

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.

VOL. LVIII.

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

VOL. LVIII.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1926

LONDON :

HARRISON AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY,
ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

PREFACE.

THE present volume of Transactions—the fifty-eighth of the series—has features that may easily be defined.

In the first place, prominence has been given to subjects that are Biblical. Oriental archæology asserts a bearing upon the Sacred Book; and Revelation, from whatever point of view it may be discussed, takes us to the same Volume for its adequate vindication. Moreover, though such a work as the Book of Job may be considered from various standpoints, yet when we detect therein remarkable anticipations of Modern Science, we are still in the atmosphere of Canonical Scripture. “Scientific Criticism as Applied to the Bible” is a subject of vital importance in view of modern speculation; and so also is the essay which deals with “The Problem of the Septuagint and Quotations in the New Testament.” More remote is the interest of “The Qur’an and its Doctrine of God”; but in days when Islam is active in many lands we must give attention to reading in this regard.

In the second place, issues of widespread interest in the realm of Philosophic Investigation are discussed. In days when Science makes large demands upon thought and activity, many will welcome the paper on “Religion and Science,” as treated by a well-known physician. A paper on “Evolution” has seemed to be fully due in this annual publication; and the discussion now presented is assured of close attention on the part of those who know something of the confusion which has followed upon the influence of Modernist watchwords of the past generation. To all and sundry “The Silence of God” has been a theme of anxious inquiry, sometimes with vexatious searchings of heart, and the treatment now supplied is twofold and

useful. Finally, a study of Latin Culture, as interpreted in the life of a celebrated Swiss divine, will bring refreshment to many.

In the third place, particular attention is directed to the increased space allowed for Discussion in this year's volume. In some cases the papers seemed to lack the accent which consists with an assured faith in Christ and His Gospel; and with a fine insight Members and Associates of the Institute came forward with clarifying statements of Truth. If any paper seemed to lack the note of Scripture verity, the deficiency was supplied in the course of discussion, and with reassuring precision.

During the year death has claimed valued friends who had read papers before the Institute—among them Professor Edouard H. Naville, LL.D., of Geneva, a Vice-President and a Corresponding Member since 1883; Prebendary H. E. Fox, M.A., also a Vice-President, and a Member for upwards of fifty years; and Dr. Anderson-Berry, a Member of Council. Mention may also be made of the death of Rev. A. Duff Watson, M.A., B.D., a Member of the Institute for forty-seven years, who passed to his rest in November, 1924.

JAMES W. THIRTLE,
Chairman of Council.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1925	1
CASH STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR 1925	6
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 15TH, 1926 ...	8
SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO THE BIBLE. BY GEORGE B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E.	10
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Mr. Charles Marston, J.P., Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, and Miss Hamilton Law	24
NOTES ON THE DISCOVERIES AT UR AND TEL AL-OBEID, AND THE WORSHIP OF THE MOON-GOD. BY PROFESSOR THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.	32
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. Theodore Roberts, the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E., and Mr. Sidney Collett	54
MODERN SCIENCE IN THE BOOK OF JOB. BY LIEUT.-COM. VICTOR L. TRUMPER, R.N.R. (RET.), M.R.A.S.... ..	63
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. H. T. Shirley, and Mr. Leonard W. Kern	74
A PHILOSOPHIC EXPONENT OF LATIN CULTURE: ALEXANDRE VINET, PROTESTANT DIVINE AND LITERARY CRITIC. BY PROFESSOR F. F. ROGET, OF GENEVA	87
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Miss Hamilton Law, Mr. William C. Edwards, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, and Mr. Theodore Roberts	108

	PAGE
"REVELATION." BY THE REV. CANON V. F. STORR, M.A., CANON OF WESTMINSTER	113
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Sir George King, M.A., Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. H. O. Weller, B.Sc., the Rev. Morris Morris, Dr. R. P. Hadden, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A., Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. F. C. Wood, Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., the Rev. John Tuckwell, M.R.A.S., the Rev. William Fisher, M.A., Mr. W. Hoste, B.A., and Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E.	
	125
THE PROBLEM OF THE SEPTUAGINT AND QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. BY THE REV. CANON A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.	152
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. Theodore Roberts, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Miss Hamilton Law, Miss L. M. Mackinlay, the Rev. J. M. Pollock, Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O., and Mr. W. Hoste, B.A.	
	162
THE QUR'AN AND ITS DOCTRINE OF GOD. BY THE REV. H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, PH.D., D.D.	175
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste, B.A., and Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A.	
	187
RELIGION AND SCIENCE. BY ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D., ETC.	194
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste, B.A., the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., and Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O.	
	209
EVOLUTION. BY MAJOR LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.	214
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, the Rev. A. H. Finn, the Rev. Morris Morris, M.Sc., Mr. W. E. Leslie, Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E., Professor A. Rendle Short, M.D., B.S., B.Sc., Mr. W. Hoste, B.A.	
	236
THE SILENCE OF GOD: HOW IS IT TO BE EXPLAINED? BY PROFESSOR HOWARD A. KELLY, M.D., LL.D., AND THE REV. D. M. M'INTYRE, D.D.	253, 258
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. C. E. Lewis Heath, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A., Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., Mr. F. C. Wood, Mr. Sydney T. Klein, F.L.S., Mr. Theodore Roberts, and Mr. W. Hoste, B.A.	
	273
LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES, ETC.	289
OBJECTS, CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS	319

VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1925.

READ AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, MARCH 15TH, 1926.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council herewith present the 57th Annual Report. The past Session was well employed. Twelve papers were read before the Society. It is noticed that the nearer the subjects are to the defence or illumination of the Holy Scriptures the greater the interest shown. Without being invidious, it might be mentioned that considerable interest was aroused by a paper by Brig.-Gen. Sir Wyndham Deedes, C.M.G., D.S.O., on "Great Britain and the Palestine Mandate," and by another by the late Professor Clay, of the U.S.A., on "The Early Civilization of Amurru"—better known as the Amorites. Written from the point of view of a critical scholar, it was interesting to hear him controvert some of the most "assured results" of the Higher Critics, and in this connection his paper is well worth careful study.

The Council regret that up to the present they have not found a suitable successor to the late Dean of Canterbury, but the matter is under consideration.

2. *Meetings.*

Twelve ordinary meetings were held during the Session 1924-25. The papers were:—

"The Worship of Idols in Assyrian History in Relation to Bible References," by Professor T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“Great Britain and the Palestine Mandate,” by Brigadier-General Sir WYNDHAM DEEDES, C.M.G., D.S.O.

Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., in the Chair.

“Seismic Phenomena,” by Dr. DOROTHY M. WRINCH, Girton College, Cambridge.

E. Walter Maunder, Esq., F.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“Psychology in the Light of History—a Study in Heredity,” by AVARY H. FORBES, Esq., M.A.

Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“The Early Civilization of Amurru—the Land of the Amorites—showing Amorite Influence on Biblical Literature,” by Professor ALBERT T. CLAY, Curator, Babylonian Collection, Yale University, U.S.A.

Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“Nature and Supernature,” by the Rev. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A.

The Rev. Eric K. C. Hamilton, M.A., in the Chair.

“The Antiquity of Man according to the Genesis Account,” by the Rev. President M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., of Xenia Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

William Dale, Esq., F.G.S., F.S.A., in the Chair.

“Psychotherapy: Mind in Curative Action,” by Dr. EDWIN ASH.

Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“Revelation and Evolution: can they be Harmonized?” by Professor GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A. (being the Langhorne Orchard Prize for 1925).

Sir George King, M.A., in the Chair.

“The Land of Punt and the Hamites” by Professor EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D.

Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“ A Review of Philosophic Tendencies since Hegel,” by Professor H. WILDON CARR, D.Litt.

The Rev. Charles Gardner, M.A., in the Chair.

The Annual Address : “ The Capture of the Unconscious,” by ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.S.

Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., in the Chair.

3. Council and Officers.

The following is the list of the Council and Officers for the year 1925 :—

President.

Vice-Presidents.

Rev. Prebendary Fox, M.A.
Lieut.-Col. George Mackinlay, late R.A.
Alfred T. Schofield, Esq., M.D.
Professor Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D.

Council

(In Order of Original Election.)

Prof. T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.	Alfred H. Burton, Esq., B.A., M.D., C.M.
Right Rev. Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, D.D.	Theodore Roberts, Esq.
Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S.	Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.
J. W. Thirtle, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S., <i>Chairman.</i>	Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.
Alfred William Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M.	W. Dale, Esq., F.S.A., F.G.S.
Sir Robert W. Dibdin, F.R.G.S.	D. Anderson-Berry, Esq., M.D., LL.D.
H. Lance-Gray, Esq.	Major H. Pelham-Burn, late Rifle Brigade.
John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A.	Sir George King, M.A.
William Hoste, Esq., B.A.	Lieut.-Col. Arthur H. D. Riach, late R.E.
	Wilson Edwards Leslie, Esq.

Honorary Treasurer.

Sir George King, M.A.

Honorary Editor of the Journal.

Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E.

Honorary Secretary, Papers Committee.

Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O.

Honorary Secretary.

William Hoste, Esq., B.A.

Auditor.

E. Luff-Smith, Esq. (Incorporated Accountant).

Secretary.

Mr. A. E. Montague.

4. *Election of Council and Officers.*

In accordance with the rules, the following Members of the Council retire by rotation :—

Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.
 H. Lance-Gray, Esq.
 T. Roberts, Esq.
 Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E.
 Lieut.-Colonel H. Biddulph, D.S.O.
 Lieut.-Colonel A. H. D. Riach.

The following are nominated by the Council for re-election : Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., H. Lance-Gray, Esq., Lieut.-Colonel Molony, Lieut.-Colonel Biddulph, and Lieut.-Colonel Riach. The Council nominate Avary H. Forbes, Esq., M.A., and Arthur Rendle Short, Esq., M.D., as new Members of Council ; also the Auditor, Mr. E. Luff-Smith, who, being eligible, offers himself for re-election.

5. *Obituary.*

The Council regret to announce the deaths of the following Members and Associates :—

W. H. Ash, Esq., J.P. ; Rev. Canon E. A. Chichester, M.A. ; Brenton H. Collins, Esq., J.P. ; E. Caudwell, Esq., M.R.C.S. ; William Dale, Esq., F.S.A. (Member of Council) ; H. A. Fairbairn, Esq., M.D. ; the Rev. J. W. Fairhurst, M.A., B.D. ; Williamson Lamplough, Esq. ; the Rev. M. B. Moorhouse, M.A. ; the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. ; O. T. Olsen, Esq., D.Sc., F.L.S. ; Miss C. Pearce ; W. H. Plaister, Esq., M.D. ; Miss F. M. Reade ; Arthur W. Sutton, Esq. (Treasurer and Trustee) ; John Sterry, Esq. ; W. M. Walters, Esq. ; the Rev. S. J. Whitmee ; the Rev. W. C. Winslow, D.D., LL.D. ; the Rev. E. A. Wright, M.A.

6. *New Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Members and Associates elected up to the end of 1925 :—

MEMBERS.—The Rev. H. W. Bromley, D.D. ; Gerald W. J. Cole, Esq. ; T. Tweedale Edwards, Esq., F.R.H.S. ; the Rev. Frederick W. Pitt ; Percy O. Ruoff, Esq. ; the Rev. Sidney Swann, M.A. ; Major H. Charlewood Turner, M.A.

LIFE MEMBER.—Major Lewis Merson Davies, R.A., F.G.S.

ASSOCIATES.—The Rev. H. E. Anderson, B.A. ; Mrs. Ida Case ; Miss Catharine S. Cheatham ; Herbert Balkwill Cole, Esq. ; Mrs. R. S. Elliot ; the Rev. Professor L. B. Henderson, B.S., B.D. ; the Rev. W. Hudson ; the Rev. Alexander Hodge, B.A. ; Mrs. H. Norton Johnson, B.A. ; the Rev. Rhys B. Jones ; Alfred F. Kaufmann, Esq., F.R.C.I. ; Professor Howard Atwood Kelly, M.D., LL.D. ; Dr. H. Krause, D.D.S., F.R.S.A. ; the Rev. Eric Lewis, B.A. ; Miss L. M. Mackinlay ; Bernard W. Matthews, Esq. ; the Rev. Henry H. Meyer, D.D. ; the Rev. Thomas Miller ; the Rev. Harold C. Morton, B.A., Ph.D. ; Miss C. A. M. Pearce ; Alexander Ross, Esq. ; H. T. Shirley, Esq. ; Mrs. Fannie M. Smith, B.Sc. ; Miss E. F. Staley ; Pastor S. F. Tonks ; Alfred G. Webber, Esq. Miss E. E. Whitfield.

7. *Number of Members and Associates.*

The following statement shows the number of supporters of the Institute at the end of 1925 :—

Life Members	14
Annual Members	106
Life Associates	52
Annual Associates	302
Missionary Associates	13
Library Associates	27
					<hr/>
Total	514
					<hr/>

8. *Special Donations.*

W. Wardle Sales, Esq., £2 2s. ; Miss G. Geary, 2s.

9. *Finance.*

The Council wish to ask the co-operation of the Members and Associates in procuring new adherents, as only by this means, apart from voluntary donations, can they be enabled to balance accounts. The expenses of printing are still heavy, though on the decrease.

10. *The Langhorne Orchard Prize.*

The Langhorne Orchard Prize and Medal for 1925 was awarded to Professor George McCready Price, M.A., for his essay on "Revelation and Evolution : can they be Harmonized ?" Separate copies of this essay may be had at one shilling each.

11. *Conclusion.*

In conclusion, the Council venture to hope that the Institute continues to fill a useful place in the general economy.

In these days of unrest, important, almost revolutionary, conclusions are sometimes reached, before the issues at stake have been clearly defined, or the pros and cons weighed. It is good then, that a place should exist, where these questions can be dispassionately discussed and where assertion must be backed up with argument, and such a place is to be found, it is hoped, in the platform of the Victoria Institute. The Council earnestly invite the hearty effort of all Members and Associates in attending the meetings and in making the work of the Society known.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

JAMES W. THIRTLE,

Chairman of Council.

BALANCE SHEET, 31ST DECEMBER, 1925.

LIABILITIES.				ASSETS.			
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID IN ADVANCE			16 16 0	CASH AT BANK ON CURRENT ACCOUNT			124 17 3
SUNDRY CREDITORS for:—				Ditto "Gunning Prize" Account			94 1 11
Printing and Stationery	111	12	10	Ditto "Langhorne Orchard Prize"			
Audit Fee	3	3	0	Account			1 4 1
LIFE SUBSCRIPTIONS:—			114 15 10	STAMPS IN HAND			0 16 6
Balance at 1st January, 1925	93	9	0	SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ARREAR:—			
Less Amount carried to Income and				Estimated to produce			27 6 0
Expenditure Account	10	10	0	INVESTMENTS:—			
TRACT FUND:—			82 19 0	£500 2½ per cent. Consolidated Stock			
Balance at 1st January, 1925	88	17	6	(Market value at 55 = £275.)			
Add Sales	6	16	2	Gunning Fund:—			
	95	13	8	£508 Great Indian Peninsular Railway			
Less Expenses	1	18	6	3 per cent. Guaranteed Stock (repay-			
"GUNNING PRIZE" FUND:—			93 15 2	able 30 June, 1925)			
Balance at 1st January, 1925	69	7	4	Langhorne Orchard Fund:—			
Add Dividends received	21	0	4	£258 18s.—3½ per cent. Conversion			
Income Tax recovered	3	14	3	Stock at cost			200 0 0
			94 1 11	INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT:—			
"LANGHORNE ORCHARD PRIZE" FUND				Balance at 1st January, 1925	119	8	2
(per contra)			200 0 0	Add Excess of Expenditure over			
Balance at 1st January, 1925	21	12	7	Income for the year 1925	38	2	1
Add Dividends received	8	0	10		157	10	3
Income Tax recovered	2	0	8	Deduct Donations received	2	4	0
			31 14 1				155 6 3
Deduct—							
Prize and Medals	30	10	0				
			1 4 1				
			£603 12 0				£603 12 0

I have examined the foregoing Balance Sheet with the Cash Book and Vouchers of the Victoria Institute and certify that it is correctly made up therefrom. I have verified the Cash Balances and Investments. £508 Great Indian Peninsular Railway 3 per cent. Guaranteed Stock became repayable on 30th June, 1925, and is in course of collection for reinvestment. A valuation of the Library and Furniture has not been taken.

15, Old Queen Street, Westminster, S.W. 1.
26th February, 1926.

E. LUFF-SMITH,
Incorporated Accountant.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE
VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 15TH, 1926, AT
3.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN called on the Honorary Secretary to read the invitation convening the Meeting, and then to read the Minutes of the last Meeting, which were confirmed and signed.

He then proposed to Members that the Report be taken as read, and after a few remarks on the general situation of the Society—which, he pointed out, had had a successful Session in 1925, and had slightly increased in numbers—he called on the Auditor, Mr. E. Luff-Smith, to make a few remarks first on the income and expenditure account for the year ending December 31, 1925. He pointed out that there was still an adverse balance of expenditure over income for the year of about £38, but that printing was slightly going down.

Mr. FRIZELL, J.P., a Member present, suggested that it would be a good thing to realize a part of our securities so as to be able to start fair another year.

The AUDITOR then discussed the balance sheet.

A question was asked as to the subscriptions in arrear, estimated at £27 6s., and the meeting was informed by the Secretary that all had been received since the beginning of the year.

The CHAIRMAN then moved the following resolution:—

“That the following retiring Councillors were proposed for re-election: Prof. T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., H. Lance-Gray, Esq., Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., Lieut.-Colonel Hope

Biddulph, D.S.O., and Lieut.-Colonel A. H. D. Riach ; also that the names of Avary H. Forbes, Esq., M.A., and Arthur Rendle Short, Esq., M.D., B.S., B.Sc., be added to the Council, and that E. Luff-Smith, Esq., should be re-elected Auditor for the ensuing year at a fee of three guineas."

This was seconded by Mr. W. HOSIE.

Mr. T. A. GILLESPIE rose to enquire whether Mr. T. Roberts had voluntarily retired, and if not, why his name was not submitted for re-election.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the question had been gone into by the Council and that, while the personal character of Mr. T. Roberts had not been in question, it had been thought best, for the highest interests of the Institute, that his name should not be proposed for re-election on the Council.

The motion then, as proposed and seconded, was put to the Meeting, and carried unanimously.

Then the second resolution was proposed by Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS, and seconded by the Rev. R. WRIGHT HAY :—

"That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1925, presented by the Council, be received and adopted, and that the thanks of the Meeting be given to the Council, Officers, and Auditor for their efficient conduct of the business of the Victoria Institute during the year,"

and agreed to unanimously.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman was proposed by Mr. W. E. LESLIE, seconded by Mr. T. A. GILLESPIE, and carried unanimously.

The proceedings then terminated.

681ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 7TH, 1925,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. A. H. FINN IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced that the following had been elected since the last Meeting:—As Members: Percy O. Ruoff, Esq., and the Rev. Sidney Swann, M.A.; and as Associates: A. F. Kaufmann, Esq., Pastor S. F. Tonks, Miss Cheetham, Mrs. R. S. Elliot, the Rev. H. E. Anderson, the Rev. H. H. Meyer, D.D., the Rev. Rhys Bevan Jones, Alfred G. Webber, Esq., Miss E. E. Whitfield, the Rev. Thomas Miller, M.A., H. T. Shirley, Esq., and Miss E. F. Staley.

The CHAIRMAN then announced that Dr. Pinches had kindly consented to change dates with Mr. Michell, in order to allow him to be present and read his paper, which he could not have done on January 11th, owing to absence from England.

He then introduced Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E., His Majesty's Consul-General at Milan, to read his paper on "Scientific Criticism as Applied to the Bible."

SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO THE BIBLE.

By GEORGE B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E., Consul-General at Milan.

"CRITICISM," says Sir Edmund Gosse, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "is the art of judging the qualities and values of an æsthetic object, whether in literature or the fine arts. It involves, in the first instance, the formation and expression of a judgment on the qualities of anything. . . . It has come, however, to possess a secondary and specialized meaning as a published analysis of the qualities and characteristics of a work in literature or fine art, itself taking the form of independent literature. The sense in which criticism is taken as implying censure, the 'picking holes' in any statement or production, is frequent, but it is entirely unjustifiable. There is nothing in the proper scope of criticism which presupposes blame."

“Candid criticism should be neither benevolent nor adverse ; its function is to give a just judgment, without partiality or bias. A critic (*κριτικός*) is one who exercises the art of criticism, who sets himself up, or is set up, as a judge of literary or artistic merit.” “Neither minute care, nor a basis of learning, nor wide experience of literature, salutary as all these must be, can avail to make that criticism valuable which is founded on the desire to exaggerate fault-finding and to emphasize censure unfairly.”

Scientific criticism may, indeed, be defined as a shrewd and minute analysis combined with a scrupulously fair judgment. It is not mere fault-finding, nor heresy-hunting, nor captiousness, nor censoriousness. It is not the taking of a theory and seeking to prove it from the matter in hand.

Thus it is manifest that scientific criticism requires a trained judgment, educated to examine all sides of a question with equal fairness and the utmost impartiality, skilled to weigh the *relative* value of all items of evidence, to reject the false, the specious, and the merely plausible, and to decide on the balance of the resultant established facts without regard to the effects on pre-conceived theories. It must, at the same time, be mindful of the limitations of our knowledge of all the circumstances, and the possibility of later discoveries which would throw a new light on points which may completely alter the judgment expressed.

A critic is both an analyst and a judge. He is not an advocate or an interested party. In delivering his judgment he is entitled, of course, to give his reasons for his findings ; but if he allows himself to seek to prove either one side or the other, he ceases to be a judge, and becomes an *ex-parte* advocate, a mere special pleader. He is, in short, an umpire, not a player in the game.

Such qualities are indispensable in all true criticism ; as applied to the Bible they are more than ever necessary. The *odium theologicum* is not a thing to be lightly aroused, and the Book that has been regarded as Divine for thousands of years by millions of people must be treated with special care and conspicuous justice.

It is clear, therefore, that not every one can be a truly scientific critic. The training of an expert in other subjects is, indeed, rather apt to disqualify the specialist from being an impartial judge. He can give good *evidence*, but the task of *weighing* that evidence as against other evidence is not his, but that of an expert in *evidence*, a specialist in *judgment*.

It may be objected that this insistence on keen and impartial

judgment in a critic is pedantic and hair-splitting. What matter; it may be asked, if the critic does not come up to this standard so long as he brings out valuable truths, and he proves his facts—at least to general satisfaction ?

I answer that, firstly, true science is nothing if not “meticulous”; and, secondly, that proof to the general satisfaction is not the true criterion; and, thirdly, that the lack of discrimination between the functions of an advocate and those of a judge has led, and must inevitably lead, to the propagation of innumerable and very serious errors.

Literary criticism is divided into two branches, viz., “Textual” criticism and the “Higher” or æsthetic criticism. In both of these branches the above-named qualifications of the critic are essential.

In both, also, scientific criticism proceeds by—

- (a) Taking the object to be judged *as it is*; not according to theories of what it ought to be, or may be supposed to have been.
- (b) Careful analysis of the facts *as they exist*.
- (c) The estimation with scrupulous impartiality of the *relative weight* of the various items of evidence yielded by the analysis.
- (d) The unbiased comparison of the resultants from these relative weights with other known facts relevant to the subject.
- (e) The establishment of the truth of the criteria and standards of comparison. These in themselves have to undergo the same process of criticism before they can be accepted as standards.
- (f) A cautious expression of opinion, which in many cases must be tentative and provisional, subject to revision on the production of new evidence.

Let us now apply these principles to the criticism of the Bible.

Taking first the textual criticism, it may be urged that here, surely, is the field of the expert. I agree. The field of the expert in *criticism*, i.e., analysis and judgment, not necessarily that of the Hebraist, the archæologist, the historian and the palæographer. These are the *witnesses*, not the judges.

The evidence of one or the other, or of all, may prove decisive, but that is for the *judge* to settle, not the witness nor the pleader.

Here, also, it is to be noted that the textual criticism is not at the disposal of the higher critic for him to accept or reject or to work out at his own convenience. The textual critic has his own laws, which he must obey, and once the text is settled on its own merits, the higher critic, the commentator, and all others have no choice but to take it as the basis of their work. In this respect the term "Higher" criticism, if it implies a plane of action superior to that of the textual, as if the latter were a lower plane, is the reverse of correct. The higher critic receives his orders from the textual critic, not vice versa.

And yet much of the higher criticism of the day is conspicuous for the play made with the text in the interest of theories.

Now there is good reason for believing that the text of the Hebrew Scriptures is extraordinarily free from corruption. There are two things about it which differentiate it from other documents, and which must be borne in mind in the textual criticism: (1) the reasons for the peculiar care with which it was transmitted, and (2) the character of the documents themselves.

(1) It is easy to imagine sleepy, monkish copyists, half-mechanically transcribing from old, crabbed, torn, and damaged manuscripts of a Greek or Latin classic, or an Anglo-Saxon chronicle, mistaking contractions, missing the line and carrying on from a similar word, bringing marginal notes, glosses, and tentative emendations into the text, making corrections of their own, notes of doubtful points, reference marks, etc., which will prove so many traps for successive copyists, and otherwise introducing changes which it is the work of the textual critic to discover.

It sounds plausible. But it is by no means a true account of the Hebrew scribes, who were far from monkish. Nor were the Hebrew MSS. allowed to fall into this corrupt condition before being re-copied for current use.

Accidental errors may have been overlooked in a few cases. But it is inconceivable that it could be the normal procedure. The text of the Bible was on a totally different footing to a Thucydides or an Asser.

(a) It was a sacred book, the standard of religion; the code of laws, civil and ecclesiastical; the ultimate reference in controversies—and none are so keen as religious controversies; the text-book of theologians of different schools; of primary as well as higher education; of the national history and literature: and

of the most zealous preachers and reformers. It was the battleground of endless disputes between parties, the object of the minute study of all earnest seekers after truth, the comfort of the exiled and the oppressed. How could unwarranted readings escape detection ?

(b) We know that from the time of the destruction of the Northern Kingdom there were Israelites scattered in many parts of the world. Wherever there were Jews there must have been copies of some parts, at least, of the Old Testament, and litigants to appeal to them, and captious persons to wrangle over words and doctrines. Indeed, there is no valid reason to think that this was not true of Israel from those early times that the Hebrew records claim for the foundation of the nation, say, the fifteenth century B.C. It is absurd to postulate that Israel could have had no code of law, no national poetry, literature, nor philosophy, and no historical records before the time of Amos. This would mean that the nation which has produced the most remarkable and permanent literature in the world lived in a state of blank illiteracy for seven centuries in the midst of the most highly cultivated civilization, and in the very high-road of traffic at that.

