God, calling on men to live above nature, will reveal Himself as a God above nature. So wrote Archbishop French.

The Rev. JOHN CAIRNS, O.B.E., writes: Mr. Sewell has proved the value of reserving judgment until the case for the defence has been heard. Experts are not infrequently wrong. The essay deserves a wide circulation.

Extract from letter by Prof. A. S. GEDEN: I have read your Essay on Jonah with great interest, and with most of it I should most cordially agree. It is only in a few details perhaps that we should differ. . . . From the point of view of the Hebrew, linguistically, the text seems to me more varied than you allow. As a matter of fact, we know very little of the history of the Hebrew language; forms that are regarded as late may, in some instances, prove to be early, and *vice versa*.

Para. 15: I think "the 6,000 [? six-score thousand] persons" undoubtedly refers to the "profanum vulgus," as Horace says, not in a depreciatory sense, but simply to mark the unlettered crowds that fill the streets. The phrase has nothing to do with children. . . . הַיָּאֵה (hāyāh) is γίγνεσθαι, not εἶναι. Chap. iii, 3, הַיָּאֵה (hāyāṭāh) proved to be, *i.e.* was found to be such by the prophet when he entered it; as you rightly urge, the word does not imply a date of any kind. Hebrew writers are intensely subjective; and it is this, in part, which makes them so misunderstood by many German and English commentators. Nineveh may or may not have been destroyed at the time of writing, but the phrase used neither proves nor disproves it . . .

Mr. ALBERT HIORTH, C.E., writes: I duly received the proof of Mr. Sewell's most interesting paper, and take pleasure in sending you from my collection of cuttings [from *Evangelists Sendetene* (Gospel Messenger), Kristiania] one containing report of an event very similar to the Biblical record of Jonas. It is stated to have been recorded in *Journal des Débats*, stating that the mariner, James Bartley, of the crew of "Star of the East," was literally swallowed by a sperm-whale, and taken out by dissecting the carcass—still living, but badly "burnt" (chemically) and for a time out of his mind. The captain of "The Star of the East" and the whole crew is said to witness the fact, and the Editor (Scientific Dept.) of the *Journal des Débats* is mentioning several similar instances of whales swallowing people.

Further, it is stated that Bartley came to Liverpool, and was subsequently sent to hospital in London and recovered, though relapsing into insanity yearly the same date.

According to the witnesses of captain and crew, the (Scientific) Editor of *Journal des Débats* is reported to say that ". . . in view of this fact, I am led to believe that Jonas really came living out of the whale's belly as reported in the Holy Bible."

As this statement might be easily corroborated, I venture to send it over for any use you might deem proper. To believers in the Inspiration of our Book it is, even if corroborated, unnecessary, but still of some interest as a scientific argument to scientists opposing the Truth.

Names given in the cutting.

James Bartley, mariner, aged 35.

"Star of the East," whaling ship; harbour, Liverpool; hospital, London.

Journal des Débats, August 25, 1891 (?), quoted by *Evangelists Sendetenel* (1915), quoting the book *Kan man stole på sin Bibel?*

AUTHOR'S reply: I am requested by the Editor to make a "general reply" to the criticisms on my paper, and "to keep it as short as possible, as the whole will be larger than we expected." I will therefore ask my critics to remember this and not suppose that special points are neglected or not answered because I was *unable* to reply to them, but only because I was not allowed room for doing so. But I propose to include answers to many relevant suggestions from correspondents who did not wish their communications to be printed.

I venture to protest against the unintelligent and irrelevant criticism that I have said that a whale's "belly" meant its "mouth." I have said the opposite in the plainest words that the English language contains (p. 36). What I have suggested has been that the words "swallow" and "belly" might be interpreted according to the appearance of what happened rather than in a purely literal manner. When we read (Ps. xciii, 7) that "the world also is established that it cannot be moved" we do not doubt that it has a motion of many hundreds of miles an hour round its own axis, and of over 400 miles a minute in its orbit, to say nothing of its possible motion in space. It appears to be relatively at rest, as regards us, and we fully understand what the Psalmist means. So I suggest that Jonah disappeared from sight into the body of the whale and seemed to be swallowed, though in fact he was not.

In face of what I have said in paras. 50 and 52, I protest against the statement that I "deny the miracle but draw a decent veil over the denial."

Some of my correspondents (who fully accept the miraculous element in scripture) nevertheless think that the miracles narrated in the Book of Jonah are so abundant, and of such a nature, as to lead them to consider the story as a product of the imagination, like the parable of the Prodigal Son, or like Hamlet. Others say that those same miracles need no defence or explanation, and regret

that any so-called defence of them should be put forward. These critics seem to answer one another.

With regard to those critics who consider the story of Jonah's remaining alive and conscious in the belly of some sea monster as needing no defence, I can only say that they can have had very little to do with young men, by whom this is constantly put forward as one of the things that make it impossible to accept the Bible as true.