Is it possible that texts could pass through so much "meticulous" and jealous criticism without the errors being observed ? Could a manuscript be accepted in these conditions by all parties as a standard, if it were in any degree faulty ? And is there any evidence of serious faults ?

(c) If the *apparatus criticus* of Ginsburg, for the Old Testament, or of any good critical edition of the New Testament be examined, it will be found that the vast majority of various readings are a mere matter of spelling, nothing worse than misprints. If we admit that errors may have crept into individual copies, unobserved in spite of all this watchfulness, that they should be universal, simultaneous, and identical is simply unthinkable.

(d) Next, it is to be remarked that the text of the Bible has come down to us in more numerous and more ancient and well-preserved codices than any other literary work. These existed and were re-copied in many different places, and in different countries, from Media, Elam, and Babylon to Elephantiné and Thebes in Upper Egypt. It is inconceivable that identical falsifications should have got into all, or even a few, of these widely scattered codices. Manuscripts might have been sent from one place to another to be copied, or as true copies of a

standard recension. But this would only show that such a standard recension already contained the errors that modern critics pretend to have discovered.

In all the cases where it is supposed that glosses, marginal notes, transpositions and omissions of words and clauses, attempted emendations and harmonistic insertions have found their way into the text, if these changes are present in both the Massoretic Hebrew, the Samaritan-Hebrew, the Samaritan version and the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint, this would prove that all these were derived from one single ancestor which already contained them all. This common ancestor must have contained *the whole of the Pentateuch as we now have it*, characterized by all these corruptions, and it must date from the time that the Samaritans received their Pentateuch, at latest.

But such a common corrupt ancestor presupposes an ultimate single ancestor in which these corruptions did not exist. It would require some considerable time for all these alterations to find their way into successive re-copyings of this earlier pure recension. For this means that one generation after another of students, commentators and copyists worked on their copies, annotating and correcting and then passing on their texts for others to continue the process, glosses, comments, midrashes, omissions, mistakes, transpositions, conjectural emendations, etc., gradually accumulating with each repetition. It also means that no standard copies of the pure original survived by which to control those in current use. Either a catastrophe that destroyed the pure original, or all its true copies, or a very long time for it to be forgotten, would be necessary to account for the survival of nothing but the "corrupt" recension from which the Massoretic and the Samaritan Hebrew and the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint are all derived.

And this "corrupt" recension must have been received, without suspicion of its faults, as authoritative by the Jews in all countries, the Samaritans and the Alexandrians. Thus we have the ancestor of our present texts, already tarnished by all their faults, dated at, and probably before, the time that the Samaritan received their Pentateuch, and the original pure text dating from many generations before that date.

For the date of the Samaritan, I must be content to refer to the work of the Rev. J. Iverach Munro on *The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism* (London : Nisbet, 1911), and the Rev. J. E. Thomson's paper on "The Pentateuch of the Samaritans," in the

Journal of the Victoria Institute, vol. lii (1920). Good reason is shown for believing that the Samaritan text, as we have it, dates from the time of Hezekiah (about 715 B.C.).

I must not be understood as accepting the theory that corruptions had already crept into this common ancestor. I have given my reasons for holding that it was next to impossible. I am merely showing now that such a theory, if it were true, would necessarily require a still earlier date for the pure original.

As a matter of fact, there is practically *only one* recension of the Hebrew text, and there is no evidence, except that of the Septuagint, which is of little value for the purpose, that any other recension ever existed. Nor is there any record of a universal destruction of texts which did not agree with it. Such attempts as were made to extirpate the sacred Scriptures of the Jews could not have been successful in all parts of the world. And if they had been, it would have caused the total disappearance of the whole Old Testament.

(e) Now, the Septuagint version, of which a good account is given in the Rev. A. H. Finn's *The Starting Place of Truth* (London: Marshall Bros.), was not made until the third century B.C., and the reasons given above for care in its transmission apply in a much lesser degree. The use of this version was comparatively restricted until it was taken over by the Christian Church, and there was considerable difference of opinion among the Jews as to its value and authority. In fact, rival versions arose to supersede it, such as those of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus. Christian apologists referred to them, of course, but they do not appear to have been so carefully studied as the New Testament, and we may say that, in general, the Old Testament Greek MSS. were handed down much as were other Greek MSS., and so subject to the same vicissitudes. The Greek text is, therefore, of less value for the control of the original Hebrew documents.

But it is not to be lightly dismissed on that account. The possibilities of genuine ancient readings under apparent corruptions must be borne in mind. Primo Vannutelli has shown in a series of articles on "Les Évangiles Synoptiques," in the *Revue Biblique* for 1925, that a frequent cause of misunderstanding, both in the Massoretic and the Septuagint, was the inability of the Jews to distinguish between the sounds of the Semitic gutturals and the Semitic sibilants and dentals. This inability existed apparently from very ancient times, perhaps from the time they left Egypt, and has been preserved by the Samaritans.

It accounts for many of the discrepancies between parallel passages in the Old Testament, as well as in the Synoptic Gospels. Here is another point for "Textual" criticism.

It may be urged that the reasons I have advanced for the special care that hedged the Bible texts are of force only as regards later times, at earliest some time after the Exile. This brings us to the subject of the *character* of the documents.

(2) The Prophets, and some at least of the Priests, were as persuaded of the Divine character of the Hebrew Scriptures they possessed as any of later times. The Books of the Bible were written by men who were actuated, or at least believed themselves to be actuated, by the purest and most sublime ideal of the Holy and Awful God of truth and righteousness of their own and every later time, whom to misrepresent and in whose Name to lie would be to incur His most dreadful wrath and punishment, and that they were uttering His messages; and their works were copied and transmitted by succeeding generations of scribes who were equally persuaded of the same truth. The only case at all similar is that of the Qur'an, a fact to which Mr. Estlin Carpenter makes no allusion.

The Hebrew text, exactly as we now have it, has, therefore, a very strong *prima-facie* claim to extraordinary accuracy. The strict principles of ordinary justice demand that this claim be respected in every case until, in particular instances, it can be shown to have failed. And in each of these instances the burden of proof lies upon those who question it, and the proof must be absolute.

Even in the case of apparent corruptions which make the text so difficult of understanding as to be almost unintelligible the critic is bound to take the text as it stands and to assume, *prima facie*, that it is the author's own words, and that he had some reason for expressing himself thus. It is the critic's business to seek first a possible meaning, before proceeding to the drastic measure of emending the words, however plausible and necessary the correction may appear to him. The fact that certain texts have survived the long ages of incessant criticism and jealous care in transmission, and have come down to us in a form almost, if not quite, unintelligible, is the best proof that they are *genuine*, not corrupt. For these difficulties have not been discovered for the first time to-day, and if the text had been "corrected," "emended" and "glossed" in the way too often supposed, these difficult passages would have been the first to be so treated.

In short, with regard to "Textual" criticism in general, the salutary rules laid down, for example, by Dr. J. F. Postgate, in his article on the subject in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, must be constantly borne in mind.

Let us now turn to the "Higher" criticism.

The higher critic may also be, of course, a competent textual critic, and he may thus combine the two functions. But he has no right to subordinate the one to the other. He must be as honest, as independent and as impartial in his textual criticism as if he had no concern whatever with the result. That this is extremely hard to do, and the temptation to make his text fit a preconceived theory so strong as to be almost irresistible, is only too manifest in the vast majority of the higher critical work published.

It must be borne in mind that, as all the presumption, in the case of "Textual" criticism, is in favour of the strict accuracy of the present Bible texts, so in the case of the "Higher" criticism, *all the presumption is in favour of the Bible tradition*. The Tradition holds the field until, *in every case*, absolute proof can be shown to rebut it. Much has been made of the force of cumulative proof. Now the cumulative effect of a hundred bad arguments is just *nil*.

The whole subject has been very cogently treated by an able lawyer, the late Mr. Arthur Phillips, late Standing Counsel to the Government of India, in his *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, 1923). Critics cannot do better than study this important work.

In no field is it more necessary to observe the rules of criticism than in enquiries that may so easily degenerate into fanciful hypotheses and an inevitable desire to try to prove them. The "Higher" criticism is in a special position and therefore needs a specially rigorous control. (1) It deals with highly technical subjects, such as Semitic philology, Archæology and Ancient History, of which comparatively few have a thorough knowledge; (2) in matters of religion there are bitter divisions of opinion, which fact leads many persons, who might be competent to judge, to leave them to experts, or rather to accept as experts those whose claim to authority they do not care to question; (3) a certain school has captured all the seats of authority and formed a close clique, so that it is hard for other voices to be heard; (4) the Bible has become the unhappy hunting-ground for cranks, and for young students on the look-out for subjects for

theses in which they can exhibit their originality, acumen, and learning. There has been too much readiness on the part of some to accept these lucubrations as serious criticism, especially when some "brilliant" suggestion can be made to subserve a popular theory.

I repeat, then, that a higher critic, like a textual critic, is both an analyst and a judge. He is not an advocate, nor an interested party. If he allows himself to seek to prove either one side or the other, he ceases to be a judge, and becomes an *ex-parte* advocate, a mere special pleader. In whatever else he may be an expert, the first essential must be that he be an expert in *evidence*, in the weighing of the *relative* value of items of evidence, and in judging of their relevance. He must be a specialist in *judgment*, and he must have no ulterior motives but strict justice to the author whose work he is examining.

For this purpose he must (a) take the work to be judged as *it is*. He is not at liberty to judge the work according to mistaken *interpretations* of it. Common justice to an author demands that he be judged on his *ipsissima verba*. (b) His statements must be accorded the *most favourable* sense possible. Fairness requires that a defendant who is not present to explain himself shall be fully credited with all that can be found in his favour. Thus as much ingenuity must be exercised in finding solutions of apparent contradictions, discrepancies, anachronisms, etc., as the opposing counsel may expend in exposing and insisting on them. It is most unjust to father upon an author errors which, if present, he might be able to refute. (c) As stated above, a higher critic cannot be allowed to manipulate the text without the consent of the textual critic. He must take the text just as it is given to him by the textual critic, with all its difficulties as it stands. Nor can the two functions be combined so as to favour a new reading in support of a special view of history, evolution, or religious doctrine which is in dispute. The moment this is done the critic abandons his rôle of judge and descends to that of a pleader. (d) He must first verify all his criteria, all his standards of comparison, all the linguistic, archæological, historical, chronological, ethical, and other scientific data before he can set them up as touchstones for testing the statements of an author. Where these are uncertain or imperfectly known, or known only in certain parts, his judgment can only be provisional and subject to revision.

Great as has been the gain in archæological discoveries of

recent years, it must be remembered that large and important gaps still remain in the early history of all the countries of the Near East ; also, much of our information is based on conjectural interpretations and restorations of fragmentary texts. The international history is well established for some periods, but for other and intervening periods, some covering several centuries, our knowledge is almost a blank. International chronology before the ninth century B.C. is also largely uncertain, whereas the Bible gives a connected chronology going back at least as far as the twenty-fifth century B.C. Whether this agrees with the secular chronology is another question, difficult to answer because the latter is so uncertain. It is often asserted that the Bible stories are incompatible with certain scientific facts. It is the critic's business to examine these facts, not to accept the assertion without further inquiry. Further, it is confidently held by some that the accounts in the Bible of Creation, the Flood, etc., are "myths" derived from Babylonian sources. A true critic cannot accept this theory without first applying the strictest tests and examining all the data in all their bearings. He must not be misled by specious arguments and superficial resemblances. Again, he must not take as axiomatic such a hypothesis as the evolution of ethical religions, and so begin by assuming that the worship of Jehovah arose from a form of Nature worship which began with benighted and barbarous Arabian tribes and "evolved" through various phases into higher forms borrowed from other nations, until some person, or a committee of persons, purified it into a henotheistic cult.

I have said enough to show that the work of the critic is no light task, and that it requires qualifications which are by no means common ; but I cannot admit that I have set the standard too high. On the contrary, I have but touched upon a few of the positive qualities of scientific criticism, and there are many negative prerequisites, pitfalls to be avoided, as well as conditions to be fulfilled. In such a case as the Bible, and in view of the serious consequences of belittling its value, the standards of criticism cannot be too high nor observed too punctiliously.

Personally I make no pretence to authority. But I have had many years' experience in sifting plausible stories and in testing bogus pretensions, as well as claims which, though good, suffer from unskilful presentation and ignorance of proper rights. And I have learnt the value of the maxim *audi alteram partem*. I cannot say that I have yet met with any attempt at Biblical

criticism that satisfies me, least of all that at present in fashion. The system exemplified in such works as Kuenen's *The Hexateuch*, Skinner's *Isaiah*, Charles's *Between the Old and the New Testaments*, and all the articles on Biblical subjects in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th edition), cannot be called criticism in any true sense of the term. It is nothing but an entirely one-sided special pleading. Its foundations are radically unsound and unscientific; all its standards of comparison are imperfect; its methods are unscrupulous, partial and, in some respects, antiquated; many of its arguments are illogical, quibbling, dogmatic and, at best, crafty. I do not deny the great learning, the immense industry, and the wonderful cunning with which it is worked out; but I refuse to bow to the authority of great scholars, when I find that they have mistaken their calling, and have debased the honourable office of a judge to that of the "artful dodger."

That "modernist" system is a surrender to ancient infidel gibes. Unskilled, and perhaps unwilling, to find solutions to apparent difficulties in the Bible, it has accepted the position with an air of magnanimity, and now seeks diligently for more "discrepancies." Mistaking modern science for sheer materialism, it has set up a rationalistic system to which it is its whole endeavour to reduce the Bible. (I use the term "rationalistic," for want of a better, to describe a philosophy which excludes Divine intervention in material and human affairs.) Imagining that modern science has no place for Divine intervention, it denies the supernatural and takes as its object to explain away the Divine revelation of the Book. The "Higher" criticism of this school is thus nothing but a begging of the question *ab initio*, and a vast scheme of sectarian endeavour to establish a purely rationalistic theology.

Now the outstanding feature of the Bible, and the most important element in it, is its claim to Divine revelation. It is precisely this element that has been the cause of its preservation to our own days, and the Book certainly possesses a living power which is due to nought else. An honest and thorough criticism cannot fairly ignore this feature of unique and primary importance.

It is no excuse to say that literary criticism is not concerned with the supernatural, whether genuine or pretended. The *higher* criticism of the Bible, if it has any pretence to be scientific, is certainly concerned with it. To put it on the lowest ground, Metaphysics have as much right to be considered as any other

science. Though no one is obliged to accept the conclusions of, say, Lord Haldane, in his *Reign of Relativity*, Bishop Gore in his *Belief in God*, or Lord Balfour in his *Theism and Thought*, it is undeniable that there is something to be said in favour of the *possibility* of a Divine revelation, and the *fact* of the Bible claim remains to be at least discussed. In the absence of any such attempt, it is grossly unfair to assume its impossibility, and to seek by underhand means tacitly to sap the foundations of all evidence of such revelation. Honest criticism ought, above all things, to be *frank*. I maintain, therefore, that this foundation of such criticism is radically unsound and unscientific.

It would take far too much space, and it is not to my present purpose, to go into the details of the numerous transgressions of the canons of true criticism.* Here I can only attempt to show in broad outline that any possible other side to the question of Divine revelation is not only ignored, but is treated as mere traditional obscurantism. All serious work demonstrating the unsoundness of the rationalistic methods is dismissed in a contemptuous footnote, if it is noticed at all, and nothing is considered but the arguments of rationalists, mostly German, in favour of the thesis. Occasionally "conservative" writers are cited, in order to give an air of impartiality, but it is invariably the most feeble that are chosen for the purpose, like skittles put up to be knocked down again.

I have already alluded to the unscrupulous use made of a faulty textual criticism to force the text into the support of the rationalist theory; a large part of present-day Biblical scholarship is entirely taken up with this illegitimate labour. Liberal use is made of "probability" and the "argument from silence"—the latter, in most cases, founded solely on our ignorance. These critics arrogate to themselves an extraordinary ability to penetrate into an author's mentality and inner convictions and purposes, as also into the circumstances of his supposed times; these are substituted for his declared aims and opinions. The Prophets are reduced to politicians and religious sectarians.

A good example of the shifts to which the system is driven in order to get rid of the prophetic element in the Bible is to be found in the two appendices to Dr. Skinner's "Isaiah XL to LXVI" (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges). In these long and

* For a discussion of some of these, the above-named work of Mr. Arthur Phillips may be consulted with advantage.

involved arguments the various views of a great number of rationalistic advocates are reviewed for the sole purpose of finding a means to apply the 53rd chapter to some other end than a prophecy of the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, Dr. Skinner gives the case away in the following significant words (p. 278): "To suppose that the prophet transports himself in imagination to a point in time when the sufferings of the Messiah were over and His glory not yet revealed *would be to abnegate the task of historical exegesis, and take refuge in a mechanical view of prophetic inspiration.*" (The italics are mine.)

Now there is another side to the question, and true criticism cannot but take it into account.

The entire Bible is taken up with one fundamental problem, the salvation of mankind from sin. "Yahwism" is not a petty monotheism. The Jehovah of the Bible is the Author and Upholder of universal and inexorable Law, moral and material. But He is also the God of Love, Mercy, and Grace. In his wisdom He made man with a free will, and gave him the unrestricted exercise of it, with one simple and easy test of submission. If man had used this freedom so as to co-operate with the Love and Goodness of God, this would have given to His Creator a glory and satisfaction which nothing else could do.

Man chose to transgress God's Law, and forthwith the law of the conservation of energy came in to make this transgression both irremediable and progressively destructive. But the God of Love, Mercy, and Grace had no intention of allowing His creatures thus to perish through His own gift, and His purpose thus to be frustrated. The problem, then, was to combine the justification and the carrying out to the full of the Law in all its rigidity, for man's own good, with the Mercy and Love which should save him from the inevitable consequence of his constant transgression of it, and, after all, to bring man back to that communion with the Holy God for which he was created. This is the essential subject of the Bible from beginning to end, and it underlies every subject treated in the various Books. It is true that this purpose does not become clearly apparent until we reach the New Testament, and especially the closing part of it. But in the light of the later Revelation we can see that this is the key-note of the whole Book.

How petty, then, is the idea of an imaginary strife of interests between Priests and Levites on the one hand, and between Priests and Prophets on the other, which is made the basis for

the elaborate dissection of the documents of the Old Testament ! And how foolish the twisting of a few expressions of Amos, Hosea, and Micah into an indication of a late date for the sacrificial system of Israel, and the building up, on this false supposition, of a great scheme of "reform," to which the "redaction" of the Pentateuch is ultimately to be attributed !

We want a sane, honest, and fearless criticism of the Bible, as it stands, on the lines indicated at the beginning of this paper, with no axe of its own to grind, up to date in its international history, chronology and archæology, and in its science, Semitic comparative philology and psychology. It is a great task, and it has not been done.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. A. H. FINN (Chairman) said : It so happens that, before I saw Mr. Michell's paper, I was engaged in writing a reply to an article on "Criticism," which contained Professor Robertson's definition : "All criticism is really an application of the principles of common sense by a person provided with the requisite knowledge of facts." On this I ventured to comment : "That, no doubt, is what true criticism should be, but it is to be feared that a good deal of what passes for criticism is no better than a prejudiced advocacy of views based on an imperfect survey of the facts," thereby somewhat anticipating Mr. Michell's description on p. 21.

When, a good many years ago, I first began to look into the "Higher" criticism, I can honestly say that I approached it with a fairly open mind, but was soon repelled by the clearly unfair presentation of the evidence, and the further I have gone into it the worse have appeared the arguments.

For a long time past I have been at work on a task, not exactly "Textual" criticism, but rather furnishing materials for it, namely a minute comparison of the texts of the Pentateuch. On this comparison was based my little work, *The Starting Place of Truth*, alluded to by Mr. Michell. Of the conclusions set forth in that book I will only touch on the most important. For the Pentateuch we have what we have not for any other ancient document, three witnesses, the Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Septuagint. Now

the Samaritan and the LXX differ from the Hebrew Massoretic text in a very great many places, but in most of these the Samaritan contradicts the LXX, or the LXX contradicts the Samaritan. Still there are many passages where the Samaritan and the LXX agree against the Hebrew, and these are sufficiently numerous and remarkable to show that they cannot have been arrived at independently but must have been drawn from some common source, as, for instance, when they insert a long paragraph in Leviticus identical in every word. To have affected the Samaritan, this source must have been an earlier Hebrew text, and the Samaritan probably goes back to the time of Hezekiah, if not still further back to the time of the separation of the Northern ten tribes from the Southern two. Then when it is simply a case of one Hebrew text against another, it is allowable to weigh one against the other, and I think I have shown reason for concluding that the Hebrew text underlying the Samaritan and LXX is less reliable than the Massoretic. Even if it were not so, if we had to adopt every one of the variations in which the Samaritan and LXX agree against the Hebrew, it would not alter a single historical incident or modify a single precept of the Law.

The real importance of testing the higher critical theories lies in this, that if the Higher critical methods are sound about the Old Testament, we cannot logically refuse to apply them to the New Testament as Modernists do. That means that we should have to consider the greater part of the New Testament unreliable. It is asserted that many acts and utterances have been attributed to our Lord which He never did or said. Also that much of the Apostolic teaching is not really Christian, being derived from pre-Christian Jewish erroneous ideas, or from Greek pagan mystery religions, and therefore not binding upon the "modern believer."

The subject of Mr. Michell's paper may seem somewhat uninviting, but it is of immense importance as showing how unreliable and unsound the higher critical methods are. For this reason I consider it a privilege to have been invited to take the Chair at this Meeting, and feel sure that all present will join heartily in the vote of thanks to Mr. Michell for his valuable paper, which I have now the honour to propose.

Mr. CHARLES MARSTON expressed his great approval and appreciation of the paper. He pointed out that the assumption underlying

the criticism of the Bible was that Humanity now possessed a fairly complete knowledge of History and the Laws of Nature which of course was absurd, yet one Bishop had gone so far as to say that the Scientific criticism of the Bible was now practically an exact Science! How could this be so when Science was continually changing its outlook? The so-called Supernatural or Supernormal was a special stumbling-block of the critics; they based their criticisms on the denial of its existence. Yet it was attested to throughout history, both Pagan as well as Christian. No fair-minded man could possibly ignore the conclusions of Sir Oliver Lodge on the subject of Spiritualism; they would soon receive general acceptance, and must change the whole critical attitude to the Bible. Sir Oliver Lodge's latest book, entitled *Ether and Reality*, had an important bearing on the subject of the Unseen.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS wished that the Chairman's comparative recensions of the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Greek versions of the Pentateuch might be published, if necessary by subscription.

The lecturer's claim that his experience in investigation as a Government official qualified him to judge the work of Higher Critics reminded him of Sir Robert Anderson's similar claim in his *Daniel in the Critics' Den* on account of his legal experience as an investigator rather than an advocate, in which he (the speaker) likewise shared. The Higher Critics so specialized by the midnight oil that they seemed to have no experience of the ordinary facts of life.

He pointed out that Mr. Michell had confined himself to the criticism of the Old Testament, and suggested that, while the official custody it had enjoyed had guarded its text from the numerous variations of the New Testament text, this advantage was more than countervailed by the much greater number of New Testament manuscripts which had been preserved, a comparison of which ensured the ascertainment of the true text.

But he believed the basic error of the Higher Critics was their exclusion of the possibility of Divine intervention, whether it took the form of miracles or prediction. He pointed out that we found no "sign" miracles in the book of Genesis, which, as professing to give the earliest records, might be expected to contain the most incredible marvels if we followed the analogy of other religions.

In conclusion, he called attention to the Bishop of Salisbury's article in last Saturday's *Times*, which showed that while in the

nineteenth century the number of Protestant missionaries had gradually increased until they numbered 15,000 in 1900, the succeeding 25 years had seen this number doubled to 30,000, which unmistakably showed what this living Book was still capable of, for the Protestant missionaries were and mostly still are all men of the Book.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said : I wish to add an expression of my very high appreciation of the excellent lecture to which we have just listened : and I congratulate the Council on securing the services of Mr. Michell for this occasion.

I have only two remarks to add to what has already been said.

First, I think the word "critic" is altogether out of place when used in connection with the Bible, especially in what is called *Textual criticism*. It is remarkable that the word "critic" is only used once in the Bible, viz., in Heb. iv, 12, where we read : "The word of God . . . is a discerner (Greek *critic*) of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Therefore, seeing that the Holy Spirit has declared that the Bible is intended to be a critic of the human heart, it does seem to me an altogether irreverent position for any human being to set himself up as a critic of the Bible ! I would suggest that we drop the expression "*Textual criticism*," and adopt, as an alternative, the words "*Textual study*" or "*Textual research*." For that is what is really meant, and it is more becoming for mortals in dealing with the inspired Word of God.

Then, as to the dual authorship of Isaiah, to which the lecturer has referred, and of which the critics are so confident. This is one of the many points, raised by the so-called "Higher Critics," the answer to which is found within the covers of the Bible itself. It will be seen by carefully reading John xii, 38 to 41, that we have, first a quotation from Isaiah liii (which, according to the critics, was written by Isaiah No. 2), then comes a quotation from Isaiah vi (which, according to the critics, was written by Isaiah No. 1). Yet in verses 39 and 41 both these quotations are attributed by the Holy Spirit to one author ! Then, let the critics be who they may, I say : "Let God be true and every man a liar !" (Rom. iii, 4.)

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : The able, judicial paper of Mr. Michell is a valuable contribution to the subject. It is with some trepidation that I submit that the argument of this paper would be strengthened by the omission of a sentence on p. 11 in the centre of the third

paragraph, which reads: "It (Scientific criticism) must, at the same time, be mindful of the limitations of our knowledge of all the circumstances, and the possibility of later discoveries which would throw a new light on points which may completely alter the judgment expressed." The latter part of this sentence pledges the future, but a judge can only give a true decision on the facts under review. If his criticism is contingent upon, or qualified by, some unknown factor it ceases to be of value.

The constituents of Scientific criticism under the headings (a) to (f) on p. 12 are very important, and if applied as tests to the conclusions of some modern critics, it will clearly be discovered that many of these conclusions which are proclaimed as "assured results" are without true foundations. For instance, let these tests be applied to the statement of Kuenen in *The Religion of Israel* (p. 225, vol. i): "To what one might call the universal, or, at least, the common rule, that religion begins with fetishism, then develops into polytheism, and then, but not before, ascends to monotheism . . . the Semites are no exception." Or to this quotation from Wellhausen: "For Moses to have given the Israelites an enlightened conception of God would have been to have given them a stone instead of bread." This is purely gratuitous and, it seems to me, the very reverse is the truth.

To quote Wellhausen again: "The giving of the law at Sinai has only a formal, not to say dramatic, significance. For the sake of producing a solemn and vivid impression, that is represented as having taken place in a single thrilling moment which in reality occurred slowly and almost unobserved." Here again, is an attempt at reconstruction which must be resisted in the name of Scientific criticism.

Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, in his *Digest of the Law of Evidence*, says, under the heading "Production and Effect of Evidence": "Whoever desires any court to give judgment as to any legal right or liability dependent on the existence or non-existence of fact which he asserts or denies to exist, must prove that those facts do or do not exist" (p. 108, 1899 edition). If many of the Higher Critics submitted their case to a court of unbiassed persons who asked for proper proof, they would find their claims rejected because the appropriate facts were lacking. Professor G. Adam Smith has said

that "criticism has won, and we have to discuss the indemnity." In this connection, it would be advisable to consult the jury, and not seek to force an issue. A distinguished modern preacher has said, somewhat sadly, that the findings of Higher criticism are not being received by a very large body of Sunday-school teachers and Church members. Their minds, he says, seem impervious, and their prejudices cannot be broken down. I would suggest that these resisting barriers against the tide of destructive criticism are erected in Christian minds through the work of the Spirit of God, and are abiding bulwarks.

Miss HAMILTON LAW said : My question has been partly answered by the Chairman. No one can criticize unless they have all the facts before them.

I would ask : Have the critics of God's Word all a available information before them ? *Reading recently about the Jews in Western Abyssinia, I was much struck by the fact that they have in their possession certain portions of Holy Scripture (O.T.) which they have apparently always had. These comprise, as I understand, the Law of Moses and the history of Israel up to the time of Solomon—no further—in what may be looked on as their own old records. This lends colour to one of the traditions concerning these people—namely, that they were sent by Solomon to Abyssinia in the days of the Queen of Sheba.

Have the critics traced the origin of such Scripture documents as are in the hands of these Falasha Jews ? And have they fully considered and given due weight to the testimony borne by these documents ?

The AUTHOR'S reply : Before replying to the discussion on his paper, Mr. Michell wished to express his high appreciation of the honour done to him in being allowed to open the new Session of the Victoria Institute with his paper. Also that his lecture should be presided over by Mr. Finn, whose work in the cause of Bible Truth is so important. He wished, too, to thank Professor Pinches for so kindly consenting to exchange the date of his lecture, so as to permit him to read his paper in person.

* I twice heard Mr. Flad speak about the Falasha Jews. Mr. Flad when a tiny child was in prison with his parents in Magdala in 1868.

With regard to the reference to Mr. Estlin Carpenter in p. 17, it should be explained that, through the exigencies of space, a paragraph relating to "The Documents of the Hexateuch," by Carpenter and Harford, had been excised, while this reference had been inadvertently retained. The paragraph omitted related to the specious argument summarized in p. 13, clause (1), of this paper.

With reference to the Chairman's work on the Pentateuch, the lecturer could only ardently hope that this would eventually be available for the general public. The edition of the Samaritan text, published by Bagsters in 1849, has long been out of print, and is very difficult to procure. The only other edition is a large and very expensive German work. Yet the Samaritan text is of the utmost importance for the scientific criticism of the Pentateuch.

In answer to Mr. Theodore Roberts, he wished to point out that in this short paper it had been necessary to confine himself strictly to the subject of "scientific criticism." But he ventured to think that it would be found that the principles laid down and insisted on applied equally to the criticism of the New Testament. But he welcomed Mr. Roberts' timely allusion to this fact.

While agreeing with Mr. Sidney Collett in the main, he could hardly give up the use of the word "criticism," as applied to the Bible, so long as it was confined to the proper meaning of the term as set out in his paper.

With regard to Mr. Ruoff's suggestion, the lecturer did not think the consequence of a prudent reserve in view of later discoveries would be quite such as Mr. Ruoff supposed. A decision on the facts under review may be perfectly true and valuable, so far as it goes. On points in which our information as to facts external to the Bible statements is imperfect, no judgment can be final as concerns these external facts. He thought Mr. Ruoff's contribution to the debate was, in other respects, most convincing.

Miss Hamilton Law's remarks were also most interesting. Mr. Michell could not help feeling that there must be Biblical documents still undiscovered that will yet be found, and which will throw a decisive light upon many subjects now in dispute. Not only in Abyssinia, but probably in Egypt, and perhaps in other parts of North Africa, it is well within the bounds of possibility that such discoveries may be made. It is very remarkable that the

great activity in archæological research, since the war, in countries where it was hitherto hampered by the misrule of the Turk, has been rewarded by very valuable finds.

Almost any day something decisive may be found. Meanwhile, it was not only in the lack of examination of the documents of the Falashas that Biblical criticism is at fault. There remains a vast field for young students yet to occupy. It would be well worth the while of a new school to take up the study of the comparative philology of the Semitic languages from the earliest to the latest times, tracing their development and their mutual relations and influence on one another. Only thus can the ages of different writers be determined, as, for instance, we can do in the case of Anglo-Saxon, Old English, Middle English, Elizabethan, &c., &c.

Then, the Cuneiform documents await a similar treatment in order to distinguish what things in Babylonian and Assyrian history, literature, and myth rest on late, and what on really ancient, testimony. We must get down to a groundwork of really scientific research based on facts and not on theories.

682ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 11TH, 1926,

AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following as Associates:—The Rev. William Hudson; Major William J. Rowland; and Miss Agnes M. Naish.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., to read his paper on "Notes on the Discoveries at Ur and Tel al-Obeid, and the Worship of the Moon-God."

NOTES ON THE DISCOVERIES AT UR AND TEL
AL-OBEID, AND THE WORSHIP OF THE MOON-
GOD.

By PROFESSOR THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.

(With lantern illustrations.)

“AND the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shin‘ar.” How well we Assyriologists know these words—so simple, so ordinary, and yet, for us, so full of romance—that romance which lends poetry, as it were, even to the commonplace! How we should like to fathom the mystery of it all—the hidden things of mankind’s history on the earth after the Flood! But there is more than this, for soon the writer of Genesis proceeds to tell us about the Tower of Babel, the first of Shin‘ar’s cities, and the circumstances in which it was founded. They (we must regard this section of the earth’s population as having been the Sumerians) were travelling from the East (*miq-qedem*) and they found a plain in Shin‘ar, where they decided to build a city and a tower

whose head was to be in the heavens (*bash-shamayim*). The opinion at present is, that these words do not contain any announcement that the old inhabitants of Shin'ar intended to scale—to invade—Heaven: they wished only to build a very high tower which would be a rallying-point for their race. "Let us make us a name," they are reported as saying, "lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth."

Nothing is said in Gen. xi as to the use to which this tower was to be put, and it has been taken, almost, if not quite, without question, as referring to the great "Tower of Babylon," Ê-temen-an-ki, "the house of the foundation-plinth of heaven and earth." I think that there is no doubt as to this identification, the more especially as there is no reference in history to any other great erection, rivalling the house of the "foundation-plinth," in the Babylonian capital. The identification, therefore, must be regarded as practically certain.

There is also no indication in the Bible-narrative that the tower erected by those who were journeying "from the East" was a religious structure, but its Babylonian name places that beyond a doubt. The tradition is, that the builders of the tower wished to reach Heaven, but such an idea certainly never entered their minds. Coming, as is stated, from the East—probably somewhere in the mountainous region of Elam—they knew perfectly well that if they seemed to be no nearer Heaven on the top of a high mountain than when they stood at its base, their comparatively puny erection at Babylon would be just as ineffective. Moreover, had they not already had experience of these things?

The answer to this question must be, it seems to me, in the affirmative, for the sacred towers of Babylonia were so numerous that that at Babylon may well not have been the first. Erech, Akkad, Calneh, and Ur all had them,* and we may take it for granted that all the great cities of Babylonia possessed them too. In Assyria there were also several of these erections, the best known being that at Calah, which is mentioned by Ovid; and as

* The cities with temple-towers are given in *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, ii, 50, as follows: "Šu-anna (Babylon), Borsippa, Niffer (Calneh), Šatti, Sippar, Agade (Akkad—two towers, apparently), Kiš (Okheimer—seemingly two again), Gudua (Cutha—dedicated to Nannar), Dilmu (Dailem), Marad (Amar-da), Ur, Uruk (Erech), Eridu, and Muru.

to the old capital, Aššur, that site had several, including a double tower, dedicated to Anu and Hadad.

It is therefore not surprising that the explorers in Babylonia of recent years have turned their attention to the excavation of the sacred mountain-temples (as we may call them) of Babylonia, and they were naturally attracted by the promising nature and condition of that at Ur. This was a city—probably a Sumerian foundation—of no small importance. Bible-students have always been much interested in its identification, as it is generally regarded as being the Ur of the Chaldees of Gen. xi, 28. This site is now called Mugheir, “the bitumenized,” or “pitchy,” owing to the use of bitumen in its construction.

According to Eupolemus, the city where Abraham sojourned was known as Urie (probably from the Sumerian form Uriwa), and signified “a city of the Chaldeans.” He does not refer to the patron-deity of the place, Nannar or Sin, the moon-god, but states that it was known by another name, probably Aramaic, Kamarina, which is evidently derived from the same root as the Arabic *qamar*, “the moon.” Eupolemus describes Abraham as having been the thirteenth in descent, and a man of noble race, superior to all others in wisdom. It was stated of him that he was the inventor of astrology and Chaldean magic, and on account of his eminent piety he was esteemed by God. It was further said, that under the direction of God he removed and lived in Phœnicia, and there taught the Phœnicians the motions of the sun and moon, and all other things, for which reason he was held in great reverence by their king.

Such is the translation from Eusebius’ *Praepar. Evangelica* as given by the late E. Richmond Hodges in his edition of Cory’s *Fragments*, p. 77. The question naturally arises, whether Eupolemus’ statements may not have been adopted by the Jews (from whom Eupolemus probably derived them) during the Jewish Captivity at Babylon. As is well known, Babylonia, as a whole, was called by the Sumerians *Kengi-Ura*, rendered by the Semitic population as “Šumer and Akkad,” the latter element being the Accad of the English editions of the Old Testament (Gen. x, 10). Ura was, in this case, equivalent to Akkad, the Babylonian state so named, apparently, from the name of the capital, called anciently *Agade*. Notwithstanding the precise and rather probable statements of Eupolemus, therefore, it seems more reasonable to think that Abraham dwelt in the pastoral lands of Ura than in the city of Ur, though it may also reasonably

be contended that he and his family pastured their flocks around the city of Ur, otherwise called *Uriwa* and *Camarina*. The Hebrew form of the name of Ur (אֲרָר) would in this case have been derived from the shortened Akkadian form, just as Akkad and Asshur, in Gen. x, must have been derived from the same Semitic nationality. Most of the late Assyro-Babylonian names in the Old Testament, on the other hand, seem to have been derived from Assyria. The earlier contact with the farther Semitic East on the part of the Patriarch was apparently the cause of the Babylonian name-forms, just as the Assyrian invasions of Jewish territory in later times caused the scribes to write Tiglath-pileser for Tiglath-pilesher* and Esarhaddon for Esharhaddon.† Abraham's residence in Babylonia seems therefore to be confirmed by the orthography of the writer of the book of Genesis.

Among the first to explore the ruins of Ur (now known as Mugheir) was the former British Consul at Basra, Mr. Taylor, who seems to have been aided by W. K. Loftus, who, in his book, *Chaldea and Susiana*, published in 1857, describes the site as he saw it. He naturally pays much attention to the *zikkurat* or tower in stages, which differs from those of other Babylonian cities, in that it was not square in its plan, but oblong. The longest sides face N.E. and S.W., and measure 198 ft., against 133 ft. in the case of the narrower sides. Both are described as sloping inwards at an angle of 9 degrees. Apparently this slope was not considered sufficiently pronounced to secure the safety of the erection through a long series of years, so it was further strengthened by buttresses. The basement-stage was 27 ft. high, and had what is described as an entrance on the N.E. side, a little S. of the centre. This entrance, Loftus says, was 8 ft. wide, and was reached by a straight stairway at right angles with the N.E. wall. A reference to the platform, on which this lowest stage was placed, gives the author an opportunity of describing the state of the country during the rainy season, for it was probably built to keep the structure clear of the floods, when they came; and we learn that, when the Euphrates is high, the surrounding plain is so covered with water that the ruins can only be reached in boats. These floods, indeed, must have greatly

* More correctly, *Tukulthi-apil-ēšarra*.

† Better, *Aššur-āhu-iddina*.

hampered the Babylonians, and account, doubtless, for the solidity and consequent want of elegance in their buildings. Ornamental decorations, moreover, had to be reduced, in that stoneless country, to a minimum, for though unbaked clay is very durable when well cared for and protected from the weather, and baked clay is practically indestructible, weathering did not improve it, and small pieces, when detached, had a tendency to be carried away. It is probably owing in part to these drawbacks that Babylonian buildings—palaces, temples and temple-towers—were so plain, and even Nebuchadrezzar's renowned palace at Babylon must have been much more attractive within than without. The plain outer walls of their buildings were generally relieved by the recessed panels which brick construction allowed them to introduce into their work.

In addition to the temple-tower, Sur-Engur, the renowned Babylonian king of forty-two centuries ago, claims to have rebuilt the defensive rampart of the city—*Bad-Uriwa*. Some of his bricks seem to have been inscribed with a stylus for impressing wedges, whilst others are impressed with a brick-stamp—primitive records printed without ink. The following is a similar text, but longer :—

(To) Nannar,
 the chief son
 of Enlilla,
 his king,
 Sur-Engur,
 the mighty man,
 lord of Erech,
 King of Ur,
 King of Sumer
 and Akkad.
 Ê-temen-imi-ila,
 his beloved house,
 he has built,
 its site he has restored.

Two meanings for Ê-temen-imi-ila are possible, namely, "the house of the lofty clay-foundation" and "the house of the foundation of elevation," according as one thought of the loftiness of the structure or of the elevation of mind that its durability and its constant pointing heavenwards, like the steeples of our

churches, inspired. The last line of this text shows, be it noted by the way, that Sur-Engur was not the actual founder of the building.

Another text, almost a duplicate of this, but inscribed on a clay cone, adds a line describing Nannar as *amar banda anna*, "Anu's lusty steer." Here, again, we have the idea of animal strength suggested by the satellite's "horned splendour."

Dungi, son of Sur-Engur, followed in his footsteps, and restored "the house of the mountain," as he seems to call the temple-tower—and this was at least a justifiable name for it. In the next line the king adds "his beloved house," and the critical reader at once asks "Whose?" for the name of the god is absent.

Another personage who dealt with the holy places of Ur was En-anna-tuma, probably not a king, but simply a kind of high priest. He was contemporary of Gungunu, who seems to have reigned about 1800 B.C. As his inscription is interesting mythologically, I give a translation, based upon those of my predecessors, here :—

To Utu (that is, the sun-god Šamaš),
 offspring of Nannar,
 flaming child
 of Ê-kiš-nu-gal,
 begotten of Nin-gal,
 his king,
 for the life
 of Gungunu^m,
 the mighty male,
 King of Ur,

II. En-anna-tumma,
zirru (special high-priest) of Nannar,
 priest of Nannar,
 within Ur,
 son of Išme-Dagan,
 king of Sumer and Akkad,
 has built his glorious house—
 his holy temple Ê-gina-abtum
 he has built—
 for his life
 he has dedicated it.

Here we have stated clearly the belief of the Babylonians that the sun was the offspring of the moon, and he was, therefore, at the same time the son of Nin-gal, "the great lady." En-anna-tumma, who built the temple in which the cone was found, was son of Išme-Dagan, and probably brother of king Gungunu, for whose life it was dedicated. Other points of interest are: (1) that the name of the temple Ê-Kiš-nu-gal is written as though it meant "the house of non-existent Kiš"—the city now represented by the mounds of Oheimer; (2) that the city of Ur is written at length in its archaic form of *Uriwaka*; and (3) that En-anna-tuma was *zirru*-priest of Nannar and ordinary priest of Nannar.

Notwithstanding that the dominion passed from Ur more than 2,000 years B.C., the city still remained, and probably remained to the end, one of the great religious centres of the land. In the geographical list, *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, pl. 50, the *zikkurat* of Ur, which is there called 𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦, *Ê-šu-kar-dudu*, is eighteenth in order (in reality fourteenth, because some of the cities preceding had temple-towers of more than one name), and Ur itself (𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦) seems to have had four names. From pl. 52, and vol. v, pl. 41, we learn that one of these names was 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦 or 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦, *Iul* or *Inar*.

To this temple-tower of Ur Nabonidus gives two names which are different from those of the geographical list—in full 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦 𒌦𒌦𒌦𒌦—*Ê-lugal-galga-sisa*, *zikkurat Ê-kiš-nu-gal*, "the house of the king directing observation (of the heavens), the temple-tower of the house of the great illuminator." He then goes on to say, that Sur-Engur, a king of former time, had built, but had not finished, it—Dungi, his son, finished its construction. These details he had seen—that is, apparently, read—in their inscriptions. As that *zikkurat* had gone to ruin, Nabonidus built, upon the foundation plinth erected by Sur-Engur and Dungi, his son, a *zikkurat* like the old one, and repaired its construction with bitumen and brick.

"For Sin, lord of the gods of heaven and earth, king of the gods, the gods who (are) gods (*or* the god of gods), dwelling in the great heavens, lord of Ê-kiš-nu-gal, which is within Ur, my lord, I founded and built (it).

“(O) Sin, lord of the gods, king of the gods of heaven and earth, the gods who (are) gods (*or* the god of gods), dwelling in the great heavens, when thou joyfully enterest into that house, may the prosperity of Ê-sag-ila, Ê-zida, Ê-kiš-nu-gal, the temples of thy great divinity, be established by thy lips, and cause the fear of thy great divinity to dwell among his people, and they will not commit sin. May their foundation be firm like the heavens.

“As for me, Nabonidus, save me from sin against thy great divinity, and give as a gift life for remote days; and as for Belshazzar, my eldest child, the offspring of my heart, set the fear of thy great divinity in his heart, and let him have no fault—let him be satisfied with fulness of life.”

If this inscription presents a true exposure of Nabonidus' faith, it contains several noteworthy points. The moon-god was the chief divinity of the Babylonian pantheon, and not Merodach; the temple of Merodach at Babylon, Ê-sagila, and that of Nebo at Borsippa, Ê-zida, belonged to him, as well as Ê-kiš-nu-gal, the moon-god was able to save from sin, and satisfy his devotee with life—a life extending to distant days (*ûmu rûqûti*). In each city, however, it is probable that its patron-god was regarded as head of the pantheon, and the antiquarian king, when he visited them, adopted the religious views of the people and their priests.

Nabonidus' bricks from the same ruin bear the following text in archaic characters:—

“Nabonidus, king of Babylon,
patron of Ur,
Ê-lugal-galga-si-sa,
the temple-tower of Ê-kiš-nu-gal,
has renewed and restored to its place.”

The views of the Babylonians in general with regard to the moon-god worshipped at Ur are not without their interest. As is now well known, his two commonest names were Sin and Nannar, the former from the Sumerian Zu-en, “knowledge-lord,” and the latter possibly a reduplicate form derived from the common Semitic root *nûru*, “light.” The explanation of this latter, however, is by no means certain, the more especially as it is always attached to the ideographic group apparently applied to the moon as 𒌒 𒌋𒌌 (𒌒), *d.uru-ki*, “the brother (protector is hardly likely) of the earth.” In an interesting lamentation over the desolation of Ur, probably due to the depredations of

some enemy, he always bears this name. As the literature of Babylonia, especially when it illustrates the poetry and mythology of the Sumero-Akkadians, is always of interest, I give here a translation of this text, with attempted restorations of the defective lines :—

[Tears] he produceth not.

. the glorious.

He poureth not forth tears—

In the vexation of his heart his eye moisteneth not.

With his crying he raiseth lamentation to heaven day
and night—

Day and night he raiseth (it)—he (raiseth his) voice.

Whilst appealing day and night, he is not comforted.

The Great Lady inhabiteth with him the hostile land.

From her glorious sanctuary the worship hath departed—

The flood is arrested, but the lady is not content.

(As for) the temple, its interior is a ruin, its side is a ruin,

Its interior an enemy hath destroyed—

(As for) the front, its beauty he hath destroyed.

Until the servant be not a servant, it is not to be restored.

He hath destroyed the House of the Life of Heaven—

Who, in the day of its glory, hath cut off its glory ?

The everlasting house, the edifice at Ur—

The everlasting house, the edifice of Ê-kiš-nu-gal.

R. Ur is a house of plenty in the land—

Ê-kiš-nu-gal of Nannari.

In heaven and earth he resteth—

heaven in earth he encloseth.

Father Nannar, lord of Ur,

To the great lady, the lady of Ê-kiš-nu-gal, give thou rest.

Heaven and earth, heaven and earth together ;

The heaven of Uraš, with the growing seed ;

(Of) En-ki, Nin-ki ; En-ul, Nin-ul ;

En-dauma, Nin-dauma ;

En-du-azaga, Nin-du-azaga ;

En-u-tila, Enme-šarra ;

The princess of the spirit of heaven, the lady of the mountain.

(Of his house), Ê-kiš-nu-gal, the place he will restore.

. . . . [let this] be the [invocation (?)] of Zuenna (*i.e.*, the god Sin).

. (Wanting.) complete.

Written and made clear like [its original]
[Palace of Aššur-bani-âpli, king of] Assyria.

(Here the tablet is broken, but there is every probability that the line containing the Assyrian king's name was not followed by any other.)

The "Great Lady" was *Nin-gal*, the spouse of the moon-god, and inhabited the temple of Ê-kiš-nu-gal with him. Her image, however, seems at some time to have been carried off into a hostile land, like that of Nanaa of Erech, which was brought back from Elam by the army of Aššur-bani-pal, and restored to its place. This statue had been "in exile," as it were, for 1,655 years.

Like all the great Babylonian towers, that at Ur had a sacred enclosure, designated by the Greek word *temenos*. The *zikkurat* lies in the western corner of this, closer to the S.W. than to the N.W. wall; and in the S.W. wall, right in front of the tower's centre, was the gateway repaired or rebuilt by Nabonidus.

East of the mound, and almost in a line with the face of the tower, the explorers found the remains of the shrine Ê-nun-maḥ, dedicated to the moon-god and his consort. Mr. Woolley speaks of the enormous amount of rubbish which had to be cleared away, but in the courtyard were the walls and pavement of a large building occupying part of the area between the *zikkurat*, Ê-nun-maḥ, and the N.E. and N.W. walls. He, therefore, dug out to sixteenth-century level the N.W. range of chambers.

The sacred enclosure seems to be a large courtyard paved with bricks, with a single range of intercommunicating chambers on three of its sides. The doorways open on to the courtyard. He describes them as suites of varying extent like self-contained flats, on both sides of a triple doorway with gate-towers and wide gate-chambers. As is often the case in Babylonian ruins,

these have been reconstructed over the ruins of earlier work. As it stands, the courtyard-building is of the time of Kuri-galzu, who reigned about 1600 B.C., and whose brick-stamp occurs in the upper courses. There was a still earlier building, possibly of Bûr-Sin's time, but its plan is unknown.

The S.W. wall is described as presenting the peculiarity of panels of plain wall with long stretches of attached half-columns or rather less. These are 1 m. wide and project 30 cms. They are built of specially shaped bricks, the upper ones unbaked and the lower ones baked, thickly "mud-plastered," and with well-preserved whitewash. A low wall with regular depressions in it gives rise to the suggestion put forward by Mr. Woolley, that it supported a row of wooden columns which, with the half-columns projecting from the outer wall, formed a kind of cloister on that side.

As to the history of this precinct, the possible work of Bûr-Sin, and the work of Kuri-galzu, have already been referred to. The pavement of the court, however, was repaired by Rammānu-âbla-iddina^m (about 1070 B.C.), but more thorough work was done on it by Sinbalaṭ-su-iqbi, Assyrian Governor of Ur about 650 B.C. This implies that the governors installed during the Assyrian dominion took the place of the king in caring for the sacred erections in their charge, and we may, therefore, expect an interesting series of inscriptions when the site has been sufficiently excavated.

TEL AL-OBEID.

The first in chronological order were the excavations at Tel al-Obeid, the joint expedition of the British Museum and the University of Pennsylvania. This Mr. Woolley's report describes as a small isolated mound about four miles W.N.W. of Ur on the line of an old canal, by means of which, doubtless, produce and necessities were sent to and from the other cities—that is, when, and if, the canal was navigable for small craft of any kind. The discovery of the site and the first excavations made there are due to Dr. H. R. Hall, Keeper of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities at the British Museum, who has published interesting and important accounts of what he found there.

In this site we have a good example of what one might expect to find in a small town in ancient Babylonia. Upon a small

natural hillock rising above the surrounding alluvium—the soil from the Persian Gulf and the two great rivers flowing into it—the explorers found a solid platform of stone—a rare material in Babylonia—supporting an erection of the nature of a Babylonian Temple. The lower portion of the wall is described as being of baked brick, the upper portion of sun-dried brick, and the core of crude brick. This, of course, points to its having been a small temple-tower, designated by the old Assyro-Babylonian word *zikkurat*. Stone again entered into the construction of the steps on the S.E. side—a longish staircase in front of which was a brick altar. On the S.W. side a smaller platform of crude brick projected, with a smaller flight of stone steps on the N.W. end. On the main platform stood a temple, now completely ruined. Near here was discovered the foundation-inscription, thrown out when the wall was destroyed. This reads as follows:—

To Nin-ḫursag,
A-anni-padda,
king of Ur,
son of Mes-anni-padda,
king of Ur,
for Nin-ḫursag
(the temple has built).

Transcription.

d. Nin-ḫur-sag,
a-an-ni-pad-da
lugal Uri(wa)
dumu mes- an-ni-
pad-da
lugal Uri(wa)
d. Nin-ḫur-sag-ra
(é mu-na-du).

I have not seen this inscription, so do not know either the exact wording, or the arrangement, of the last line, as that seems to be written on the reverse, which is not published in the reprint which I have. The same remark applies to the ends of lines 3 and 5, which seem to be continued on the edge, and probably extended to the reverse.