As regards those who regard the story as resembling such a narrative as that of the "Prodigal Son," I cannot but think that they have not fully thought out all that is implied in Our Lord's reference to "the sign of Jonah the prophet." Whatever may be thought as to the reference to the three days and three nights, no one can doubt that He referred to the repentance of the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah. The occasion was on a solemn appeal, before a large audience, from the Scribes and Pharisees whom He acknowledged to be the authorized religious teachers of the Jewish nation. (*Cf.*, Math. xxiii, 2; see also Luke v, 14.) He did not altogether refuse their request for a sign, but He Himself *selected* the sign of Jonah the prophet as the answer to their request. The case was not at all that of a typical example of human nature, like that of "a sower" or "the loving father of a spendthrift son." If, on the other hand, it be compared to a reference to a known work of imagination, like Hamlet, I find it impossible to believe that He, knowing the story not to be true, and knowing that His hearers thought it to be true, *selected* it as giving any answer to their demand for a sign.

But my critics must answer one another.

The criticisms of Mr. Gregory Wilkinson and Dr. Anderson Berry go to the root of my explanation of that part of the story which deals with the "great fish." Mr. Wilkinson gives no facts or reasons in support of his contention. But Dr. Berry does do so. He says my measurements of the whale's mouth are based on "an open mouth." This is simply not true. Taking the minimum measurements of a whale's open mouth as 1,680 c. ft., I have deducted 680 c. ft., leaving 1,000 c. ft. (a round number) for the dimensions of a closed mouth. He can take off another 200 or 300 c. ft. if he likes, and my argument will not be affected.

He also says that the mouth of a whale when swimming on the

surface is filled with water. Of this he has not and can have no proof. If the mouth is partly filled with water, having some air in the upper part, the conditions required by my suggestion are fully met.

What Dr. Berry speaks of as "the network of large vessels . . . containing a copious supply of oxygenated blood . . ." are described in Jardine's *Natural History*, but that is a comparatively old book (1843). Beddard's book is much more recent and deals fully with the question of the respiration of whales. He pronounces definitely upon the whales "spouting" as being an ejection of air, charged with water spray, when the whale rises to the surface after "sounding." There must be a quantity of air in the whale's lungs when it "sounds," in order that it may be ejected when it rises to the surface. And it is to be remembered that it may stay more than an hour under water.

Again, it is admitted that the water taken into the mouth when the whale is on the surface is ejected through the baleen. What can take its place but air? There is surely not a vacuum in the top of the whale's mouth.

Until these questions are answered by Dr. Berry's (imaginary) biological expert, my suggested explanation of the situation remains valid.

The statement in para. 71 beginning, "And in fact plants do not grow in the night . . ." is an undoubted blunder, as has been pointed out by a scientific friend from Cambridge, and by Mr. A. W. Sutton. Plants do increase in length in the night, but (as stated in answer to Mr. Sutton's question by the Director of Kew Gardens), "The important physiological process which ceases in the absence of light is the manufacture of organic compounds from carbonic acid gas and water (photosynthesis), hence "growth in continued darkness leads to ultimate "starvation in the case of ordinary flowering plants." It is this action of photosynthesis which would result in the formation of leaves. So that the formation of a covering shelter of large green, fleshy leaves, to shade the prophet from the burning sun, may well have taken place during those forty days which he spent in waiting to "see what would become of the city." See, on this, Mr. G. A. King's helpful suggestion as to the possible meaning of the phrase בִּין לַיְלָה (bin-lāylah).

It has been pointed out in a very kind and helpful letter by Canon Lukyn Williams that, on my theory, some explanation is required as to how Jonah escaped from his position behind the screen of whalebone. To this I would reply that it is stated (in Jonah ii, 10) that "the Lord spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land." The phrase is וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְדָג (vayyōmer Y" laddāg), commanded the fish, for the word אָמַר ('amar) is frequently used of commands given by God to inanimate beings and the forces of nature, as well as to men. And the baleen, though it acts as a screen to prevent the egress of solid objects from a whale's mouth, is not so rigid as to withstand force. But the act of vomiting is produced by contraction of the muscles acting upon the stomach and forcing its contents outward, often with great force, more especially in an animal weighing one or two hundred tons.

The question of the "three days and three nights" of our Lord's stay "in the heart of the earth" is a very old difficulty. My friend, Sir George Grierson, suggests that the clause was a marginal comment on Matt. xii, 40, which was afterwards, by mistake, incorporated into the text. But this is a pure supposition; there is no textual evidence for it at all. Weymouth translates the passage: "For just as 'Jonah was three days in the sea-monster's belly' (Jonah i, 17), so will the Son of Man be three days in the heart of the earth"; and in his note he says: Three days, literally "three days and three nights," a striking Hebraism. According to the *Talmud*, a day and a night together make up a night-day, and any part of such a period is counted as a whole. Thus in our Saviour's case the three "nights and days" consist of about three hours on Friday, the whole of the Saturday (reckoned in the Jewish mode from sunset to sunset) and the first half—the night—of the Sunday."

Mrs. A. S. D. Maunder has kindly supplied this reference from the *Talmud*, Moed-Katon, fol. 12, col. 2: "Part of a day is equivalent to a whole day."