The strange thing about the plan of this temple is, that there seems to be but little attempt at symmetry in it. Mr. Woolley's plan shows that the rear was fairly placed at right angles with the sides, but the S.W. front retreats, as it were, at the eastern end, on the right of the staircase, forming an obtuse angle, whilst the wall on the left of the staircase forms an acute angle, though not pronounced. The staircase, moreover, is not in the centre of this front, and has a slant to the east. Erections around this temple probably influenced the builders—or, rather, rebuilders—of its walls, but the Rev. J. P. Peters noticed similar irregularities at Niffer; nothing, he says, seemed to be really well centred.

Nevertheless, the restoration of the S.E. façade, with the steps, landing, and porch, has not a bad effect, as the varying angles are not noticeable.

It is impossible to notice all the details of this interesting little site, with its temple dedicated to the "Lady of the Mountain," and all the objects and erections connected with it. Suffice it to say, then, that according to the explorers' discoveries, Dungi, who reigned about 2250 B.C. at the neighbouring town of Ur, was the last king to restore the buildings there. For 4,000 years, therefore, wind and storm have worn down, as it were, the deserted sanctuaries and brought the remains nearer to a state of decay. Yet it was, in its time—perhaps for 2,000 years before its desertion—a place of some importance, as the interest shown in it by its earliest royal patrons show. The works of art which were found on the site are of considerable importance. Among these may be mentioned the mosaic columns from the temple-porch, which consisted of a wooden core covered with bitumen, and overlaid with tesserae of light-red sandstone, black paste, and mother-of-pearl. These columns seem to have been about $2\frac{1}{2}$ yds. high and 1 yd. (90 cms.) in circumference. Others had been found by Dr. Hall, and still others, smaller, existed.

Further artistic productions belonging to this age-old temple were remains of four copper statues of bulls, mostly in a very bad condition after their forty-two centuries of burial in the earth. They were about 2 ft. high, and were represented advancing with the head turned sharply outwards from the left shoulder. The method of producing them seems to have been by means of castings and plates of bronze fastened to a wood core by means of bronze nails.

Of special interest are the artificial flowers, their stems and

calices of baked clay, the petals and corolla of white limestone, red sandstone, and black paste. The petals sloped downwards, so as to make the blossoms sharply convex. These flowers, it is said, must have stood upright in the open, being fastened together so that they would strike the beholder as being natural. They were closely connected with the standing figures of bulls, and occupied a position suggesting the ground-level, so that the bulls seemed to be walking in a field of daisies.

There is also an admirable frieze with inlay-figures depicting a milking scene, and another with a procession of bulls. In this case the inlay used was shell—a favourite material for carving and engraving among the Assyro-Babylonians.

As already noted, the distance of Tel al-Obeid from Ur, or Mugheir, is about four miles, and it is thought that it was a place of pilgrimage, like Ur itself, and all the other holy places of Babylonia. Of this there can hardly be any doubt, and the artistic decorations of the temple imply that a real attempt was made to render the shrine of Nin-hursag attractive. Its sudden abandonment is difficult to explain, but there is just the possibility that its abandonment was due to an invasion by an enemy, and that, like Pompeii, it was cut off when in the height of its prosperity. The full history of Dungi's reign, when found, will probably inform us upon this point.

I have not found in Mr. Woolley's description of the excavations at Tel al-Obeid any indication as to what the ancient name of the place was, but it may, by chance, have been based upon that of the temple, Ê-Nin-hursag, "the House of the Lady of the Mountain." With regard to the goddess herself, Nin-hursag was the spouse of Merodach, and therefore the principal goddess of that great capital, where she had a temple named Ê-mah, because of her other name, Nin-mah, "the supreme Lady." The little city four miles from Ur was doubtless in later days, the days of Babylon's supremacy, completely forgotten.

THE GOD OF UR.

The nature of the divinity worshipped at Ur is not without its importance. As is well known, the deity of the city was the moon-god Nannar, also called Sin. It may be contended that there is much uncertainty as to the origin, and consequently the etymology of these words, but it is probable that the former is (as suggested on p. 39) for *Nannar*, and derived from the

Semitic root *nūru*, "light," whilst the latter is Sumerian, and means "knowledge-lord," from *zu*, "to know," and *en*, "lord." We have here, then, the moon-god in his two aspects—that of light-giver, and that of the deity—the *lord*—*knowing* "signs, seasons, days, and years." This is referred to at length in the Akkadian Creation-story, which states that when Merodach ordered the heavenly bodies :—

*He caused Nannaru to shine, ruling the night,
He set him then as a creature of the night, to make known the
days.
Monthly, without ceasing, he glorified him with a crown.
"At the beginning of the month then, kindling over the land,
With horns thou shinest to make known the six days,
On the seventh day is the half-disc.
A sabbath then thou encounterest (in) the middle of the month,
When the sun on the horizon of heaven hath approached
thee."*

Nannaru, therefore, as already recognized (*see* Langdon, *Epic of Creation*, pp. 158-9) indicates the new moon. The usual ideographic group for this is $\rightarrow\text{†} \text{𒀭} \text{𒂗}$, in which the first character is the common sign for divinity, and the remainder apparently a combined character, consisting of the sign used for "brother" and "to protect," and that meaning "earth." That the Babylonians should have thought of the moon as "the brother of the earth" is by no means improbable, especially as they had come to the conclusion that the planets and the earth were all of the same nature; but this idea ought not to apply to the group for "new-moon" only.

In all probability there is no inscription in praise of Nannar to compare with that published in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, iv, pl. 9. There the reader finds the honorific titles bestowed on this noted deity by his worshippers, especially those of Ur, which, in fact, is mentioned in lines 9-10. I give a rendering of the opening invocations here :—

- 1-2. *Lord, prince of the gods, who in heaven and earth alone is supreme.*
- 3-4. *Father Nannar, lord Anšar, prince of the gods (who in heaven and earth alone is supreme).*
- 5-6. *Father Nannar, great lord Anu, prince of the gods (who in heaven and earth alone is supreme).*

- 7-8. *Father Nannar, lord Sin, prince of the gods (who in heaven and earth alone is supreme).*
- 9-10. *Father Nannar, lord of Ur, prince of the gods (who in heaven and earth alone is supreme).*
- 11-12. *Father Nannar, lord of Ê-kiš-nu-gal, prince of the gods (etc.).*
- 13-14. *Father Nannar, lord of the sparkling diadem, prince of the gods (etc.).*
- 15-16. *Father Nannar, whose royalty is exceedingly perfect, prince of the gods (etc.).*
- 17-18. *Father Nannar, who in a princely garment advanceth, prince of the gods (etc.).*
- 19-20. *Mighty steer whose horn is massive, who has perfected his limbs, he groweth a beard of lapis, beauty and richness abound (to him).*
- 22-23. *Fruit which is produced by itself, growing in its abode, seemly to the sight, its richness undimmed.*
The merciful one, begetter of all, who with the living creatures hath founded a seat.
The merciful and gracious father, who holdeth the life of the land in his hand.
Lord, thy divinity, like the remote heavens (and) the vast sea, is filled with awesomeness.
Producing the land, founding the shrines, proclaiming their names.
Father, begetter of the gods and man, founder of the sanctuary, fixer of the divine offerings.
Proclaimer of the royal priesthood, giver of reverence (?), decider of destiny for the remote future.
Ancient, mighty, whose heart is wide, none can divine (it).
The speedy one, whose knees rest not, he who openeth the road for the gods his brothers.

From this extract we see that the Urite priests claimed for Nannar all the attributes of a supreme deity—he was a prince of the gods, who in heaven and earth *alone was supreme*, the embodiment of Anšar, the “host of heaven,” and identical with Anu, the god of the heavens himself. But—and probably above all things—he was the type of the self-creator—the fruit (*ēnbu*) which was produced by itself, for the disc of the moon was likened to the products* of a fruitful tree. They believed

* See pp. 21-22.

that he "held the life of the land in his hand," and it may, therefore, be supposed that the Babylonians had found out the influence which the moon exercised on vegetation. As he is so frequently described as "father" in this hymn, it is only natural that he should have been regarded as "the begetter of the gods and man," though this is not in accordance with the belief in the other cities of Babylonia, especially at Babylon, where the begetters of the gods were Apsū and Tnawath, and Merodach and Zēr-panitu^m were the creators of mankind. These and other varying mythological teachings in Babylonia, however, possibly led to the identification of all the gods with Merodach—for at Babylon, Sin or Nannar was "Merodach the illuminator of the night," and owing to this, all the deities of the Babylonian pantheon could be identified with him and with each other.* Such was the nature of Babylonian monotheism, which was due in all probability to what became an absolute necessity, namely, that of reconciling conflicting creeds within the Babylonian States, with their various patron gods, and the related heavenly hierarchies admitted by the various priesthoods.

Owing to his knowledge of the "times, and seasons, and days, and years," Nannar was *bēlu^m paris purussē šamē u ēršiti^m*, "the lord, maker of the decisions of heaven and earth."

Tameḥ d-Girri ū mē-mutariū šiknat napišti^m, ayau ilu mala-ka imsi ?

Holder of the fire-god and of water, causing living creatures to exist, what god hath found as much as thee ?

Ina šamē mannu šīru ? Atta idišši-ka šīrat.

Who is supreme in heaven ? Thou alone art supreme.

Ina ēršiti^m mannu šīru ? Atta ēdišši-ka šīrat.

Who is supreme on earth ? Thou alone art supreme.

As for thee, thy word is recorded in heaven ; and the Igigi bow down the face.

As for thee, thy word is recorded on earth ; and the Anunnaki kiss the ground.

As for thee, thy command passeth on high like the wind ; (and) pasture and watering-place abound.

Here, again, it would seem that the Babylonians were aware of the moon's influence on vegetation and on the breeding of

* See the *Journal of the Victoria Institute*, 1895, pp. 8-11.

Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, xii, pl. 18, l. 14 from below, where the pronunciation of 𒌶 seems to be given as *nu-u* instead of *šir*. In the next line we have this character followed by 𒌶 , and we are told to pronounce this group as *giš-nu*. This is explained by the Semitic *nu-[u-ru]*, "light," thus setting the reading *É-giš-nu-gal* beyond a doubt. *Giš-nu* is

also given as the pronunciation of 𒌶 , rendered by three words which are unfortunately incomplete. We have, therefore, no clue as to the other meanings of the group, though one of them, if completed as *šarū*, with the possible signification of "to dig," might suggest that *giš-nu* may mean "penetrating light." A temple with a similar name was 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶 , *É-šir-gal-anna*, "the house of the great light of heaven," explained as "temple 64 (at) Lagaš" (Tel-loh) in *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, II, 61, 37g.

In the "great list of gods," the section explaining the attributes of Sin are unfortunately broken away on the left-hand side, where his Sumerian names occur (*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, XXIV, pl. 39), but the right-hand (Semitic) column is intact. From this we learn that as Nannar, he was "Sin of heaven and earth," an explanation which seems to attribute to the first component character after the divine prefix, 𒌶 , *sis* or *uru*, the meaning of "heaven," whilst to 𒌶 , *ki*, was attached the ordinary meaning of "earth," which would imply that the Assyrian scribes quite neglected the fact that, in the early Babylonian texts, the group for Nannar is always written as one character. In the next line, as *Zuenna*, "knowledge-lord," he is explained as being "Sin of decisions" (*purussū*). After this he successively appears as "Sin of tiaras," "of rain," "of brightness" (*namurte*), "of becoming bright" (*namāri*) (which translates 𒌶 𒌶 𒌶), "of prayer" (*ikribe*), "of dawning" (*niphe*), "of the sheepfold" (*supuri*), "of riches" (*igisi*), "of the ark" (*makurri*), "of the month," and "Sin, whose shining is bright."

In this list, the attributes of Sin, the moon-god, number fifteen, but there is only one set down for Nin-gal, his spouse, who is simply "the great lady of the land"—*Nin-gal ša mātī*. This is an undoubted defect in the unknown Babylonian compiler's work, but the gap can apparently be filled by a reference to other tablets, as, for instance, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, XXIV, pl. 30, IV, 11 ff., where we find Nin-galla followed






by *Ab-nir-ra* (?), *Nin-sir*, "lady of light," *Gul-si* . . . , *Lugal-guda-mu*, "queen of my (heavenly) bull," and *Nin-dirig-ga* (?) "the supreme lady" or the like.



In the name Arioch (Gen. xiv), it is thought that we have the not uncommon Sumerian appellation of Sin or Nannar, namely, *Aku*. In this case, Arioch would mean the same as *Warad-Sin*, "the servant of the moon-god," with whom he is commonly—and probably rightly—identified. On pl. 49 of *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, XXV, we have this word, *A-ku*, explained as *Sin mâr rubê*, "Sin, the princely son," which gives the etymology attributed to it—a, "son," and *ku*, "prince." Ξ *Ku*, however, with the meaning of "prince" is stated to have been pronounced *ge*. Nevertheless, we can hardly say that the etymology is unsound, as the final vowel may have been omitted altogether, producing a form more nearly approaching the Hebrew. "G," moreover, was often hardened to "k" when final. Arioch for *Eriak* may be simply due to faulty massoretic pointing, as in other Hebrew transcriptions of Assyro-Babylonian names. In what I have called "the legend of Chedorlaomer" in the *Journal of the Victoria Institute* for 1895-6, p. 26, we have the name of a Babylonian king which I then regarded as being that of Arioch. This, however, was written differently, and appeared as *Eri-Ê-aku*, and had a strange variant, namely, *Eri-Ê-ku*, "the servant of the (divine) Êaku" or "Êku." The likeness of the two names is so great that they are most likely connected, but whilst *Eri-Aku* or *Eri-Age* is historical, *Eri-Êku* or *Eri-Êaku* is, in all probability, legendary. Other names compounded with that of the god Sin appear in the *Journal* for 1895, pp. 7, 8-10, 13, 15-16.


The migration of the family of Terah to Haran has been attributed to the supposed fact that the moon-god was the deity whom Terah worshipped owing to his residence at Ur of the Chaldees. In the Talmud, the patriarch is described as an officer in the service of Nimrod, who, like his master, worshipped idols. How far this may be true we do not know, but the chapters of Genesis dealing with Abraham show that the family of Terah was not entirely free from that taint, though there is no mention of any deity other than "gods" who were in the form of *teraphim*. The twelve gods mentioned in the Talmud, as worshipped by Terah, suggest that he was regarded as having adored the deities connected with the signs of the Zodiac. As to Haran, the Haran of the inscriptions, the moon-god was certainly worshipped there, but so were the other Babylonian deities, just as the same

pantheon was honoured in most of the cities of Babylonia and Assyria.

From these notes we see that the moon-god was a favourite deity among the Babylonians and the Assyrians. He was to them one of the great gods, comparable with Merodach. Some of his titles and descriptive names have been already given, and to these may be added others. We have seen that he was prince of the gods; lord Anšar; great lord Anu; lord of Ur; lord of the sparkling diadem, etc.; such are some of the names already quoted, but he was also "the great horn of heaven," "the princely son," "the king," "the lord," "the distributor of abundance" (*Mu-hengalla*), "*Asari*" (a name of Merodach), "the star of heaven" (in the sense of "the greatest star"), "the king of the land and of the earth," "the god 30," and "the god of the 30th day" (*Šelašū*).

One more point may be noticed, namely, the likening of the moon to a fruit, already referred to. The best-known passage is a colophon which gives the running title of the Assyro-Babylonian series of hemerologies—those monthly lists of divine feasts and sabbaths which were such a feature of Babylonian worship. This title is probably taken from the first line of the first tablet, and reads *Sin bēl warḫi*, "Sin, lord of the month." In this the name of Sin is expressed by the scribe-invented ideograph , which generally stands for *inbu*, "fruit," the Heb. *enabh*. There were apparently two explanations of this character, one being that it was composed of  twice and  twice; and the other (which has the form ) that it was  four times (*Western Asia Inscriptions*, V, pl. 19, lines 57-60). Unfortunately the Semitic explanations are broken away.

Still another variant form is given by the B.M. tablet 81-11-3, 1539, where we find  pronounced *mašdu* in Sumerian explained in the Semitic column as *inbu*, "fruit," and  *Sin*, the common name of the moon-god. All these three forms seem to me to be attempts to show the roundness of a fruit, or the disc of the moon, by means of straight lines or wedges, the eye adding thereto an imaginary circle. Another ideograph for fruit is a fourfold arrangement of the character for "enclosure,"

thus: . The Sumerian pronunciation of this is *gurun*

and the Semitic rendering *inbi* for *inbu*, probably because, if the scribe had written the nominative form, it might erroneously have been read *inpu*. As to the ideograph, it probably expresses a heap or cluster.

Not only did the Babylonians and the Assyrians believe in many gods and many lords, but those gods and lords possessed many names. The moon-god's oldest names were probably Sin and Nannar: most of the others were descriptive or honorific, and a few seem to have been due to comparison with things on the earth. No other revelation had they, alas! than the revelation of their own imaginations. Yet worthy men were those old scribes of the wedge-writing of Babylonia and Assyria, and we owe to them mines of ancient lore and learning.

Postscript.

Since writing the above, Mr. Woolley's article upon the further excavations at Ur has appeared in the *Antiquaries' Journal*. In this addition to his reports of the work done he gives an historical account of the temple-area and that of the *zikkurat*. On the N.W. of the latter he located the terrace of Ur-Nammu (that is, Ur-Engur). Here he found this king's cones inscribed, in accordance with the usual custom, with a dedication to the god of the place, Nannar. They were inserted in the vertical divisions of the brickwork—a detail not hitherto known. Mr. Woolley next turned his attention to the Nin-gal temple on the other side of the *zikkurat*, where he found, among other things, a fragment of a diorite stele with a dedication to that goddess by Uru-ba-gal, king of Erech, who ruled about 2350 B.C. The dedication was made by his *šakkanaku*, Ur- (?). He thinks it is probable that the name is to be restored as Ur-Engur (Ur-Nammu); this would indicate that at this time Ur was a vassal state of Erech, and that Ur-Engur began his career as a subordinate governor who rebelled against Uru-ba-gal and, having achieved independence, founded the 3rd dynasty of Ur.

After this is a description of the sanctuary Ê-dublal-mah, where tablets of the nature of schoolboys' exercises were found. One of these, a "syllabary," or perhaps a sign-list, is designated a "the property of the boys' school." Most important of all, however, would seem to be what is described as the remains of a little museum of local antiquities, installed by Bêl-salti-Nannar,

daughter of Nabonidus, and high-priestess of the god. The writer of the notice in *The Times Literary Supplement* says, "How modern it all seems," but most Assyriologists would probably add, "What else could you expect from the daughter of the noble Babylonian antiquarian-king, Nabonidus, to whom students of Babylonian history owe so much?" Finally, Mr. Woolley's report describes the great stele found in Ê-dublal-maḥ, with a bas-relief, and recording "the erection of the greatest monument that to-day survives at Ur (namely, the *zikkurat*), and with it a contemporary portrait of the founder (Ur-Engur), who was the greatest of the city's kings."

It is probable that, as indicated by the name Sur-Šunabi, in the *Legend of Gilgamesh*, the element ~~U~~^U, *ur*, of Ur-Engur or Ur-Nammu should be transcribed as *sur*. The falling-away of the "s" occurs in the values of other characters.

An important historical personage appears in Sin-balatsu-iqbi, Assyrian governor of Ur about 650 B.C., whose name occurs on the pavement-bricks a few centimetres below those of Nabonidus in the Neo-Babylonian ruins of the temple of Nin-gal, the spouse of Nannar.

[Among the pictures shown were various forms of temple-towers, for comparison with that discovered at Ur: the "Tower of Babel" at Babylon; the double temple-tower at Aššur; an old Babylonian temple-tower from a boundary-stone; and two varying forms of temple-towers from Perrot and Chipiez's *History of Art in Antiquity*. In addition to these, the author was able to show, by the kindness of Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, Director of the British Museum, several pictures of the results of the excavations at Ur and al-Obeid (*Antiquarians' Journal*, Oct., 1924, pl. XLVI.); the N.E. elevation of the *zikkurat* at Ur; three views of the same from different angles; a view of the long flight of steps leading to the top; a portion of the brickwork with a cone of Sin-balat-su-iqbi still in position; the sanctuary Ê-dublal-maḥ; and friezes with inlays, including the milking-scene, from Tell al-Obeid. With the older pictures, the views, etc., formed an excellent series.]

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, in calling for a vote of thanks to Dr. Pinches for his lecture, remarked upon the thoroughness with which a difficult subject had been summarized. Many characters had been brought

before the audience, but the advantage of the lecture was not that it made the men to live again, but rather that it brought to view the magnitude of their work—work, moreover, that was human from first to last. If the religious conceptions were not particularly elevating, yet it was evident that they dominated the men who erected temple-towers and altars in pursuance of a devotion which it is difficult for us, in this day and in Western lands, fully to understand. And from the midst of such things, at the call of God, there came forth the father of the faithful, Abraham, of whom we read that he was “the friend of God.”

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS pointed out the contrast between the numerous flights of steps in the ancient temples which they had seen depicted on the screen and the Divine prohibition of the Mosaic law—“Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar” (Exod. xx, 26), as showing the difference between the religion of human effort and that of Divine revelation.

He regarded Abraham—the chief figure in the book of Genesis—as the first nobleman known to authentic history, and thought his position in Canaan resembled that of a European of to-day amongst negroes or Chinese. He called attention to Abraham’s self-abnegation in leaving the choice to his nephew, and his disinterestedness in refusing to take anything from the king whom he had rescued. It might be asked whence he obtained these fine qualities; but as a man’s character was mostly formed by the god he worshipped (and Abraham was known in after years as “the friend of God”), we had the greater question to answer: Whence came this pure monotheism which Abraham professed in his homeland amidst the idolaters, of whom we had heard from Professor Pinches, who believed the nonsense that the moon-god produced the sun (Joshua xxiv, 15)?

Abraham was evidently the depository of those ancient records which he carried with him to Canaan, and his descendants to Egypt, and which Moses seems to have put together to form the book of Genesis.

In revealing Himself to Abraham as the Almighty, God commanded, “Walk before Me and be thou perfect” (Gen. xvii, 1), even as our Lord in His Sermon on the Mount enjoins us Christians

to be perfect, as our Heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. v, 48). We, as Abraham, are to take our character from the God we know as Father, and thus not be affected by the way people treat us, but love our enemies—even as our Father is likewise unaffected by the treatment He receives, but makes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust.

The chief lesson that Professor Pinches would seem to teach us was the contrast between these old religions and that of the Bible.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES thanked the Professor for his learned paper and excellent illustrations.

Anything bearing on the history of Abraham, his departure from Ur of the Chaldees, and his idolatrous associations with the Sumerian temple-builders, was of special interest in these days, when the accuracy of Biblical statements was called in question.

The tower “and its top with the heavens” (Heb.), *i.e.* with the zodiac depicted on it, of Gen. xi—as in ancient temples in Egypt, and as perpetuated in Freemasonry to this day—was with rebellious intent.

“They left off to build the city”—but do not modern attempts at “reconstruction” include projects of human brotherhood from which the truth of God relating to Christ and His glories in creation and redemption are deliberately excluded? “The Great Architect of the Universe” is not intended to refer to Christ.

Mr. G. B. MICHELL, O.B.E., said: It is such a pleasure, and so important for the cause of the truth of the Bible, that a great authority on Assyriology, such as Professor Pinches, should favour us from time to time with reliable information on the subject of the testimony of the ancient monuments, that I hesitate to appear to find fault with anything he is good enough to tell us. And on the general subject of this most valuable paper I have no criticism to offer. I wish, however, to take this opportunity to raise the question of the connection between the earliest forefathers of Israel with Babylon.

I have the gravest doubts whether Abraham ever was in Babylonia, or whether the “land of Shin’ar” was in Southern Babylonia at all. Indeed, I think it can be clearly shown that neither of these

suppositions are true, or that early Israelitish culture ever came into contact with that of Assyria or Babylonia before the time of Ashur-nasir-pal III—say, 876 B.C.—when this king conquered Carchemish. Undoubtedly the “land of Shin‘ar” was identified with Sumer in the days of Daniel, at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.; but I believe that that was a late and a mistaken identification. I suggest that “Shin‘ar” is the same as the country called “Sangar” or “Shankhar” in the early Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions, and was situated to the north-east of Phœnicia, not far from Aleppo. Further, the Tower of Babel was in this country, and not in Babylonia. Note that the tower was never finished, and that the city which the builders intended to found was never built (*see* Gen. xi, 8); it cannot therefore be identified with Babylon; the names must not be confounded. The native and Biblical name of *Babylon* was “Bab-el,” the “Gate of God”; the name of the tower was “Babel,” connected with root “Belbel,” meaning “confusion.”

In Isaiah xi, 11, the name “Shin‘ar” occurs in a list which includes Assyria, Egypt, Pathros, Cush, Elam, Hamath, and “the coast-lands of the sea.” If juxtaposition signifies anything, the association here is rather with Hamath and the Mediterranean coast. “Shin‘ar,” in Joshua vii, 21, and in Zech. v, 11, is quite non-committal, and the only other references to the name in the Bible are in the book of Genesis. The name does not occur in the Babylonian or Assyrian inscriptions as applying to any part of Babylonia.

As for Nimrod’s kingdom, in Gen. x, 10, “Erech” is supposed to be the Assyrian Arku or Urku, the modern Warka, half-way between Hilla and Korna, a place of great celebrity in the cuneiform records. The identification of “Akkad” with “Agade” is very doubtful, and “Calneh” has not been identified at all. The Bible references associate Calneh with the districts north and east of Phœnicia. I am inclined to think that “Nimrod” may be another name for “Shulgi” or “Dungi,” to whom Professor Pinches has referred in this paper.

As for the birthplace of Abraham, I am convinced that it was not the great city of Ur, of which we have been hearing. It is carefully distinguished throughout the Bible as “Ur-casdim,” apparently to

accentuate this fact. "Ur-casdim" could not have been far from Haran, because Nahor, who remained behind, is shown in Gen. xxiv, 10, to have dwelt in Aram-Naharaim ("Naharin," between the Orontes and the Euphrates), and Bethuel, his son, and Laban, his grandson, as dwelling in Paddan-Aram, not far from Haran (Gen. xxvii, 43; xxviii, 10; and xxix, 4). There is an ancient Hebrew tradition to the effect that Ur-casdim was in this district and not near the mouth of the Euphrates.

I would point out that all the sympathies of early Israel, and indeed of their whole history, were with *Egypt*. They were consistently *pro-Egyptian* throughout, and *anti-Semitic*. In view of the German school of criticism and its insistence on the Babylonian origin of the Mosaic accounts of the Creation, the Flood, and of the religious and civil codes of Israel, it is most important to examine this question. As I have stated, I am convinced that the facts are all against this theory. The history and the religious and civil organization of Israel, and their general culture, were all recorded in the books of the Bible up to the time of the division into two kingdoms, just as we have them now, many centuries before the Israelites could have learned anything from Babylon or Assyria.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said he was interested to note that so high an authority as Professor Pinches held the view that the Tower of Babel was not built with the idea of its top reaching Heaven, as the Authorized Version of Gen. xi, 4, would seem to imply. The more literal rendering of that passage is, I believe, "whose top is in the heavens."

There is also a very similar expression in Deut. ix, 1, where Moses speaking of the Anakims, Israel's enemies, said, according to our Authorized Version, they had: "Cities great, and fenced up to heaven." But here, again, a better rendering of the Hebrew is, I believe, "Cities great and *fortified into the heavens*."

Now, there is in the New Testament a passage which throws a striking and solemn light upon these otherwise mysterious words, viz., Eph. vi, 12, where we read that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in

high places"—or, as it would be better translated, "*wicked spirits*" or "*spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenlies.*"

Now, seeing that Satan is "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii, 2), it is not strange that his emissaries should also occupy that region. So that it would appear that the men who built the Tower of Babel were deliberately seeking an alliance with these unseen "hosts of wickedness" in open defiance against Almighty God!

Similarly, Moses appears to refer to the same kind of thing when he spoke of the cities of the Anakims being "fortified into the heavens"; thus reminding the Israelites of the solemn fact that the victories they had over their enemies, could only have been achieved by *the power of God working with them*, as, indeed, Deut. ix, 3, clearly shows. This is remarkably illustrated by the fact that whenever Israel were at war with their enemies, if they were, through disobedience, out of touch with God, they were invariably defeated, *however great their numbers were*. While, on the other hand, when, owing to their obedience to God's laws, they were enjoying His presence and favour, they were always victorious, *however small their numbers were*! And it is doubtless to this great fact that the Apostle refers in Eph. vi, 11, where we are warned to put on the *whole armour of God*, that we may be able to stand against *the wiles of the devil*.

The AUTHOR'S reply: As the answering on the spur of the moment of unexpected questions and comments is always exceedingly unsatisfactory, I make no attempt to reproduce what I replied when I read the above paper, but write my remarks on the discussion independently of my spoken words.

Mr. Theodore Roberts has spoken about the numerous steps leading to the upper stages of the temple-towers. It is doubtful, however, if sacrifices were offered on these high platforms. On the highest stage of the Tower of Babel there seems to have been a chamber wherein, probably, ceremonies were performed and the god was supposed to descend and rest. The altar below, whereon young animals were sacrificed, was seemingly quite near to the ground-level, whilst that where large and full-grown animals were sacrificed was on the ground itself.

There is no doubt as to the nobility of Abraham, to which Eupolemus refers, and he and his family may well have carried Babylonian tablets to Palestine and to Egypt. With regard to the sun being the offspring of the moon, this idea comes from that of progressive perfectionment or evolution, and, as we know, in reckoning time, the ancient Semites regarded a day as consisting of "evening and morning," and the ruler of the night did not, therefore, follow the ruler of the day, but preceded him.

The contrast between polytheism and Hebrew monotheism was naturally great, but in the absence of a revelation the Babylonians had no other course open to them but to continue the faith in "lords and gods many," as handed down to them by their forefathers. The suggestion of the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, that the Tower of Babel is described as having its top "with the heavens," and not "in the heavens," is interesting. We know that the Babylonians sculptured the signs of the zodiac on their boundary-stones, or, rather, land-grants (which seem to have been deposited in the temples), but that their temple-towers had something analogous is an entirely new idea. The tower at Babylon, though very high, was far from being of excessive tallness—it was doubtless higher than the towers of other Babylonian cities, that is all.

The text of Gen. xi reads *bashshamayim*, "in the heavens." If the signs of the zodiac were referred to, we ought to have a different word—probably *bammasaroth*, which would mean "in the zodiacal signs." Hebrew specialists, however, will be better able to pronounce an opinion upon the alternative readings.

I am greatly gratified by the kind words with which Mr. G. B. Michell introduces his remarks. Assyriologists, however, will be greatly startled at the suggestions which he makes. That Babel should not be Babylon, as hitherto universally believed, seems to me to be unthinkable. Indeed, we have only to turn to the fourteenth chapter of Genesis to find the proof of Abraham's sojourn in Babylonia. There we read of Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch, king of Ellasar (*âl Larsa*, "the city of Larsa"), Chedorlaomer, king of Elam (of the family or the families of the Elamite "Kudurites"), and Tidal, king of Nations, generally regarded as Media, but the royal name is probably one similar to the well-known Tudhul'a of the Hittites. All these were nations in alliance Ellasar being in

Babylonia, and therefore part of Shin'ar at a time when Elam was overlord in Babylonia, and Amraphel, of Amorite origin, exercised the overlordship of the Cities of the Plain. And how is it possible that Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, all of them Babylonian names, should not have been cities in Babylonia—that country from which Nimrod went out into Assyria—Assyria, which had the same language, the same gods, and the same literature as Babylonia itself ?

Notwithstanding the plausibility of the contention that the Tower of Babel was not at Babylon, it is worthy of note that *it was the people who were scattered abroad from thence upon the face of the earth who left off to build the city.* It is not said that the tower was not ultimately completed, nor is it said that those who remained did not continue to build houses there when they wanted them. The only other Babylon known to me is the old Roman fortress so named at Cairo, but this could not in any case be regarded as cast of Palestine.

With regard to the height of the Tower of Babel, there is no indication in Gen. xi that this had anything to do with a project to invade Heaven. The real reason is clearly stated—they wanted to have a rallying-point, but the very monument which was to have supplied it, proved to be something with a contrary effect, for “from thence they were scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” But Mr. Sidney Collett's contentions are interesting and well marshalled.

In reply to Mr. Hoste, our Hon. Secretary, the cylinders of Nabonidus are written in Semitic Babylonian, otherwise Akkadian, which is regarded as being the term applied to the Semites of Babylonia and their language. Its vocabulary is probably closest akin to that of the Hebrews, but its verbal conjugations are more numerous and probably, also, more regular. Sumerian differed in that it was an agglutinative language, but the connection with Chinese, which has been claimed for it, seems to me to be doubtful.

I am much obliged to my audience for their interest in a somewhat special subject. This, however, was unavoidable, for lectures upon excavations, no matter where carried on, must be of a very special nature. Unfortunately I was unable to read even half of what I have written, otherwise there would have been more variety in what I had to say. The translations of the religious texts, however, may

prove to be interesting reading, and will supplement my paper upon idol-worship read on December 28th, 1924, and published in the *Journal* of the Victoria Institute, 1925, pp. 10 ff. This additional matter supplies much that was wanting in the earlier communication.

I am sure that my audience will join with me in many expressions of thanks to the administration of the British Museum for the lantern-slides which they were so kind as to lend me. These have added greatly to the interest of the paper. It is needless also to say, that I am much obliged to those who have joined in the discussion for their appreciative remarks.

NOTE UPON ERECH, AKKAD, AND CALNEH (p. 57).

Erech in Assyro-Babylonian is Uruk. Akkad is regarded as being derived from the Sumerian *Agade*, the name of its capital. The Biblical "Accad" is certainly the Babylonian "Akkad." Calneh seems to have been identified with Niffer by the Rabbins, who, however, reproduced the name as Nopher, a form which would account for its pronunciation as heard by the American explorers, namely, *Noufar*. (See my article on Calneh in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, vol. I (London and Chicago, 1915)). *Calneh* or *Calno* in Syria was a different site.

683RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 25TH, 1926.

AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the following elections were announced:—As Associates: The Rev. Alonzo Baker; James Stanes, Esq.; and W. H. Seymour, Esq., M.D.

The CHAIRMAN announced that as the author of the paper, Lieut.-Com. Victor L. Trumper, R.N.R., was absent in Egypt, he would read the paper for him. Lieut.-Colonel Molony then read the paper entitled "Modern Science in the Book of Job."

MODERN SCIENCE IN THE BOOK OF JOB.

By LIEUT.-COM. VICTOR L. TRUMPER, R.N.R. (RETIRED),
M.R.A.S.

THERE is probably no book in the Bible that has been more deeply studied by some, and more neglected by others, than that magnificent philosophical poem which is called the Book of Job.

To the poet it is a mine of the sublimest expression, thought, and imagery that the human soul can conceive; to the philosopher it probes depths, the end of which are beyond man's mental grasp; and for the Christian it spans time, from the beginning of matter to the beginning of eternity.

However, to the seeker after material learning who will take the trouble to delve into its pages, it reveals an unexpected amount of knowledge—call it science if you will—which is astonishing, considering the period at which the book was written.

Before proceeding further, I will try and define—or perhaps it would be better to say, limit—what I mean by modern science.

What I do *not* mean is the latest speculation of some dabbler in knowledge, which is often given to the world by the aforesaid dabbler through the press as the latest “conclusion” of modern science (which, by the way, often does not hold until the next “conclusion” comes along). In this connection, perhaps, you will forgive a little story.

It is said that a great preacher once received a visit from one of his congregation on Monday evening, who asked him: “How do you reconcile what you said in your sermon on Sunday evening with the latest conclusions of modern science?” “Well,” replied the great preacher, “I am sorry I cannot tell you. I do not know what the latest conclusions are, the latest edition of the evening paper is not in yet!”

What I do mean are those contributions to knowledge which have been hammered out by patient experimenters and investigators, who, working on scientific lines, have made theories subservient to facts, and not facts to theories.

I used the expression just now, “the period at which the book was written,” and to get the full force of my contention we must consider what is the date of the author, for, if it be modern, the wonder of its unique knowledge is somewhat dimmed. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* gives the probable date as the 4th or 5th century B.C., while the *Temple Dictionary of the Bible* gives the period of Solomon or Hezekiah as probabilities. The date in the margin of our Bibles is given as 1500 B.C., and when one goes through the arguments for a late date as to authorship, one can only say that the traditional view of Moses as the author is just as reasonable, if not more so. The article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* has a damaging admission. Speaking of the date of Job it says: “Any conclusion can be reached only by an induction founded on matters which do not afford perfect certainty, such as the comparative development of certain moral ideas in different ages. . . .” It seems as if the dead horse of the reconstruction of Biblical chronology, according to what the modern critic thinks the ancient Hebrew ought to have thought, still gets a sound flogging now and then, to try and galvanize it into life.

There are, however, two internal evidences in the book, both of which point to about 1500 B.C. as the time of the incidents recorded, and the possibility, if not probability, of its Mosaic

authorship. The first evidence is the names, which, according to other parts of Scripture, were all possible contemporaries. In Gen. xlvi, 15, we find that a man named Job was a son of Issachar, and consequently a grandson of Jacob. Eliphaz and Teman are mentioned in Gen. xxxvi, 10, 11, as the son and grandson, respectively, of Esau. Shuah was a son of Abraham by Keturah his concubine, and Bildad the second friend is called the Shuhite. A man named Zophah (which may be the same as Zophar) is named in 1 Chron. vii, 35, as being a descendant of Asher. Elihu the younger man is called the Buzite and of the kindred of Ram; in Gen. xxii, 21, we find that Buz was the nephew of Abraham, and in Ruth iv, 19, we find that Ram was a great grandson of Judah. So we see that all these men were possible contemporaries of Moses while he was spending his forty years of exile in the land of Midian.

The other piece of evidence is more or less indirect, but is as strong in support of the traditional date of Job as any that the critics can adduce for a much later day. I refer to the passage in Job iii, 13, 14: “. . . then had I been at rest with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves.” The expression “build a desolate place” sounds rather obscure, and the Revisers of 1881 seem to have felt the difficulty, for they translated it, “built up waste places,” which certainly is more intelligible, though that hardly fits in with the trend of thought in the whole passage. In the margin of the Revised Version the alternative rendering given for “waste places” is “solitary piles,” and I think this gives us the key to the difficulty. Some authorities favour the rendering “pyramids,” while the word used in the Arabic Bible, which is usually reckoned by scholars as a good commentary on the Hebrew, is *ahram*, a word whose actual meaning is “ruin,” but which is now used to denote the Great Pyramid, the underlying thought being that it is *the ruin* par excellence, in the same way that a Londoner would speak of “The Tower,” and no one would think that he meant anything other than the ancient fortress on the Thames. Now, if we read “pyramids” for “desolate places,” the whole passage glows with meaning, for Job is longing for rest in the grave or anywhere else, like kings and counsellors of the earth who built the mighty Pyramids as everlasting resting-places, and expected their bodies to remain there undisturbed for eternity!

Now for the dating. If the Book of Job were written at the

close of the age of the Pyramid-builders, when the Pyramids in all their glory and perfection must have been the talk of the whole earth, then this allusion is pregnant with meaning. However, a few hundred years later, the Pyramids had been rifled, they were by no means secure resting-places, and the kings and counsellors of the earth had devised other means (such as the rock-hewn chamber with concealed entrance and booby-traps, as at Thebes) to secure their eternal rest. Consequently, the clause under consideration would have been meaningless, if written at the date that many critics assign for the book.

Some of the passages which I shall quote are direct statements of fact, others are merely allusions which imply knowledge of scientific data, but to whatever category they belong, they carry the impression that they were commonplace to the author, in the same way that two educated men, in course of conversation with each other, might refer to facts, which would be considered as marvellous statements, not to be mentioned incidentally, by one who did not know them at all, or to whom science was just opening up her vistas of knowledge. To illustrate what I mean—whereas in one of his early poems, Tennyson referred to the then newly discovered gas (for lighting purposes) as something marvellous, yet, in a few years, gas-light became such a commonplace of life, that in a later edition of his works he deleted this reference to gas as being unworthy of the range of a poet's thought. So, in all the wide range of scientific fact touched on in the Book of Job, we find nothing that would indicate any newly acquired knowledge, but all is the spontaneous welling-up of profound Wisdom.

In Job v, 23, we get the remark: "Thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field." These are the words of the candid friend, Eliphaz, who is telling Job that, if he were only righteous according to his own particular pattern of 'doxy, all would be well with him. The statement is rather extraordinary, for stones in the field are apt to be more of a nuisance than a help to the cultivator. However, the modern science of chemical manures has made us realize the profound significance of this remark by Eliphaz. The stones of the field, in Palestine and adjacent lands, are mostly limestone, and lime is a necessary constituent of a fertile soil; so, at every former and latter rain, a certain proportion of lime was washed out of the stones and transferred to the surrounding soil, thereby ensuring great and continued fertility.

From chemical manures, we go to the forces which have altered the face of the earth. Job ix, 5, 6: "Which removeth the mountains and they know not: which overturneth them in His anger. Which shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble." The last three sentences obviously refer to earthquake and those cosmic forces which in all ages have altered the contour of the land surfaces of the earth. The first sentence, however, has a subtler meaning, for I think it refers to those other forces at work which are unobtrusive, but in the end none the less potent. Frost and cold have a great deal to do with the gradual degradation on mountain ranges; it is not generally known that the agency of frost is utilized in the splitting and making of the paving stones that are used on our pathways. Intense heat will also do its part in the disintegration of a mountain. But all these forces, though as potent as the earthquake, are so gradual, that in the poetic thought the mountains themselves do not know that they are being removed.

From cosmic and natural forces we turn to Physiology, and find a terse allusion to the absolutely complete protection of the vital parts of the body in Job x, 11: "Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast fenced me with bones and sinews." Few other than medical men realize the perfection of this description. Every one knows how our flesh covers and keeps warm all the vital parts and communications of artery, vein, and nerve; but how many think of the wonder of the skin, which consists of millions of non-return valves, whose efficiency would make the fortune of any engineer who could imitate them mechanically? These valves allow the sweat and waste products of the body to pass freely outwards, but form an impenetrable barrier to anything attempting to get the other way. The surgeon performing an operation knows that he is immune from danger of infection, as long as the skin of his hands is perfect. We all know how we are fenced with bones, the brain protected by the skull, and the lungs and heart by the ribs; but how many realize that in a physically perfect man the sinews can play an equally important and efficient part? I knew a man, many years ago, who went in for physical culture, who would allow a person with both his hands to try and throttle him—which no one ever succeeded in doing; he had trained the sinews of his neck, so that they were an adequate protection to the gullet, arteries, and veins.

Some may remember, near the end of the last century, the great prize-fight between Fitzsimmons and Corbett for the world's

championship. The former was training in San Francisco while I was there, and he was known as "the man with the marble stomach." Somebody whom I met, a short, thick-set, powerful man, used to go to his training rooms, and he told me that one day Fitzsimmons offered to let him hit him in the stomach with his bare fist; the man accepted the offer, with the proviso that Fitzsimmons would not hit back! Then he punched him "in the wind," until he strained his wrist, and Fitzsimmons just stood with his arms hanging by his side, smiling; the pit of his stomach—usually considered the most vulnerable and unprotected part of the whole body—was adequately "fenced with sinews."

One of the most beautiful passages in the whole book is that in chap. xii, 7-9: "But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?" Here we have the whole creation, including the earth itself, called to witness to their Maker.

I have touched in other places on the marvellous geological formation of the earth, which the science of Geology is but dimly scratching; but who can think of the beasts of the earth and not be lost in wonder at their comprehensive perfection?

Some years ago a well-known journal offered a substantial money prize for a drawing with a brief description of a new animal, the only regulations were, that it was not to resemble any known living creature, and that it was to be anatomically possible. There were many thousand entries, but the judges confessed themselves disappointed, for out of all the attempts which conformed to the second rule, viz., that it must be physiologically practicable, there was not one which was radically different from some already known animal. So we see that it may be considered impossible for man to conceive a real addition to the animal creation.

The fowls of the air still hold the Divine secret of flight, in spite of all the marvellous advances in the knowledge of aeronautics, and our airmen would be glad to be able to do what the sparrow does, to say nothing of sea-birds and hawks. We do not yet know really how birds fly; there is still something that eludes our grasp. And the fishes—there is, if possible,

more Divine wisdom and contrivance exhibited in them, and we know less about them. How men have striven to know what the humble herring does all its life! It comes from somewhere and goes somewhere, but its life-history is only known to its Maker. And what shall we say of the whale—that paradox of paradoxes in the animal creation, with, amongst other things, its, to us, unknown solution of the problem of resistance to pressure?

In chap. xiv, 18, 19, we have: "And surely the mountain falling cometh to nought, and the rock is removed out of his place. The waters wear the stones: thou washest away the things which grow out of the dust of the earth." The poet seems to recur again and again to the wonderful forces which change the surface of the earth, and these verses are peculiarly brought home to one living in Egypt. The whole of the cultivated land in the Delta and far up the Nile Valley was once an arm of the sea, but it is now dry land and supports a population of about thirteen millions. This alluvial soil was once the dust of the earth in the mountains of Abyssinia, washed away by the agency of the River Nile.

From Geology we now turn to Astronomy, and there find the same remarkable knowledge. In chap. xxvi, 7: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." It must have been noticed from earliest times that there was a singular paucity of stars between the Great Bear and the celestial Pole, which has been confirmed in modern times by telescopic observation. But what of the succeeding sentence? What were the ideas of men regarding the foundations of the earth, about the time the Book of Job was written? I quote from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: "To primitive man the earth was a flat disk. . . . In many cosmogonies this disk was encircled by waters . . . the disk stood as an island rising up through the waters from the floor of the universe . . . much speculation was associated about that which supported the earth. Tunnels in the foundation to permit the passage of the sun and stars were suggested; the Greeks considered twelve columns to support the heaven, and in their mythology the god Atlas appears condemned to support the columns, while the Egyptians (? Hindoos, V.L.T.) had the earth supported by four elephants, which themselves stood on a tortoise swimming on a sea. Earthquakes were due to a movement of these foundations. In Japan this was

considered to be due to the motion of a great spider, an animal subsequently replaced by a cat-fish ; in Mongolia it is a hog ; in India a mole ; in some parts of South America a whale ; and among some North American Indians a giant tortoise." Such was the state of knowledge and imagination of the most cultured as well as the savage nations of antiquity. The author of the Book of Job will have none of it. In these five sublime words, "hangeth the earth upon nothing," he cuts across all the puerilities and often bestialities of ancient beliefs, and reaches down to the present day, when even the idea of the invisible pull of gravitation is being called in question by the theory of Relativity. Whence did he get his knowledge ?

Chapter xxviii of this remarkable book is wonderful, not only for majestic and forceful imagery and striking allusions to mining, with its difficulties and dangers, but amongst other things it touches on three scientific facts. The first that I shall mention is in the realm of Ornithology. When I was a boy, we were taught that the carrion-eating birds found their food by a keen sense of smell, and I believe in the works of one of our well-known poets the line occurs, "The vulture scents the carrion from afar." This seemed quite a rational explanation, as dead carcasses are apt to advertise themselves fairly unmistakably within a wide range. However, later research and experiment have proved that (perhaps happily for them) the carrion birds have a poor, or possibly non-existent, sense of smell. An experiment was made in India to test this by a well-known naturalist. A carcass, pretty far gone, was placed in a field at night, and covered with an opaque cloth. Small pieces of the flesh were placed on top. At dawn kites and other carrion birds came and greedily devoured the small pieces, and, although actually standing on it, were entirely oblivious of the carcass underneath, though its presence was very obvious to the noses of watchers a few hundred yards away !

Another recent announcement by a naturalist is, that owls and other birds of prey have a contrivance by which the lens of the eye is altered in shape, so that when the bird is making a swoop after its victim it can keep the object accurately focussed all the time on the retina. In Job xxviii, 7, we have : "There is a path . . . which the vulture's eye hath not seen," and in chap. xxxix, 27, 28 : "The eagle . . . makes her nest on high. . . . From thence she seeketh the prey, and her eyes behold afar off." In both these passages, the thought of the keen sight

of the vulture and eagle when seeking their prey is alluded to, a fact to which recent ornithology bears full testimony.

This, however, is something that might have been guessed by a keen observer; but what are we to say to a remarkable fact in physics? Not many generations ago, air was considered to have no weight; it was the zero of matter. The idea still lingers in our expression "light as air." Galileo suspected that air had weight, but it was reserved for Torricelli, who invented the barometer in the 17th century A.D., to demonstrate beyond shadow of doubt that the air had a weight which was definite and measurable. Now it is such a commonplace of knowledge that we are apt to forget how recent it is. The fact enters into our calculations in meteorology, submarining, deep-sea sounding, torpedo running, diving, aeroplaning, airships, bridge-building, and hosts of other things. Yet two or three millenniums previously the author of this book declared, in chap. xxviii, 23, 25: "God understandeth the way thereof . . . to make the weight for the winds."

In verse 26 of the same chapter there is a terse allusion to definite meteorological and electrical facts, "When he made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder," for recent discovery has proved the intimate connection between the particles of water suspended in the atmosphere, which form the nucleus for the positive and negative discharges of electricity, and results in the precipitation of the moisture in the form of rain.

The whole of chaps. xxxvi and xxxvii constitute a panegyric of the earth and its wonders, in relation to the creative and governing powers of the Deity, and many a sentence indicates an accurate and observant knowledge of natural phenomena. Two verses must suffice to show what I mean, chap. xxxvii, 15, 16: "Dost thou know when God disposed them, and caused the light of His cloud to shine? Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of Him which is perfect in knowledge?" "The balancings of the clouds"; what a picture is therein conjured up of the gigantic cumulus rising or falling, governed by a minute difference of temperature or an infinitesimal up-current of air, caused by an inequality on the surface of the earth—it may be a mile below—but all governed by Him "who is perfect in knowledge!"

It is quite possible that the ancients empirically knew a good deal about sound, but it is only of recent years that its origin and

means of propagation has been satisfactorily and scientifically explained. In chap. xxxviii, 7, we have as a culmination of creation: "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." This is generally looked upon as a poetic description of the rejoicing of the heavenly hosts. It is that—and more. The lowest sound perceptible to the human ear has about 30 vibrations to the second, and the highest note has about 40,000 vibrations to the second. Higher than that there is silence, until, after an immense gap, vibrations are again perceptible to the human faculties, but this time as light. It is, however, essentially vibrations or waves, and whether we perceive them as sound or light is only a matter of degree. Now let us think of the Deity and the "sons of God" with faculties that can take in as sound what we call light, and then think of the stellar heavens and the unplumbed depths of the Milky Way, the wonderful binary stars whirling round each other at incredible speeds, the revolving spiral nebulæ, the star clusters, the comets with luminous tails millions of miles long, appearing for a moment and then going off no one knows where, yet keeping time to the hour a hundred years later—all this, and yet the nearest fixed star is four and a-half light-years away! As we think of all this as sound, the limitless orchestra of Heaven, the "song of the morning stars" will have a new meaning for us.

Opinion is divided as to whether the ancients knew anything about refraction caused by the atmosphere, though the apparent bending of a stick when placed partly in water must have been observed by primitive man, as also the seeming displacement of objects in water when such primitive man was engaged in shooting or spearing fish with arrows or javelins. It is thought by some that the builders of the Great Pyramid wished to place it in exactly lat. 30° north, but that, being ignorant of refraction, and using northerly stars to get their position, the site is about one minute twenty seconds out ($1' 20''$), just the error caused by neglect to reckon with the displacement produced by the refraction of the atmosphere. However, it is difficult to think that the author of Job was unacquainted with refraction, when he could pen such a commentary as is found in chap. xxxviii, 12, 13: "Hast Thou commanded the morning since Thy days, and caused the dayspring to know his place; *that it might take hold of the ends of the earth?*" These words, although couched in poetic language and imagery, accurately state a truth which would be self-evident to every eye, could we but take a journey to the moon for this

purpose ; for then we should see the rays of light from the sun striking the earth and being bent round the outer edge, so that parts of the earth out of direct sunlight are still illumined by the atmospherically refracted rays, and the "dayspring" literally grasps or "takes hold of the ends of the earth." I challenge anyone to find a more beautiful, or a description more scientifically accurate of the natural phenomenon of refraction, by which we have dawn before sunrise and twilight after sunset.

In verse 36 of the same marvellous chapter we have another reference to the unsolved problems of Physiology, for, although no special fact is stated, the words : "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts ? or who hath given understanding to the heart ?" betoken an appreciation of things of which no physiologist yet would undertake to give a full and satisfactory explanation. Why does the heart beat faster in times of work, stress, or emotion, so as to send increased supplies of blood to brain or muscle ? Or what wisdom do the stomach and intestines have when, amongst all the varied ingredients that they receive, they sort out and send to its proper destination what is necessary for blood, bone, muscle, nerve, or brain, and pass on that which is useless ? "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts ?"

One of the outstanding advances of science in the last century is the knowledge of the fact that sound, electricity and light are all conveyed from their source of origin in undulations or waves. We are now quite familiar with the phrase, "such and such a metre wave-length," as applied to the various wireless broadcasting stations. But there is a property inherent in wave-motion, which is, that it must progress ; a stationary wave is an unthinkable proposition. We can test this for ourselves in a pond or a basin of water. A wave can be created which travels onward to the edge, and there it either ceases to exist as a wave, or is reflected back and continues in its new direction. The same holds good with regard to light. It is conveyed to our senses by waves in a substance which, for want of a better name, is called ether ; and such waves travel at the incredible speed of about 186,000 miles per second. Supposing we were able to stop these waves, what we should immediately get would be darkness ; because, as I said before, a stationary wave is an impossible condition. A laboratory experiment can be made with two beams of light intersecting each other, which at the point of meeting cause a patch of darkness, because the two sets of waves interfere with each other, and practically eliminate each other.

Now progression implies a pathway or direction, and quiescence implies a place ; therefore, if waves bearing light get to a place and are stopped there, they cease to bring light, and darkness results. I hope I have made my meaning plain to the audience. This, as I said before, is one of the triumphs of the nineteenth-century science ; but is it not accurately foreshadowed in Job xxxviii, 19, where we have, " Where is the way where light dwelleth ? and as for darkness where is the place thereof ? " ? You will observe that the writer speaks of a " way " for the light, and a " place " for the darkness, terms which, though in poetic language and thought, are in perfect accord with modern knowledge.

It has been my aim to bring to notice some, but by no means all, of the wonderful scientific statements, allusions, and implications contained in a truly wonderful book. My contention is, that whatever date we admit for the writing of Job, whether it be 500 or 1500 B.C., yet the state of human learning and science was such that no one could have had the knowledge to write, unaided, such profound truths as we find scattered throughout the book. I submit that the only rational explanation of these wonders is to assume that the writer was divinely inspired by Him who knows the end from the beginning, who is mighty in strength and wisdom, and " who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven " (Job xxxv, 11).

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony) said : I need hardly say that, as an Army man, it gives me sincere pleasure to preside here and to read a lecture written by a Naval officer. With the gist of it I heartily agree.

Commander Trumper gives two arguments for believing that Job was written about 1500 B.C. (the date of Moses). Critics allow that " numerous and consistent marks of extreme antiquity pervade the book," but they ascribe these to " consummate art in the author " ; and urge that the chief positive argument for a late date of the book is its religious standpoint. Job believes in the resurrection of the righteous, whereas Moses says very little about it. This, however, does not prove the late date of Job, because the Egyptian Book of the Dead, which was certainly in existence in

Moses' day, plainly teaches the resurrection and just judgment of the righteous.

Professor A. S. Peake writes : " But the phenomena of the book hardly permit us to place it earlier than the time of Jeremiah. The *decisive* argument in favour of this view is the stage of religious reflection represented by it. It was not till the age of Jeremiah, when the state was breaking up under the assault of Babylon, that the old belief in the association of prosperity and righteousness *began to give way* before the facts which disproved it."

Now, most of us have noticed that Almighty God does not always prosper the worldly affairs of individuals, though they be righteous. We clearly understand that this is so, in order that an answer may be found to Satan's taunt : "*Doth Job fear God for nought?*" So the fact is not inscrutable, although that term is often applied to it.

Here, then, is a fact which many of us have noticed, and which must have been a fact before Moses' day, for it was very strikingly illustrated by the ancient story of Joseph. Yet Professor Peake asks us to believe that it *could not* have struck any individual author before Jeremiah, because he says that only about that Prophet's day did the contrary belief begin to give way. Could any argument be weaker? Is this a fair specimen of the reasons for which we are asked to assign a late date to the Biblical books? Surely this author can hardly be surprised if we regard him as prejudiced!

As we are now dealing with what the advocates of a late date for the book of Job call their *decisive argument*, the point is important, and I may perhaps be allowed to illustrate it. There is the well-known fact that high-water occurs at a different hour every day for a fortnight. But there is also the less-known fact that high-water of *highest spring-tides* occurs at about the *same hour* for centuries—that is at any one place. Now, suppose that a number of fifteenth-century writers mentioned the well-known fact about the ordinary tides, that would not prove that no fifteenth-century writer could have observed the less-known fact about spring-tides.

Just so, we have the well-known fact that the worldly affairs of the righteous generally prosper—a fact often alluded to in the earlier Biblical books. But that is no proof that some gifted author did not notice the less obvious fact that the worldly affairs of the righteous do not *always* prosper, especially as the latter fact was

strikingly illustrated by the story of Joseph, which *is* a case in point, because his afflictions were very severe, and lasted longer than the afflictions of Job.

A document has been found which contains the passages, "When night comes, he allows me no breathing-space," and "Upon my bed I rolled like an ox," and other passages which are very like parts of the Book of Job. This document is called the Babylonian Job, and dates from about 2000 B.C. Of course, it does not prove the early date of Job, but *its evidence* tends that way.

To the cases of scientific accuracy cited by Commander Trumper, I would add the following :—Job xxxvii, 9, "Out of the south cometh the whirlwind." We know now that all cyclones are great whirlwinds, and that, in our hemisphere, they almost always progress from south to north.

One cannot but be struck by the wonderful way in which the author of Job was preserved from making mistakes like those who have supposed that the earth rested on some gigantic animal. The cumulative force of the argument presented by Commander Trumper is very great.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES took it for granted that all present had a great deal to say about the Book of Job. In the case, however, of the excellent paper before us, it is right to bear in mind that it is the allusions to scientific matters in this very wonderful book that should influence any comments we may make.

Astronomy. The reference to the twelve signs of the zodiac in chap. xxxviii, 32, was very remarkable. The wisdom locked up in these, the oldest, symbols of the human race was scientific and esoteric, as well as exoteric. Why had one of these signs been tampered with when early corruptions of the Truth of God in Egypt and Assyria took place? Why had Libra the Balance been substituted for the Atonement sign of Ara the Altar?

Again, the Preface, giving the dramatis personæ of this, the "porch" to the Holy Scriptures, was scientifically remarkable. What deep knowledge of the Spirit World, which Job and his friends had not yet learnt!

Up-to-date science can give no information as to Origins as this author does.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said he had only three remarks to make, all of which were in keeping with the admirable lecture to which they had just listened.

First, the empty space. In Job xxvi, 7, we read : " He stretcheth out the north over the empty space," referred to on p. 69. It was an interesting fact that, only a few years ago, Professor Barnard, of the Yorks Observatory, discovered that precisely in the northern heavens there was a vast expanse without a solitary star in it. In exact accord with the statement of this ancient Book of Job.

Secondly, the sound of light. In Job xxxviii, 7, we read : " The morning stars sang together," referred to on p. 72. We have the same thing spoken of in Ps. lxxv, 8, the correct rendering of which is, " Thou makest the *radiations* of the morning and evening to *sing*." Also in Ps. xix, 2 : " Day unto day (when there *is light*) uttereth speech : night unto night (when there is *no light*) showeth knowledge." Now, although these statements have stood in the Bible all these centuries, it has only recently been discovered that light actually has *sound* ! Indeed, at an exhibition, recently held at Surbiton, this fact was demonstrated to such a remarkable extent that a person, stone blind, is now enabled, by the aid of an instrument which catches the sound of light, to read, after a little practice, an *ordinary printed page* at the rate of sixty words a minute !

Thirdly, in Job xxviii, 26, we read : " He made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning of the thunder," referred to on p. 71. There is also a similar expression in Ps. cxxxv, 7 : " He maketh *lightnings for rain*." Now, the connection between lightning and rain, incidentally referred to in these Scriptures, was remarkably confirmed by the late Lord Kelvin, when, addressing some students at University College some years ago, he suddenly paused and said : " Gentlemen, I believe there is never any rain without lightning ! "

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said : Although the composition of the Book of Job is by so devout a commentator as Dr. Samuel Cox (1894) placed in the age of Solomon, I agree with Commander Trumper that it must have been written before the giving of the law at Sinai, though for different reasons. Seeing the book is a Hebrew poem, it cannot be a translation of an earlier work, and must therefore have a Hebrew author who could not have failed to have mentioned either the nation of Israel, or the Mosaic law, if that

nation had ceased to be slaves in Egypt, or that law had been given from Mount Sinai.

I am quite in sympathy with Commander Trumper's general argument, but think he has attached too much importance to the instances which he suggests imply knowledge of a scientific nature. All I think they show is that the ancients were better acquainted with the laws of Nature than we in our pride are apt to imagine.

But I think Commander Trumper has overlooked the distinctive feature of the Book of Job. Literature is man's highest work, and two of the very greatest writers, Shakespeare and Goethe, chose the drama to convey their thoughts. I venture to describe the Book of Job as drama of a higher order than either Hamlet or Faust. This does not affect its historical truth. Was it not the great Duke of Marlborough who said he learned all the history of England that he knew from Shakespeare's plays?

I do not see how we can regard Job and his friends as directly inspired by God in their speeches as recorded in this book, for they each view Job's sufferings from a different standpoint and are all found to be mistaken, as the subsequent speeches of Elihu and the Almighty Himself show. Indeed, Job's friends are afterwards specifically condemned for having spoken amiss concerning God.

If, as we believe, the Bible is not intended to teach us anything which we could discover by our own natural faculties, still less should we expect to find God making any revelation of Nature's secrets through Job or his friends. Even in His own speeches the Almighty confines Himself to such natural history as was then known to men, and specially points out Job's ignorance of the secrets of Nature.

All I think we can say is, that it is inconceivable that a merely human composition of such ancient date, dealing with so much natural history, could possibly have escaped falling into numerous statements of current belief, which science has since shown to be false. But if, as we believe, the record of these speeches is divinely given, we should expect to find nothing in that record inconsistent with any true facts of science. It is here that Commander Trumper's paper is of value as a brick in the great fortress of our faith, for it shows the Book of Job, being inspired of God, is in agreement with modern discovery.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : The author fails to give any objective definition of " Modern Science." Whether any particular theory is a " contribution to knowledge," or a " speculation " (p. 64) may be a matter of personal opinion. I suggest " Those doctrines contained in the scientific text-books in use in the University of London."

The author's argument requires Job to be dated in pre-scientific times. As this is admitted, the discussion of the exact date introduces irrelevant matter and obscures the issue. The suggestion that the writer must have lived when the Pyramids stood " in all their glory and perfection," because he refers to them as a " ruin," is an extraordinary oversight.

Some of the examples by which Lieut.-Com. Trumper supports his argument might be stronger. Surely strong men have developed their sinews in Biblical times (p. 67). The " hand of the Lord " has long been recognized in His works (p. 68), so also surely the keen vision of the eagle (p. 70). The interpretation of the " league with the stones of the field " (p. 66) and the " way " of light and " place " of darkness appear somewhat dubious.

The argument would have had more apologetic value if the author had concentrated upon three or four strong points, and discussed any alternative interpretations that may have been put forward.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : I do not think it needful to follow many of the subjects so ably dealt with in the paper. I consider it a piece of arrogant conceit for so many of our so-called modern critics to regard the ages of the past as being so pitiably ignorant. My reading of the works of antiquity leads me to the opposite conclusions. I imagine that some much-boasted inventions were possibly discovered ages ago and forgotten, and the cycles will go on, and much that we have discovered will be forgotten and rediscovered over and over again if the world lasts long enough.

What I consider so wonderful is, that here is a work dealing with so-called scientific subjects, and yet no cardinal error can be found in it—indeed, quite the contrary, our lecturer finds it in harmony with, and anticipatory of, many of our latest and much-boasted discoveries in the realms of physics.

I propose to deal with a few other points that are lightly touched upon in the paper or are in harmony with the subject.

Let me premise that I presume that all here present believe that Job was a real historical personage. Of course he was, and united testimony and traditions point even to the places where he reigned and ruled as a kinglet or mighty chieftain.

About sixteen hours south of Damascus is a place where the Arabs show the site of the house of Job, his vineyards, etc. The place is in the centre of a rich and fertile district called El-Hauran. There they show a stone and call it Job's stone. It is covered with hieroglyphics and bears a cartouche of Rameses II. The district was one of the strategic centres of the ancient world. Through it passed the caravan routes that led from Babylon, Nineveh, Tadmor (Palmyra), and Damascus to Tyre, Sidon, as well as Egypt. Job must have seen thousands of such caravans passing through his city. It was a cosmopolitan sort of place—there you could find Copts from Egypt and Nubians and people from many other parts in Africa. It must have been a babel of languages, a paradise for a philologist. No place on God's earth at that time could have been kept so well informed as Job's city. The latest news of Egypt or Tyre; the newest fashions or politics of Nineveh or Babylonia were to be seen and heard of there.

Now all this fits in with the Book of Job. Take the description of the horse (xxxix, 19–25). Many a time must Job have seen the horsemen of Pharaoh in this outpost of the Egyptian Empire, but what wonderful word-painting! Surely literary art here reached its climax and can never be excelled—perhaps never equalled. We can see the prancing horses of Pharaoh's chariots, hear the shouts of the captains and the trumpets sounding the irresistible charge that is once more to scatter the armed men and bring victory again to the armies of Egypt.

When Job speaks of the black water that came from the white snow, he spoke of what he had often seen; but when he speaks of the leviathan (xli) or behemoth (xl) in his soliloquy with God, he is speaking of what he has only heard from others, and such things which must have been difficult to describe or things that were much exaggerated by the narrators.

The leviathan was, I think, a whale, of which he had heard tales from the merchants of Tyre, for, before the steamers frightened away these monsters of the deep, the Mediterranean was one of the happy homes of hundreds of schools of whales. Mark well verses

7 and 29-32 of chap. xli, and you will see how truly in many ways he describes a whale, although probably he had never seen one.

When one reads regarding the behemoth one feels uncertain at times whether he means a hippopotamus or a crocodile. I fancy verse 15 of chap. xl makes us think of the former, but verses 17 and 21-24 seem to refer to a crocodile. At any rate, I have in the East watched with interest the mighty sweep of their tails, and I visualize a crocodile from the words.

Again, as regards chap. xxviii, which is a miner's chapter, those who know anything about mines will, I think, agree that he is referring to mining that he has been told about, and not a mine which he has seen working. He says that one mine is for silver, and other places for other metals; he gets on to iron and copper (brass in our version), and slides into a tale about sapphires and gold ore (? gold washings). I fancy that I can see the good man listening to the merchants' stories of the gold of Ophir; corals and pearls, rubies and topazes from Ethiopia; and asking searching questions that the men themselves cannot answer.

Finally, as regards the suggested references to the Pyramids.

I was one day standing besides the Great Pyramid, and I said to my dragoman: "Suleiman, do you know that this is referred to in our Holy Book?"—"No, no," he said, decidedly.—"Well, tomorrow you shall see," I replied.

I tried to get a missionary to meet him, but the man refused, and said that the passages I referred to had never been pointed out to him before.

However, the salesman in the Bible shop was as polite as the missionary was brusque. I said to him: "Please give me an Arabic Bible and open at the third chapter of Job, and translate at the thirteenth verse and onward." He translated somewhat as follows:—"I should have rested and been quiet with kings and wise men that have built for themselves pyramids (Ahrum)." I marked the passage, and many more, for my dragoman to read. You should have seen his face as he read the verse. "So it is," he said, "so it is." The verses are worthy of profound study. It is not one king but many kings, not one counsellor but many counsellors, and not only kings and counsellors but princes also who have

built "in" desolate places (I suggest this as the idea) great places for the quiet resting-place of their bodies. Verse 19 looks beyond the grave to a place where all are equal—the realm of Spirits.

Now, I crave your patience whilst I try and enquire how came this precious book into the Canon of Holy Scripture ?

When Noah organized the Worship of God and ordained the sacrifices he fixed places for priests. The greatest of all these kingly priests was Melchizedek, Jethro was another of the representatives of this order, Balaam another. Who can doubt that Job was not only a king but also a priest ? Probably Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar, and possibly Elihu were priests as well as Job.

Observe the command of God to Eliphaz (xlii, 7-9) to go with the other two and let " my *servant* Job " offer up a sacrifice for their sin and folly. Note also the sacrifice : seven bullocks, seven rams. Now refer to Balaam's sacrifice for Balak (Num. xxiii, 1).

It may be interesting also to refer to Virgil : when Æneas goes to the sibyl and has to offer " seven bullocks of a herd that never felt the yoke and as many ewes duly chosen."

Now, I want to say that I believe that Job wrote this book, *i.e.* from about chap. i, 6, to perhaps chap. xlii, 9. Copies were made of this work. What can be more likely than that in the house of Jethro Moses found the book, and that it cheered the long and lonely life of the shepherd that had once lived as a prince in Pharaoh's palaces ?

When Israel had crossed the Red Sea, Moses found himself with a multitude of illiterate ignorant slaves. He must have set about trying to teach them ; indeed, four books of the Pentateuch seem to be concerned with teaching. Maybe Jethro himself helped.

Anyway, books had to be written for the ignorant to learn to read, and God Himself guided the pen of Moses to write the story of the Creation of the World, the circumstances of man's fall, and the course of events down to the death of Joseph. I verily believe that it was so.

What more likely thing to happen than that Moses should have translated the work that had been a solace to him in the dark days of his sojourn as a stranger in a strange land in Midian and Arabia ? He would have to translate many terms, write the introduction to the book as well as add the final lines of verses 10-16 of chap. xlii, telling

of the latter days of Job's happiness. This explains the rough-and-ready estimates of Job's flocks and herds and accounts for the presence of the word Jehovah, etc., in some of the passages.

Thus the book became a treasure to the children of Israel and the Church, and such it still is, and will remain till time shall be no more.

Mr. H. T. SHIRLEY writes: I consider Lieut.-Com. Trumper's paper most interesting and instructive. As a student of physics and chemistry, I was naturally very interested in the subject, and although I do not quite see the significance of the author's remarks on the subject of a "way" for the light and a "place" for the darkness, yet I think his statements are scientifically correct, with one exception.

The remarks on p. 72 with regard to vibrations seem clearly to imply that, were the human ear sensitive to vibrations having a frequency comparable with that of the vibrations which give rise to the sensation of light (*i.e.* of the order of 375 million million per second), then we should hear light. This, of course, is untrue. The author of the paper appears to have overlooked the fact that the vibrations which produce sound are of quite a different character to those which enable us to see. The first are longitudinal vibrations (in the direction of the line of travel) in a material medium, usually the air, while the latter are transverse vibrations (*i.e.* vibrations in a direction perpendicular to the line of travel) in a non-material medium, the ether of space. Light can cross interplanetary space, but sound (which can only travel through matter) cannot do so.

This error was unfortunately made very prominent by the remarks of Mr. Collett during the discussion. In support of Lieut.-Com. Trumper, this speaker said that by means of the optophone the blind were able to hear light and so read. This popular explanation of a very wonderful instrument is not strictly true. The succession of light and darkness as the instrument moves across the printed page is made to control the current flowing in a telephone and thus produces a sound effect. The light merely acts as a kind of trigger to release electrical energy, which is then used to produce mechanical vibrations and therefore sound. This, of course, is an entirely different thing to "hearing light" in the sense in which that expression was used at the meeting.

This criticism does not affect the Book of Job, and I have ventured to offer it only because it seemed to me a pity that such a valuable paper should be considered unreliable because of an all-too-frequent confusion of thought on the subject of light-waves and sound-waves.

MR. LEONARD W. KERN writes: Although unable to attend the meeting, owing to Government duties here in Bolton, I have greatly enjoyed reading the proof of the paper, but regret that there is one statement to which I must take exception.

Despite the fact that both sound and light are certainly due to vibrational disturbances in an elastic medium, or what is commonly known as waves, the method of perception, that is, whether by ear or eye, is not "only a matter of degree" as Mr. Trumper would lead us to imagine (p. 72), but purely one of media, which can be easily shown by setting an electric bell ringing under an evacuated bell-jar, where, like the proverbial ideal child at the dinner-table, it will be "seen but not heard," the explanation being that sound needs matter as a vehicle of transit, a vibrating body in a vacuum producing no acoustic effects, whereas light is due to the excitation of waves in the luminiferous ether which permeates all space.

Thus, should any action (whether chemical or otherwise) occur on one of the stars or planets producing simultaneous effects of light and sound, the former might possibly reach us if sufficiently powerful, but the latter never.

What Job indeed says is, that "the morning stars *rānan*," a Hebrew word only in this one instance translated "sang," and more correctly meaning "made rejoicing" or "gave forth *vibrations like* a musical instrument," which accords with our modern knowledge of the facts.

The AUTHOR'S reply: The adverse criticism of my paper can, I think, be considered under two main headings. Firstly, my citing of Job iii, 14, as probably referring to the Pyramids; and, secondly, my statement as to light and sound both being caused by vibrations or waves, and whether we perceive them as light or sound being only a matter of degree.

With reference to the first, Mr. W. E. Leslie accuses me of an "extraordinary oversight," though I think the oversight was his, not mine. Perhaps my meaning was not quite clear owing to the

severe pruning the paper has undergone. My whole contention was that the passage referred to the Pyramids in their perfection ; but with the decaying of the Pyramids we see the word remaining the same, but its meaning change, till now the same Arabic word denotes a ruin, simply because the Pyramids are now ruins compared with their former glory. In our own times we see words totally reverse their meaning, *e.g.* "let," which now means permit or allow, used to mean "hinder." Also, everyone knows the present meaning of the expression "the weakest goes to the wall," but a few hundred years ago it had just the opposite signification. In those days places of worship had no seats except a stone bench which ran round the side. The old and weak went to the wall where they could sit, while the young and strong knelt or stood on the bare floor in the centre.

I may add that the word in question is translated "pyramids" in the Russian version of the Book of Job, which was one of the earliest of any portion of Scripture to be translated into a European vernacular ; it was derived from the Slavonic, A.D. 900, the Vulgate, and the Septuagint. However, this is quite an unessential point of my argument.

With regard to the other question raised, I would point out that if I err in considering the means by which light and sound are conveyed to our senses as being the same in principle—viz. vibrations or undulations, but only a difference in degree—well, I err in good company. In the article on "Light" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, there is a good deal on the undulations, vibrations, and wavelength of light, and two quotations must suffice : "The undulatory vibration postulated by Fresnel having been generally accepted as explaining most optical phenomena, it became necessary to determine the mechanical properties of the ether which transmits this motion"; and again, "When the speed of light is measured the result is not the wave-speed as above determined, but something less, because the result depends upon the time of the group passing through the medium. The lower speed is called the group-velocity of light. In a vacuum there is no dying out of the wave so that the group-speed and wave-speed are identical." The same words, waves, undulations, and vibrations, are used in the article on "Sound" in the same work. Mr. Shirley has mentioned that light can only be conveyed through ether, which is a non-conductor of sound. But what is ether? Lord Salisbury in his Presidential

Address to the British Association in 1894 said, "For more than two generations, the main, if not the only, function of the word 'ether' has been to furnish a nominative case to the verb 'to undulate.'" Do we know any more about it now?

In a paper on "The Human Colour Sense and its accordance with that of Sound, as bearing on the 'Analogy of Sound and Colour,'" by Dr. John D. Macdonald, I.H.R.N., F.R.S., read before the Victoria Institute, there is a good deal that bears out my contention, but as space forbids a lengthy dissertation, I will content myself with two quotations. Referring to the cones and rods in the retina of the eye and their functions, he says: "That fact alone seems to him sufficient to show the necessity for supposing that each cone is capable of stimulation by all visible undulations of light, and transmitting such nerve vibrations as are capable of inducing all the colour sensations." Further on he says: "Two important laws or tenets have been brought to bear in the construction of the foregoing tables, namely, first, *That the undulatory theory is applicable to both light and sound*, and second, *that the musical ratios appertain also to colour*, though comparatively low numbers in one have to be compared to billions in the other."

It only remains for me to remind my critics that I never imagined a human faculty as able to *hear* the undulations which we perceive as light, but for this I specially postulated the Deity and the "sons of God" as mentioned in Job xxxviii, 7, though I also am looking forward to the possession of the same faculties in the future.

Prior to the reading of Commander Trumper's paper, occasion was taken to hand to Professor GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE the silver medal awarded him in connection with the Langhorne-Orchard Prize Competition (1924). The presentation was made by the Chairman of Council, Dr. Thirtle, and Professor Price made acknowledgment in fitting terms.

684TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8TH, 1926,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of G. Wilson Heath, Esq., F.R.G.S., as a Member; Mrs. Hilprecht, as an Associate; and Miss Agnes M. Naish as a Life Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then, in the enforced absence of Professor Roget, requested the Hon. Secretary to read the paper on "A Philosophic Exponent of Latin Culture: Alexandre Vinet, Protestant Divine and Literary Critic (1797-1847)."

*A PHILOSOPHIC EXPONENT OF LATIN CULTURE :
ALEXANDRE VINET, PROTESTANT DIVINE AND
LITERARY CRITIC.*

By PROFESSOR F. F. ROGET, of Geneva.

I.

THIS title may strike the reader as unusual. A doctor in divinity whose authority is unchallenged as a critic of literature; an expert in the subject of literature whose reputation as a divine is well-founded, widespread, and enduring; that is a rare combination. We know no other of equal merit and conferring credit equally great. That one such example could be, and that there could be only one, will appear shortly.

If you take up Chambers's *Biographical Dictionary*, you will read under the name of VINET twenty-four lines as follows, altogether 200 words :—

“VINET, Alex. Rodolphe (1797–1847), Swiss divine and critic, born at Ouchy near Lausanne, became in 1835 Professor of French Language and Literature at Basel, and in 1837 of Practical Theology at Lausanne. His *Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes* (1826) involved him in the struggle against state interference; and in 1845, resigning his chair, he joined the Free Church of Vaud; in 1846 he was compelled to resign his professorship of French literature in Lausanne Academy. Vinet was an eloquent and evangelical preacher. His *Chrestomathie française* (1829), his *Études* on the literature of the nineteenth century (1849–51), his *Histoire* of eighteenth-century literature (1853), *Moralistes des XVI et XVII siècles* (1859), and *Poètes du siècle de Louis XIV* (1862), took high rank. Amongst the works translated into English are *Christian Philosophy* (1846), *Vital Christianity* (1846), *Gospel Studies* (1851), *Pastoral Theology* (1852), *Homiletics* (1853), *Studies in Pascal* (1859); *Outlines of Philosophy and Literature* (1865). See “Studies” by Scherer (1853) and Chavannes (1883); “Lives” by E. Rambert (1875), Louis Molines (1890), and Laura M. Lane (in English, 1890); and his *Letters* (1882 and 1890). A new and complete edition of his works is in course of publication since 1911, with notes and all useful matter—George Bridel and Co., Lausanne.”

I proceed to unfold the meaning of those words, each of which in this summary is extraordinarily precise, illustrative here, we might almost say, of design with a capital “D.” Let us run our eyes along the lines.

First the name, Vinet, which like Godet, Muret, Roget, Grandet, is linguistically as French as French can be; then Swiss, that is, of a nationality which has no language of its own, but expresses itself in three tongues, each borrowed from another nationality, in each case a nationality quite foreign to Swiss nationality; then a divine, which means a trained student of the Bible and servant of God, in the Christian sense of the word, but says no more. That is quite enough to show what sort of literary critic a man so trained must be, if true to the spirit throughout. To this vocation and education Vinet was true: no question yet of belonging to this or that Church.

The next predicate makes him a critic, but does not say of what. We may well assume from what precedes that Gospel

truth is meant. That his standard of criticism will be either Protestant or Roman may further be presumed. That, as a consistent divine, he will carry that, his standard of criticism, into literature is, in all verisimilitude, the conclusion to be drawn from the information we get next.

He was born and educated and trained in divinity in Protestant, French-speaking Canton Vaud, in Switzerland, at Lausanne, where the National School of Protestant Theology dates as far back as 1526. We find next that, at the age of twenty-eight (in 1835) he was appointed Professor of French Literature and Language at Basle, a German-speaking Zwinglian community bordering on Lutheran Alsace. His spiritual vocation (divinity) and his intellectual profession (criticism) keep pace together quite wonderfully; they are reciprocal and alternative.

Two years later (1837) he returns, as Professor of Practical Theology, to the Faculty of Divinity at Lausanne. In that office his persuasion is modified. The civil notion of a State Church is no longer acceptable to his Christian conscience; he turns Evangelical. He resigned his official chair of Theology, resigned his official professorship of French literature in the Academy; this makes him an unattached divine and an unattached intellectualist. He thus reaches a unity and personality of conscience embracing both branches of his life-work, with spiritual and intellectual independence in his public functions.

Two years after this achievement his visible life came to a close (1847), but his self did not perish for so much. He was an eloquent man and a good preacher; he was a writer, and had consigned himself to paper. He had prepared at Basle and published (1829) a *Treasury of French Literature*, in three stout volumes, which for four generations now has educated the Swiss youth of either sex in all that is sound in French literature. This book, with its notes and introductory history of French literature, marks down or keeps out anything in French thought, poetry or prose, the acceptance of which would be a playing false to Protestant ethics, or, if paraded before the young, conducive in fact to corruption of taste and morals anywhere.

His Critical Studies of French Literature (animadverting on any implicit morality or immorality, vulgarity or distinction), were published one by one after his death, till 1862. His Studies of Christianity were made public in their sequence, till 1865. His Philosophy, a most valuable product of his religion and

human sense, is now being made available for recension and re-presentation, in a complete edition of all his critical works, which has reached its fourth volume of 560 pages octavo. There have been published in English many translations, based on the earlier editions.

II.

On the principle that the irreligion of a non-religious man is made, by the law of perversion, his religion, Vinet and Rousseau, both Protestants, are in Protestantism as the poles asunder. Rousseau is the rotted fruit fallen from the tree. Vinet is the pure sap of the vine-stock, its unfermented sweet juice. In his life-work there is an individual purpose made manifest. But the Design, or semblance of a Design, to which we pointed in the beginning—is it made apparent in this? Well, there is, in the background of Vinet's life, a kind of previous adjustment to time and place, and of both to the evolution of Church, State, and Ethics (public feeling) in Europe. Let us make our meaning plain.

The geographical area covered by the French language, and, if we may say so, by the French stock of men and women, is not co-extensive with the territory of France. It extends further to the north and to the east. In the north, that is, in Belgium, public feeling—social ethics—are continuous with those of France. In other words, the Roman Catholic Church has established its universal claim to mould alone the religious spirit and, conversely, the irreligious, in Belgium and in France.

But if we look east, toward Switzerland, what occurred there is a thing apart. The French-speaking parts of Switzerland which are Protestant, form a geographical whole, and have moved together in spiritual unity and in like religious ethics since 1526, without a break or interference. Moreover, the Protestant German-speaking Swiss also form a solid body in which the Zwinglian type of Protestantism has held unbroken sway through the centuries. The Lutheran Reformation did not agree with the Swiss national spirit. But both Calvinism and Zwinglianism, which are practically interchangeable, did arise and flourish there as the national form of adherence to Biblical Christianity. So the Protestant "block" in Switzerland, numbering some two million people, is consistent, self-dependent, national, and of the popular type—no hierarchy.

Protestantism, in France, does not form an aggregate. It is dispersed, sporadic, discontinuous; it has no habitation, neither

in the heart of the nation nor in the ethics of the people. And the irreligion of France—whether it be taken as fostered by the Roman Catholic Church, antagonistically, or as resisting it justly—did not challenge Protestantism in the name of a higher conception and, *ex hypothesi*, a better one, and so has no home in Switzerland as against any of the forms in which Christianity is established there.

Now let me take the Swiss area saved for Latin Christians of Protestant complexion, as by a decree of Providence. Let us mentally remove it—geography, spirit, ethics, and all—to join it to Great Britain, and to the whole Anglo-Saxon race, to which it is kin, the ethnic feature alone excepted. What do we find? We find that, if Protestant Switzerland could be lifted up *en bloc*, so to say, on one huge shovel, and laid, say, on the top of Yorkshire, or Wales, or Scotland, it would fit in perfectly, disturb nothing, and undergo no disturbance. If, on the contrary, we were to place it, *en bloc*, on some part of the map of France, it would prove entirely heterogeneous to France, as a form of faith, as a Church, and in public ethics.

From every point of view fellowship with the British mind would be perfect. The irreligion, even, of the Protestant-born Anglo-Saxon renegade and that of the Swiss-born are as much of one piece as the religion was one which their ancestors held in common. Everybody knows that Calvinism was parent to both Protestant religion and irreligion, as Adam was parent to Abel and to Cain.

Thence follows that Alexandre Vinet, answering the description I gave at the beginning of this demonstration, stands to France exactly in the same relation as an Englishman would, supposing that Englishman to be a Protestant divine who was at the same time an ethical critic of French literature.

Yet, strange to say, there is no such Englishman as Vinet was. Why? Because no Englishman has a Latin mind; the English soul is Anglo-Saxon. And so we get to the heart of the matter. We have before us a mind which was a Latin mind, by inheritance, by breeding and by self-culture, sitting in judgment over French literature. He edits it, as it were, critically as to its spirit and contents, but with sympathetic affinity, for the benefit of Protestant-bred people and for general enlightenment. The position is unique in the history of literature. But the vantage of the position depends entirely on the power, penetrativeness, and fairness of the man.

III.

There has been no greater appreciator of French literature than Vinet. Not a voice has ever been raised in France against his criticism, but all have remarked that it is not catholic in tone, and yet quite apart from the tone prevalent among non-Catholics or anti-Catholics. The tone of Vinet's exposition is strictly ethical; his moral belief in matters literary which are made public matters through the printing office is that licentiousness has no share in beauty, art, style, inventiveness, and resource.

So much, then, for Vinet's post of observation as a retrospective overseer of French culture within France through the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. He was a contemporary spectator during the first half of the nineteenth century, in which literature turned from the classic to the romantic expression of the French genius.

But what about his attitude to French literature outside France? This branch was a native sapling in French-speaking Switzerland; it had grown there under the protective shadow, or rather in the light, of Protestantism since 1526, without check or admixture. With the sap of that growth Vinet was fed, and from that nurture of brain, heart, and conscience he drew critical inspiration. And to what was his tone of mind naturally attuned?—To the Anglo-Saxon, which, through the same period of history, had by stages grown Protestant.

So we complete the circle. The tone of Vinet's criticism is the Anglo-Saxon, yet the spontaneous outburst of a Latin mind, quite irrespective of any English contribution; for Vinet was English neither in blood nor by voluntary nurture, nor by mental disposition, nor by habitation, nor by habituation. He did not speak, nor write, nor read English; his acquaintance with the contents of English literature was second-hand.

The case is similar in respect of his Biblical, evangelical, and theological activity. He translated or transferred nothing from English to French, but what he wrote with his Latin mind on religious subjects happened to be of a same spirit with the Anglo-Saxon, was translated and proved easily transferable.

That Vinet's doctrine in literature is an outflow from his doctrine in religion and public morals need not be stressed. *Cela va de soi*. That is his originality. In him are thrown together Geneva, Canterbury and Edinburgh; Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox; Wesley and Fox.

This association is natural. As in Switzerland, Protestantism in Great Britain grew naturally from out the earlier Catholic unity of faith. Not so in France; a detestable and warping element came in—force. In the sixteenth century Catholicism had got out of balance. Protestantism was an effort at restoring, keeping together, the oneness of faith and Church; left to itself, that effort had succeeded.

There can be no doubt that, had force not been applied to the repression of French Protestantism, the Latin world would have fashioned itself to it. Some of the foremost bearers of the new light were Latins. One of the main sources of the Reformation was Latin—the existing Church. Leaders of French extraction were quite numerous enough, sufficiently supported, and convincing to collect round themselves a very large following.

IV.

For those reasons, the eyes of Vinet at the outset of his career as a critic were fixed upon Pascal, who seemed to him the right corner-stone for the building up of a new philosophy after the Renaissance period. Pascal also seemed the fit starting-post. Vinet wanted to fulfil his purpose, in laying down from milestone to milestone the rules and the duty of literature.

Why?—Because Pascal (1625–62) was French of the French, a past-master in the use of literature as a moral force, a semi-Protestant who would have made of Catholicism a Biblical Church, had he lived long enough to become a public character in his time, and powerful enough.

The first Protestant edition of the “Thoughts” of Pascal was published in 1856; it is inscribed to A. Vinet, who, more than anybody, stood up in defence of Pascal, and won for him love and approval in the early nineteenth century.

Here is, in short, Pascal’s doctrine as to literature: Pascal proclaims in Jesus Christ the “restorer of mankind through Scripture (Holy Writ).” Now, Scripture is of Jewish origin, and became Christian with Christ; we have Him recorded only in writing. The foundation of literature, thus, because Scriptural, is at once Christian and moral: the link is established; it is a thing of religious and moral origin. Throughout the Middle Ages the fount of literature is Christianity, even when its publication is by word of mouth only among the illiterate masses of the people. That, subsequently, all literature should come

under this religious and moral canon of criticism is consequential enough. Vinet draws rigorously the conclusion to be applied to profane literature in its relation to the law of morals. As a free production of the mind of man, it is subject to Christian morality.

This standard he applies to the appreciation of the Latin spirit in literary culture. "The effects of religion appear fully and completely only in history," says Vinet. "Speech is the greatest instrument of good and of evil. Speech, the child of thought, reacts upon thought, and, through thought, upon life, made up of will, conscience, and acts, wherefrom proceeding the social effects are seen," says again Vinet. He traces himself back to Pascal, who says, "Eloquent speech is an enforcement of thought by emotion. The thought is painted up, and oratory is the painter. The effect is jointly attained by concordance: by the attuning of the mind and heart of the reader or listener to the mind and heart of the speaker or writer through the instrumentality of thought and expression, with an infusion of passion. The less art, the better the art: one expected an author and one finds a man: a supreme delight."

Plus humane quam poetice locutus est is the highest praise Vinet would grant an author. And here his Protestant nature shines through his Latin mentality. As a Protestant he was made aware of the deflection, the deviation which French literature had undergone, the one-sidedness which it got from the continued subjection of the French mind to the Roman Catholic in its historical development, outside of, and as opposed to, the Reformation. We cannot repeat it too confidently. Protestantism, freedom being given, was the natural outcome of Mediæval Christianity. It was wiped out by force—first by the Inquisition, next by the State, and last by the Revolution, which, assuming that it was a corrective justly applied to the evils of autocracy, was the third Inquisition, persecution, and horror. This was the last bloody artifice of a long series, the last systematic throttling of the spirit. The Protestant spirit could not be revived, because its bearers in flesh and blood had been physically ruled out of existence. French nationhood remained out of balance. One of its natural limbs, cut out of the normal social body, was suppressed.

That French literature, compared with the wealth, depth, and breadth of that of England, is defective on that account struck Vinet, and, as a Latin, he wept over this impoverishing of the sources of literature. Like the maimed French social body,

artificially supported, the literature of France has its share of artificiality, perceptible mainly in the realm of poetry, as compared with the corresponding province of English literature. This, of untold wealth down the ages, shows that none of the richness of the native soil has been extirpated with spade and shovel. Wherever the spirituality fanned into life by Protestantism has been preserved in social institutions, such as schools, for instance, as is the case throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, the spiritual life of the laity has been made manifold, many times over. It has acquired multitudinous strength. Vinet knew this. When speaking of the fecundity of sentiment in literature (the sense of which he got from the English rendering of the Psalms), he enlarged upon Pascal's saying that those whose nature it is to judge by sentiment, do not, when reasoning, bear out those who make of their feelings the servants of grandiose principles of logic. The first do embrace at a glance the whole field of vision; the others, caught in the grip of reason, confine their sentiment within the conceits of reason. "Why not call in piety," says Vinet, "which is a love infused with a respect for man—a creature visited by God?" Science, in human respects, cannot replace the immediacy of feeling. Could the works of religion and piety be kindled into life by principle? Suppose those words did not exist, could their meaning be supplied by logic? The use of speech is always an act; it may be moral or immoral. In Vinet, as in Pascal, the trend of language is always moral. And so would Protestantism have it, which is directly founded on the Word, our guardian against impiety, irreligion, and inhumanity.

V.

Let us place Vinet in contrast with the spirit of French literature in the seventeenth century of which Pascal should have been the leader in the department of written thought. The display along the avenue of time cannot but interest us.

The display is magnificent. The Church has it well in hand; conformity is triumphant; literature is disciplined; its discipleship is unfailing; one sound it gives forth, indeed that of an instrument of social morality under religious guidance. There is not a dissonant voice. The persecution and expulsion of the Protestants, the expunging of their spirit, are systematic, publicly approved and successful. The tone of literature is unified. There

is no such turbulence as marks the politically seething and anarchically religious atmosphere in England. There physical violence, reciprocal proscription, revolt and repression, earthquake tremors, accompany every manifestation of the warring spirits; but it is all about religion and political principles upheld with a tenacity akin to religious belief; it is all strong, untractable conviction. It is the will of rival written and vocal propagandas to be free, which exultingly clash one against another in the conflict of views. The turmoil is irrepressible and the pitched battle never remiss.

In Switzerland, too, neither Protestantism nor Roman Catholicism in the seventeenth century are pacific. But this quarrel is not carried on to the pitch of political discord among parties. The Roman Catholic and Protestant states, bound together in a national confederation, are kept geographically distinct by border-lines marked out on the ground as with indelible chalk. They are unmixed confessionally, each enclosed in its own rigid framework by the perfect local agreement of Church with State in each community. On those clear outlines is some civil war waged, and dies out in the eighteenth century.

In France, on the contrary, the complete deletion of Protestant public thought by force (1685) establishes a dead level of conformity in the national spiritual life, till the hurricane of social revolution sweeps over the country from 1789 onwards and dissolves the old State, a hurricane from which the Roman Catholic unity of creed emerges once more entire, and the nation is more than ever forbidden the fruits of Protestantism.

What is, then, the attitude of Vinet to the "century of Louis XIV," as it is called in literature, a subject which, busy in his own field of social philosophy, Matthew Arnold evoked in his book *Literature and Dogma*? Vinet writes:—

"In the century of Louis XIV criticism has not entered the domain of faith. Belief, not faith, is, as it were, the mood and temperament of that period. The 'authorized' Frenchman of the age—he is not a free agent—believes in political institutions where Roman Catholicism combines with the right of monarchy to claim obedience. The French mind is at rest in that double religion, secular and ecclesiastic. The tone of the upper middle-class makes for solidity, upholds strictly traditional morals, which Molière stands for even on the comic stage (Madame Jourdain, his Orgon in *Tartuffe* and his *Le Misanthrope*)."

In the matter of general morals the disposition of the seventeenth-century spirit in France was not amiss. In literature it compares favourably with the tone of the English stage, and of much unrestrained imaginative composition in the same age. But the English age of genuine moral efficiency, protecting evangelical morals in private life was, in French literature, kept back and did never dawn. There, survive the trite, staple subjects of the social novel and of the playhouse—adultery in aspiration or in effect—a woeful Latin inheritance, sprung up again after a long period of disciplinary repression.

“Of evangelical morals, Milton,” says Vinet, “was a genuine interpreter in the relevant books of *Paradise Lost*. But,” continues Vinet, “we should not expect too much from literature in that respect. Literature is a mirror to society. A literature exclusively Christian would not command complete adhesion. Every literature has to strike a mean as a public vehicle for moral standards. By keeping above the middle line it may gather under its command discreet admirers, but would fail to satisfy general curiosity. Yet there is hope in the naïve delusion of the multitude—a most commendable feature of man taken as a crowd—that literature is privileged to convey to his mind utterances ripe and good in themselves. This instinctive expectation is exposed to sore disappointments. It rebels somewhat when its curiosity is offered mean satisfactions, instead of the better ones, however much spectators may be reconciled thereto by the spell of literary expression.”

Imagination has emerged, partially corrupt, from the Fall, and that is where Milton's standard comes in restoratively. Such a fundamental prepossession—the presupposition of rightness in literature—being derived from early religious use, it is not easy to overcome it. As an interpreter of unrighteousness, an advocate of open wrong, an adversary of God, literature is not very effective without the aid of much talent in ensnaring credulity, the bastard offspring of trust.

Strictly speaking, therefore, to literature taken as a social function, we may ascribe as an attribute neither non-moral qualities nor a truly and profoundly moral office. A scale, degrees, have to be allowed for in literature. What we must allow in French seventeenth-century literature is that it has the ethical quality in a higher degree than the immoral. We must grant that, in morality, it stands above the religious standard of the sixteenth century, and that it is purer than it will be in the

eighteenth century. The element of Christianity is inherent ; it presents moral ideality in a good state of preservation. The breach made therein later is not wide at that period. Moral ideality is a predicate hard to uproot in civilized man ; even the eighteenth century, which destroyed so much of it, could not extinguish it.

But the Protestant "leavening of the lump" was made impossible by a social surgical operation performed on the body of France. To say that, by this operation, the modern peoples generically Latin—with the exception of the Swiss Protestant Republics of French stock—cut themselves adrift from the Middle Ages, and maimed themselves wantonly, may seem paradoxical—though, as a strict historical fact, it is quite right to say that seventeenth-century France is no daughter to the Middle Ages. Nobody will question this asseveration in connection with the so-called *classical* literature of France straight on to the nineteenth century, when that literature passed into the *romantic* form. Why not recognise the same dissentient course in the whole social fabric of France ? This reversal was consciously entered upon in the days of Richelieu (died 1642 ; Mazarin died 1661). It was made complete by the reversal, in 1685, of Henry the Fourth's (the last French liberal king) Toleration Edict, of 1598, which centralized the moral life of the French nation under the one rule of Pope and monarch. During the Middle Ages, the said life was carried on in a decentralized form. There is no use in blinding oneself to, or screening out of sight, that lamentable fact. A glance at the composition of the British State, Church and Society, whithersoever it has been carried, is by comparison irrefragable evidence thereof. Every Protestant must wish that France had continued its growth on the mediæval lines of nation-building.

"But there is no arguing against the event," says Vinet, "and the classical literature bears the taint thereof." Clerical and secular despotism cut Protestantism out of the growing social organism, wherefrom thought suffered much and society no less. Under that combined weight civilian life was borne down, philosophic imagination, with its ideas contributory to social development, was submerged wherever it was a renovating process in religion or a display of theories in the field of metaphysical speculation. It was impossible that such conditions should not narrow and contract the avenues opening up before writers and that the public mind should not be underfed.

The price had to be paid for that kind of languid conformity of public opinion. Its apparent compliance and insensibility show how inanimate it was. Literary activity is, throughout that period, of an "abstract" type. It is not a public affair, or a public voice, or a general spokesman; it has no outer application. Prose and poetry are autonomous concerns; they have no other purpose, no other scope than self-realisation.

VI.

From Pascal, who was a Jansenist, to Racine, whose spiritual disposition was not averse to it, we pass on easily under Vinet's leadership, faithful to his tenet in literary criticism that the standard of evangelical morals is one whereby all published literature should be judged. Racine gave him satisfaction in three ways: First, he was a man of Protestant leanings as a disciple of Port Royal, the Jansenistic centre of opposition to Jesuitism; secondly, his good taste in dramatic literature is perfect and free from any such spurious admixture as is habitual among those who aim at publicity before perfection; thirdly, he would publish nothing but that which—while presenting perfect dramatic and literary construction on the classic lines of the old Greek plays—represented also to the life the struggle of a would-be noble and generous spirit with adversity, or with some passion of which his soul felt inwardly the inherent guilt, or the moral inferiority to one's better human nature.

From that point of view did Vinet write his volumes on the aspects of French dramatic literature in the seventeenth century. There was happily a distinct harmony in this between the acknowledged French dramatic stage at that time and Vinet's moral prepossessions, as a critic of the examples put before the world by tragedians and comedians. There is, in the masterly dramatic productions of seventeenth-century French art, a decorousness that is unchallengeable. This put Vinet quite at his ease in imprinting upon them the stamp of his approval, as an evangelical moralist bent upon truthful philosophic presentation of realities. He felt that the conformation of civilized modern man is such that the stage and the moral thereof are the principal sources to which his receptive imagination turns for refreshment, nourishment and suggestive impressions, though often finding inducements to yield to the blind impulses of his imitative faculty.

Vinet attached himself particularly to the "Phædra" of Racine, and so must we, if we would derive from his consideration thereof the sum total of his instruction. The topic is the sexual passion which a married woman may conceive for her stepson. The issue is not one that we can now pursue. Racine, a moralist moving within the pale of Christian morals, and Vinet both view this theme in its setting at once carnal and spiritual: a chapter in the morals of family, or domestic, life. Racine, being a dramatic exponent, distributes among persons the destructive forces let in through the breach opened in the family complex. There is a disruption of human instincts which would be harmonious. A distraction in the calls of ethical law is the result; confusion is brought about in holy relationships; the tear and wear of soul transcends the inhibitive faculty; disaster overtakes the sophisticated home and its inmates; the sense of wrong-doing, or suffering from evil, festers.

The transformation of one's resentment to compassion and pity, effected by Racine, is a masterpiece of art, and shows, says Vinet, the inspiration of a Christian directing the hand of the playwright. To Christianity alone, says Vinet, belongs this pity of a unique cast which goes out to the criminal as to a fellow-Christian, and is urged upon the Christian by the sense of brotherhood which came down to him from the Crucifixion, the sense of a common sin and redemption. In that light, the state of sin is the occasion of charity. None but the religion which looks upon the state of sin as the highest misfortune that can befall man could generate such compassion.

VII.

Turning our attention to Vinet's attitude toward those thinkers professedly writers on morals, who belong to French literature, where they are classed as "moralistes," of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we are first struck by the fact that not one of them is a divine or a Protestant, while their critic Vinet is a divine, a Protestant, and, to the French, a foreigner, though, by conformity of mind and in language, a Latin like them. That the Protestant mind should have no representative among the moralists of France admitted to the first gallery in national literature, leaves that literature incomplete, one-sided, in one most important respect. Neither Rabelais nor Calvin are moralists in the philosophical sense, though, strange to say, both wore clerical vestments, being under that dress as

the poles asunder. French moralists of acknowledged literary standing are all alike in this, that they are of Romanist nurture or atheistically inclined.

Vinet distinguishes the descriptive moralist, the political moralist, the poetic moralist, when he gives his definition of what a Christian may expect of a poet—that he be true and not interested in vice. Indeed, says Vinet, if a poet speaks with truth, he has spoken with the tongue of a Christian. All moral truth belongs to Christianity, because Christianity, transcendently true, comprehends, and is comprehensive of, all truth—or, at least, expects allegiance thereto by personal confession, or by open profession of one's belief or disbelief.

Thereby poets who have, neither in their writings, nor perhaps in their course of life, respected enough the precepts of morality, have none the less been, unaware, Christians and prophets in the pictures they have formed of man's nature: so real it is that men may render homage where it is due without realizing the truth of their witnessing. In that way many an enemy of the Christian faith has served it with the one hand while raising the other against it. In that way the book-cases of a Christian may be enlarged by the accession of many books which the author did not conceive in the Christian spirit, which he none the less illustrates, whatever his purpose.

Are right morals founded on true religion, or is the trueness of religion to be brought to the test of morals? Vinet does not hesitate. Inferior morals proclaim unfailingly religious inferiority, using the Gospel of Christ as a standard, or criterion, to discriminate by. Are morals an idea, or are they a feeling? Do moralists set up a principle or do they supply a want? On to this dilemma Vinet hinges, as it were, a remarkable description of the progress of "moral liberty" in the Anglo-Saxon world. Calvin and Knox did not claim liberty as a philosophic entity. They resisted an unjust use of power, and their disciples appropriated that freedom for themselves. They did not bring logical proofs of their right: they exercised it. Did they make of liberty, for so much, a matter of belief? Barely, but they claimed it for their creed. Slowly only was "soul-liberty" recognized to be a universal good, a generic common right, claimable in terms of religion, to be a guardian of the public and private moral life. This is the Evangelical liberalism which the Church of Rome does not grant. "*Otez la morale de la religion, rien ne reste du Christ.*"

And then Vinet animadvertes upon the small part which the freeing of the will plays in the literary productions of the essayists and other philosophic writers who rose to fame—men of great intrinsic merit—during the classical age of French literature, and gave it a distinctive stamp. One doctrine, one practice, one Church, one State. There was a dearth of public moral sense, because public life was starved out.

VIII.

Entering the eighteenth century we draw nearer and nearer to the French Revolution. If it could give itself a voice, this century, in France, would call itself the philosophic age—*le siècle philosophique*—which is a misnomer in so far as we would have some regard for the meaning of the word. Every scribbler—and there were legions, hosts, hordes of scribblers—styled himself a philosopher. Every writer, every talker, was merely the exponent of a philosophy in which speech and writing were as unphilosophic as anything could be. Among the prejudices which that century fought religion was reputed the most hateful, and was presented at large as being the most odious:

In psychology those philosophers were “sensationalists”—that is, they reduced the mind to an aggregate of physical senses and built out of them that superior complex which we call the soul. The more sensationalist, the more philosophic; the more philosophic, the more was repudiated the doctrine of spirituality in the life of the soul.

By that time the Protestants of France, had they been allowed to live and multiply there, would have been numbered in millions, and have fully counterbalanced in public and intellectual service those pernicious writers and speakers. They would have been Latins of the second birth—regenerate Latins. The blame of Vinet rests upon those “philosophers,” just as it rests upon the theocratic Scholastics.

Place a spiritual force like that of Calvin opposite Bossuet in the seventeenth century, and another such spiritual force as Wesley against Voltaire in the eighteenth, how the whole face of French political history would have been changed, its place in Europe made incomparably greater, its inner growth enriched, and its world-power enlarged!

An abyss yawns between Bossuet and Voltaire. Protestantism would have filled it with solid rock, strewn it over with fruitful

earth, raised from it an abundant crop. If public homicide practised upon two royal heads may be slipped in as a hyphen between two incongruous events, please compare Cromwell's means of power and those used by Voltaire ! What a chasm !

Such was the effect of the forcible suppression of a third, an intermediate, civic group, a third mouthpiece of national conscience, will and wisdom, says Vinet. The Age of the Reformation had come and gone. Protestantism, fired out of its cradle, was extinct in the French mind-complex. The Reformation was a re-statement of the moral element in the essence of Christianity, that very substance, marrow and sap of any spiritual existence. The Latin mind had foregone that benefit. As a power among men of Latin blood, conformity and virtue, that benefit had retired into the Latin-French social units of Switzerland, and behold there national growth through the centuries, a work of peace, progress and concord !

Bossuet was Cromwell's contemporary. He exclaimed, in his "Funeral Oration on the Death of Henrietta of France," that it was given to Cromwell to "lead a people astray and to prevail against kings." Which was worse, we would ask Bossuet's shade : Cromwell or Voltaire ?—for kingship, first ; for religion, after ; for the greatness of a people, last ? And what a responsibility for Bossuet that we should be able to put the question ? We word the query without respect for political homicide, which, to our mind, is plain murder.

IX.

It is with a sense of personal relief that we turn, with Vinet, from the Voltairian thought to that of Montesquieu, the really wise man, we think, of that period, in the theoretical handling of public questions. From him Vinet quotes the following characteristic passages :—

"A pious man and an atheist are alike in this, that both are ever ready to talk on the subject of religion : the one speaks of what he loves, the other of that which he fears."

As a public thinker, his aversion for atheism bears testimony to the straight workings of his mind. His distaste for atheistic doctrine was rooted in his knowledge of the true wants and actual case attaching to a human commonwealth.

Montesquieu, says Vinet, understood Christianity far better than the would-be ethical thinkers of his day, while putting

the matter in its philosophic aspect. Vinet lays particular stress on what he says on "soul-liberty":—"What does most injure a Government is the devising of a scheme or system for bringing all the citizens into conformity to one opinion in religious matters, when the circumstances are totally averse to such an exhibition of indiscreet zeal for the outer perfection of the Republic While increasing problematically the number of heads counted within the fold, the number of *men* is reduced."

"The principal source of so much misfortune among the Greeks was that they never grasped the nature of, nor drew the right limits between, the ecclesiastic and secular power. This brought about endless strayings away from the right path in public affairs. This essential distinction in authority, the one on which rests the tranquillity of a commonwealth, is grounded not only on religion, but also is founded in nature and accepted by reason. They both require that two things, which are really separate and distinct, and which can only subsist conjointly by being kept asunder, should never exist in a state of confusion."

X.

We have to pass from Montesquieu to J. J. Rousseau and Mme. de Staël, that is from the strictly philosophic and classical, to the imaginative and romantic exponents of "morals" in French literature.

What has been the contribution of Protestant Latinity to general literature? We put the question as one to be answered by Vinet, an ethical and literary critic of evangelical persuasion.

His whole task is confined to two personalities—one, a vagabond in the world of letters, J. J. Rousseau, died 1778; and a woman, Madame de Staël, who died in 1817. These two names carry us over two generations, or three even: those which prepared and then either endured or carried out the French Revolution; that which lived through the first Napoleonic Empire; two critical ages, one following closely upon the other, and doing each its allotted work in a direction totally opposed to the other, whether in statecraft, social philosophy, or general aspirations.

With Vinet we must begin by throwing Rousseau overboard as a private individual. He has to be reckoned with entirely as a public writer. The private life of Mme. de Staël is quite presentable; that of Rousseau has to be cast aside and overlooked

altogether; his constructive imagination and his heart are utterly incongruous. The Protestants of his generation disgorged him as a man of no character, morals or credit; they regarded him as a quite abnormal product. Yet he was no unnatural product of the Genevan atmosphere, which he hardly breathed at all in his conscious days. Psycho-Analysis would probably find in him complex hereditaments accruing from a long and continuous tale of self-repression and compression among his forebears, a kind of resorption ending in a discharge of promiscuous putrid matter accumulated at last in *one* man.

So, like Vinet, we take up Rousseau as a Protestant public writer, an eccentric Genevan contributor to a general didactic philosophy. In that field his authority, righteous and wrongful, has kept growing immensely since Vinet considered him from the standpoint of an evangelical Christian. A lot of excellent public work has proceeded from his impressive teaching, from his attitude of protest against the social perversity of his day. That his experience of social life and of social ills was acquired in France, when he was in daily contact, under the *ancien régime*, with Church, Society and State; that the French overthrowers thereof claimed him as their prophet, apostle and inspirer; that he still thrills the Latin mind; that his influence is acknowledged outside the Latin world; that his place in the very first rank of literature is nowhere disputed—make of this man, who had no character, a great character in history.

Perhaps the only point concerning him on which Roman and Protestant discipline agree was his mistrust of the public playhouse. Here Vinet finds an opportunity for contrasting the English dramatic art at its height with the French Stage. He says the Stage does not set up a doctrine, like the Pulpit or the Chair. It clothes an idea with flesh, braces it up with bone and muscle. Any professed philosopher must view with interest such impersonations when they are the work of psychic genius. And so may any serious-minded spectator. The interest of Macbeth, for instance, lies in the perceived fatefulness of crime; it takes possession, step by step, of the human soul, from the germ laid there by an evil thought, on to the horrors of the final catastrophe.

Vinet notices, with regard to comedy, when an amorous plot—and what plot!—is generally the staple of the play, that Rousseau inveighs loudly against the part cast for women. As a rule, woman is portrayed in her wickedness, or merely held up

to scorn and thrown over to masculine outrage ; and there is the woman-actress, false enough to her sex, to play the derisive part. What about the respect to which every human society should bind itself toward woman ? The dignity of woman is inseparable from reserve and modesty. And who of us would have for his daughter or sister a woman who held herself, her sex, and her function so cheap ? Young people are misled, particularly young women.

The chief advance made by original Christianity is that it raised the status of women. Why should literature be exempt from this, be irresponsible, or be held irresponsible ? And what is a bad novel, if not the Stage brought into the home ? Should the gratuitous portraiture of the failures and errors of the sex be a sure refuge for immorality ?

And here Vinet, with Rousseau, means both sexes, because that which degrades the one degrades also the other. Indeed, the public office of the imaginative art is to be poetical. Yet Rousseau, in many respects, was ignoble.

Of Rousseau compared with Voltaire, Vinet says that his social work would have been constructive. He was an intensely earnest spokesman. Born among the Geneva artisans, he belonged to the people. Rising above the labouring masses, he bore along with him most distinctly the imprint, the stigma of primitive humanity ; his scriptural eloquence was as a storm-wind blowing from a cave round the heads of men.

There was something peculiarly apt in this, because the next exponent of his doctrine was to be a woman springing up from the upper and educated class in the same Protestant quarter of Europe as produced Rousseau from its lower social strata.

XI.

Our opportunity is most valuable in our learning from Mme. de Staël what place might be allotted to woman as an exponent of ethical philosophy in its application through literature to the moral progress of nations, nations whose historical progress, like that of France, has been marred, or has been made incomplete, by the absence of Protestant culture.

Mme. de Staël, writing in the light of Protestantism, drew the attention of that too much self-contained nation, at a time when its native moral force was very near exhaustion, to the mainsprings of collective moral activity in England and Germany.

By Mme. de Staël the Protestant mind of England and that of Lutheran Germany were interpreted in Latin parlance and celebrated in the finest strains of the French language.

This interpretation found such general acceptance and was of such persuasiveness and eloquence that serious improvements were brought to the unilateral culture which had been unbroken for three hundred years and had come to shipwreck on the rock of a revolution; culminating in a military dictatorship which closed the gates of Paris against her, the prophetic of liberalism, but could not stifle her voice echoing in from beyond the border.

At last the true architect seemed to be at work on the future cultural unity of Europe, in the liberal sense of the word Culture.

As much as Rousseau and Voltaire were irresponsible personalities, so much was Mme. de Staël endowed with a stern manlike sense of social responsibility. According to Vinet, Protestantism does develop in the layman, in the common man, a sense of responsibility to God, to his fellow-men and to himself, a blend of the utmost utility to orderly progress throughout the world.

By discrimination, and as by a nice adjustment of contraries, Vinet passes from Rousseau to Mme. de Staël in criticism just as the sceptre of royalty passed from the one to the other in the French world of letters.

The association of the three aforementioned obligations was with her as inherent a hereditament as they were dissociated, inconsistent in, and contemned by, the contemporary schools of practical thought. She expressed this union in sentences which cannot be translated with the same shortness, terseness, and force of conviction in English:—“ *Il faut que les hommes déifient la morale elle-même, quand ils refusent de connaître un Dieu pour son auteur.*” Or else: “ *On ne trouve que dans le bien un espace suffisant pour la pensée.*” Or else: “ *Le bien est la patrie de la pensée.*”

Here is Vinet, commenting upon those aphorisms by which ethics and philosophy are made one, when he says: To disregard, to push aside, righteousness when in search of truth is to give up truth, since truth cannot be parted from the right. Without truth righteousness is untrue. Righteousness is primary truth, supreme truth, the truth of truths.

When one reads through the works of Mme. de Staël in the chronological order, one sees her getting nearer and nearer to

Evangelical Christianity. Ethics, says Vinet, are contained in dogma, and dogma is contained in ethics. Gospel dogmas are supernatural facts, in which the corresponding moral idea, or teaching, finds expression. Thus, in the Gospel, everything is ethical, including the dogmatic teaching.

These are many reasons wherefor intellectually and critically inclined women should make themselves acquainted with the character of Mme. de Staël. At the beginning of the nineteenth century she is the true harbinger of what Anglo-Saxon women were to lay claim to, namely, a raising of their station in intellectual and social respects to the level on which stand good men, though one may fear that, ethically, even these have not yet attained to the elevated passions that Mme. de Staël bore witness to in her life, work and ethical strife, with all the strength of her Protestant thoroughness and native ardour.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving a vote of thanks to Professor Roget, remarked that the meeting could not but be conscious of a distinct obligation to the Honorary Secretary who, in the absence of the lecturer, had read the paper to excellent purpose. From first to last the treatment of Latin Culture by Professor Roget bears an impress of distinction. The writer had shown himself to be thoroughly at home with his subject, and one could not but feel that in every section he had more to say—more pertinent facts at command, more searching judgments to advance. A Swiss in sentiment, Professor Roget shows himself to be an Englishman in his thorough appreciation of the British point of view. In conclusion, the Chairman indicated the paper as one which he was sure would well repay a second perusal.

(The vote was accorded with acclamation.)

Miss HAMILTON LAW: Does anyone think that the reason for much we have been hearing of, in connection with Latin Culture, is that the Latin mind has never yet fully got the answer to Pilate's question, "What is truth?"

Anyone who has been much in foreign society cannot but have been struck with the difference between the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon minds. The former seems lacking in truthfulness, the conversation

is often coarse and lacking in purity of tone. In fact, the general moral standard is lower in the former than in the latter. Without Truth as a foundation Righteousness cannot be built up.

Isaiah writes : " Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth faileth " (Isa. lix, 14, 15).

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : Vinet was one of God's choicest gifts to Switzerland. He was a man that had begun at the beginning. He had realized that he was a fallen man—a sinner, and he had come as a *repentant* sinner to Christ and known the joys of conversion : he had received the witness of the Spirit : he had the blessed consciousness of the indwelling of God in his heart.

When reading Vinet, one is reminded of the Apostle Paul (Eph. iii, 4). Vinet understood something of his (Paul's) knowledge of " the mystery of Christ." I cannot do better than, with your permission, read a few translations from Vinet's writings.

Concerning the fall of Adam, Vinet writes :—

" In the person of Adam, humanity committed a crime that each of its members repeats and confirms, so to speak, as far as in him lies.

" This crime is that of denying God. But no. It is something still worse ; it consists in saying, ' There is a God, but I will act as though there were none.' Now this crime is fundamental, the parent of all crimes, and just in the same way that man, had he not committed it, would have committed no other ; so, having committed it, he is capable of all others, for all spring from this one source.

" This doctrine of the fall of man, who is there that will receive it ? No one, and yet every one. It irritates human pride, but it finds an echo in the human conscience, and conscience will finally prove stronger than pride."

Hear what he feels concerning conversion :—

" Everything is mysterious, nothing is magical, in the process of conversion ; the laws of our nature are observed therein, and we do not for a moment cease to be men.

" God could, with a single word, create new heavens, even within the limits of the old ; but the secret and obscure birth into the true life of a single human soul is a more important event than the creation of a new universe in the deserts of space—if space have deserts.

" God might, with one breath of his mouth, sweep bare the

firmament, annihilate those planets, and those suns amongst which the globe on which the human race agitates itself, is but a grain of sand on the shore of the ocean, or a drop of water in that ocean ; but *this fearful catastrophe would be but a vulgar accident compared with the final destruction of one of those souls that God has made capable of contemplating, understanding, and adoring him.*"

Here is another striking passage :—

" A religion is neither a law nor a doctrine ; it is a fact that unites the heart and will of man to the Author of his being.

" The manner in which we acquire the accent of a language is a striking illustration of what we call synthesis. Religion is learnt in the same way. It is characteristic of true religion, as of all true systems, *that each truth contains the whole truth, and each detail, rigidly followed up, entails the whole system.*"

Gospel Liberty is thus described :—

" The more complete the dependence to which religion submits the individual, the higher as to all other relations the independence it confers. *All religion is liberty ; by giving us to one master, it frees us from the rest.*"

His experiences of " assurance " :—

" What is commonly called assurance ought rather to be called the consciousness of salvation, for one has this sentiment of salvation, as one has with regard to moral life, the sentiment of wishing to do right or of having loved ; and with regard to bodily life, the sentiment of being well, being alive.

That which is called assurance of salvation instead of consciousness of salvation, is God in the heart ; is that communion of will and of mind between God and man which man cannot evoke."

The Love of God inspires him in the following passage :—

" The Love of God is at once the culmination and the annihilation of the me. A lively sense of happiness, an indefinite power of renunciation, combine to form its essential character. To obey God is the supreme duty, but the supreme felicity as well. To love is at once to give all and to have all ; we give our hearts, but the reward of that gift lies in the gift itself ; and the sacrifice of the me, in this mysterious state of the soul, is itself the delight of the me.

" Everything for God and nothing for me ; such is the motto of love.

“ Everything for God, provided God be mine. Does he who loves God deceive himself? Is he not in the truth? *And if Christianity alone gives power to love him, must not Christianity be exclusively true?* ”

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY wrote: I have had the pleasure of meeting Professor Roget, a good many years ago, in Switzerland, and found him a skilled mountaineer and a most agreeable companion. Some months later he came to England and gave lectures on the Swiss military system, and he was most helpful in inciting us to expand our small regular army to what it became during the Great War—a nation in arms.

He has also given us here in the Victoria Institute valuable lectures on the subjects in which we are interested. This last lecture is one of his best, and it traces the remarkable European progress from the darkness, intolerance, and oppression of the Middle Ages to the freedom—intellectual, political and religious—of more modern times.

We owe much to Geneva and to the Swiss in leading the way in freedom of thought in the critical times under consideration. Geneva furnished a safe home in those days for oppressed French Christians, and Switzerland resembled England in benefiting from the arrival of persecuted Huguenots. But even in Switzerland it was not all peace, and we notice how Vinet had the courage of his convictions, and resigned various professorships sooner than resign his religious convictions. We notice (pp. 94, 95) Vinet compares the tendencies of English and of French literature, and his findings should fill us with thankfulness, as the verdict of an honest and capable onlooker.

Union of churches is much to the front at the present time; the paper before us may well make us pause before giving way to any sacrifice of principle in order to obtain outward uniformity. Let us remember how much we owe to former spiritual leaders like Calvin, Knox, and Wesley (*see* pp. 100, 101, 102) before we fall into dull and lifeless uniformity. Let us consider the United States, England, and Switzerland: in all of them material progress is evidently due to the “soul-liberty” (p. 104) of which Vinet speaks.

Vinet and Roget wisely trace the progress of woman, fully declared in the New Testament, but only gradually recognized in the waves of freedom which have gradually swept over Europe after the dark

ages (p. 106). Vinet states wisely that both man and woman progress together, and conversely what degrades the one degrades the other. Vinet also well says that Protestantism develops (p. 107) a sense of human responsibility to God and to our fellow-man.

This is a thoughtful and most useful lecture at this time when changes of startling rapidity come upon us ; we do well to consider our ways, and carefully choose the right and reject the wrong, and we warmly thank Professor Roget for his wisely planned and instructive paper.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS wrote : Many of us have hardly realized, that side by side with a French literature which had rejected the purifying and liberalizing influence of the Bible, and was rushing into a blank atheism, Protestant Switzerland kept alive a true flame of moral discernment. The poverty of strictly French literature on its religious side serves to show what we English and our German cousins owe to the Bible.

We learn from Professor Roget's paper what France might have been in her literature, had she not put aside the Protestant Spirit with its Bible. It also warns us what English literature may become if our youth should cease to be brought up on the Bible. On the one hand the politician would keep it out to propitiate the Papist and the blind sectarian, while the so-called "modern" teacher would sap its moral power by resolving it into myth.

Having regard to certain words of criticism expressed in reference to the Latin mind, the CHAIRMAN observed that, were Professor Roget present, he would doubtless direct attention to the fact that his subject was not Latin *Christian* Culture, but Latin Culture ; and this is made evident by the manner in which he brings in Racine and Rousseau with other non-Christian writers, and shows to what an extent, in their work, they were led to occupy a point of view largely in harmony with Christian ethics.

686TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MARCH 15TH, 1926,

AT 4.30 P.M.

SIR GEORGE KING, M.A. (HON. TREASURER), IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the following Elections were announced:—As Associates: George Phare, Esq., the Rev. Lewis Foster, and John Ashworth, Esq.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. Canon V. F. Storr, M.A., to read his paper on "Revelation."

"REVELATION."

By the Rev. Canon V. F. STORR, M.A., Canon of Westminster.

THE religious history of mankind is proof that the vast majority of men have always believed in the possibility of revelation, for the story of religion cannot be reduced to the story of man's search for God. It is true that man has been searching for God since the earliest ages, but it is also true that he has been convinced that his search has been met by an answering movement on the part of God. The medicine-man, the priest, the wizard, the oracle, witness to a belief that it is possible for man through the appropriate means to come into active relationship with the mysterious power behind phenomena which we call God; and that God makes a disclosure of Himself and His purposes in greater or less degree, though that disclosure may vary considerably in its methods. We are to discuss therefore something which is of world-wide import.

Revelation sends us back at once to the Revealer ; and before we can profitably discuss the problems connected with revelation, we must spend a few moments in thinking about the nature of God. We must banish at once from our minds any thought of arbitrary action on God's part. All the Divine activities must flow from the Divine character and be an expression of God's essential nature. Hence, if He reveals Himself to men, it must be because it is His nature so to do, and because to reveal Himself is part of His purpose for the world. Can we now reasonably infer anything as to the nature of God as a self-revealing Being from a study of His works, among which must be included man ? Evolutionary science unfolds for us a story of development in which, by the very constitution of our minds, we cannot help seeing purpose.

The history of this planet is the history of a succession of changes, which are not mere changes, but changes directed to an end. Stage succeeds stage in orderly evolution, and each stage prepares the way for the next. Nor is this all. In the process of development there is the constant emergence of what is new. New kinds appear, richer in quality, which cannot be explained by what went before them, but call for their own principles of interpretation. Thus, life cannot be explained in terms of non-living matter, nor can consciousness be reduced to movements of particles in the brain. The whole development viewed broadly, and with due regard paid to the fact of retrogressions, has converged on the production of man. Personality is the goal of the process. To make man seems to be the purpose of evolution, a purpose only as yet partially realized, for man has surely not reached the full measure of his growth, even on this planet !

Now, if we are prepared to grant the existence of God, we must view this evolutionary process as a revelation of Himself. The term "revelation" is, of course, being used here in a wide meaning ; but it is the right term to use, because God does disclose Himself to us, at any rate in part, through creation. To create is to reveal. It is so with ourselves. The picture reveals the artist ; the book reveals the author's mind. In the popular mind God's creative activity is usually construed as the power of making something out of nothing. But the important fact about creation is that it is the mode of the Divine self-expression or self-revelation. The evolutionary view of the world has forced me to think of God as essentially a Being

whose nature it is to reveal Himself in ascending degree. A stone tells you something about God ; a flower tells you more ; man, moral and spiritual, tells you yet more ; and as a Christian, I add that the Perfect Person, Jesus Christ, crowns and completes all the earlier and less perfect revelations. It is the ascending scale in Nature which is the important point, because if it be true (and it is true) that a development should be judged by its end, not by its beginning, by what it becomes, not by what it began with, then in order to discover the meaning of our planet's evolution you must look at man, the goal and end of the whole process.

And when you look at man, what do you find ? In man at his best (and it is by his best that he is to be judged) you find a spiritual being, haunted by ideals, with a measure of free creative power, with a sense of God and a desire to know God. He is a growing being, whose “ reach exceeds his grasp ” ; his achievements never keep pace with his possibilities. In character and knowledge you feel that there are higher levels which he is capable of reaching. Now if in the purpose of God the long process of evolution has resulted in the production of such a being, it is a fair inference that the Power behind the process is interested in persons. Having made them, having given them this desire for God, this reaching out after a beyond, will not God want to reveal Himself to them, according to their capacity at any stage to grasp such a revelation ? To bring man upon the scene, and then to deny him all knowledge of what he wants most to know, seems to me to be procedure which amounts almost to irrationality. The nature of God then, as inferred from the structure and history of this earth, leads me to believe that He will reveal Himself to man. I am assuming, of course, that religion is not to be explained away as merely a man-made thing. The battle is raging to-day between the psychology which would treat religion as simply a product of deep-seated tendencies and instincts, coming down from a long past, within the man himself, and having no objective reference ; and the theism which grounds religion in objective reality, and sees in it the product of two factors—man's search for God, and God's touch upon the human soul. Once grant the existence of a Supreme will and mind behind the visible scene, and revelation takes its place as the natural unfolding of God to men who, in some degree, share His nature.

The Christian conception of God as Love emphasizes the truth that it is God's nature to reveal Himself, because love is an energy which flows out in blessing upon others. Human love proves itself to be love only by giving of itself to others. That is the law of its life—that it cannot keep itself within a self-contained circle, but must overflow in ever-widening activities. Love is essentially a self-revealing power.

Let us go on now to consider our subject more in detail. The first point for discussion is the nature of the difference between revelation in its wider meaning and revelation in the narrower meaning, which we more usually attach to the word. In its larger significance, revelation covers all the divine activities in Nature and history; they are all a manifestation of God and His purposes. In its narrower significance, revelation relates to what we believe to have been a special activity of God in relation to the Hebrew race, and in relation to the coming of Jesus Christ. These two views of revelation correspond to the old distinction between natural and revealed religion. Natural religion, so it was once taught, included all those truths about God which man, by the unaided use of his reason, could discover through a study of Nature and his own constitution. By this road he reached (I am stating it roughly) the conception of a Creator and Ruler and Designer of the Universe, who possessed moral character, and was interested in the moral development of man. But can we to-day press the antithesis between natural and revealed religion so rigidly as it was once pressed? I do not think that we can, and for the following reasons:—In the first place, man can discover nothing which God does not choose to reveal; hence, even natural religion is really a revelation. Secondly, when this contrast between natural and revealed religion was in the ascendant, the study of comparative religion had hardly begun. Since then comparative religion has grown to be an important science. A vast mass of material is to hand about the various religions of the world, and a study of this shows that it is extremely difficult to maintain that there is a body of beliefs which can be called natural religion. If you take the beliefs which are common to all religions, you will find they are very few. I am, therefore, of opinion that we must get rid of the distinction between natural and revealed religion as it was once set forth, and adopt a different method of approaching the subject. We shall be on a more fruitful line of inquiry if we keep in mind the

conception of degrees of revelation, and think of God as never having left Himself without witness among any tribe of men, but of the witness as varying in clearness to an almost indefinite degree. The development of religion is due to the interaction of two factors—a human factor and a divine factor. The crudities and superstitions which attach to religious beliefs, more markedly in their earlier growth, are due to man; yet the fact that there has been an advance in religion, that animism and polytheism have given place to monotheism, and that monotheism has become more ethical, is indication that there has been Divine control of the whole movement. Such at least is the conclusion drawn by the theist.

Now this conception of degrees of revelation leads us to another problem which presents great difficulties. What explanation are we to give of Hebrew religion? The fact which we have to explain is the existence among the Hebrews of a religious experience and of a conception of God without parallel among contemporary peoples, or indeed among any peoples uninfluenced by the Bible. How was it that this one nation reached in their prophets a conception of God which is the basis of all our modern theism? Why did they have this rich and living experience of God, recorded in a literature which has power to “find” men, as Coleridge put it, in the very depths of their souls? There can be no doubt about the answer which their own writers give to these questions. They assert that this knowledge of God came to them through revelation; it was not their own discovery; it was something given to them, impressed upon their souls by God Himself.

The Old Testament, it has been said, pictures God as coming down from above upon human life. Everywhere the priority is attributed to Him. He selects Israel in love, trains the nation, illumines the minds of their teachers. Now we must discover a cause adequate to produce so remarkable an effect, and revelation is the right word to use in this connection. But is our reason satisfied if we say that God, who endowed the Greeks with their artistic powers, gave to this people a remarkably rich religious endowment? Or have we to postulate, in addition to this original endowment, a specific activity of God upon the souls of the religious teachers of the race? And if we have to postulate the latter, are we dealing with a difference in kind or only in degree? When does a difference in degree

become a difference in kind? This last question I do not think we can answer, nor does that matter for our present purpose. With regard to the other problem, whether you can explain the religious outlook of the Hebrews by saying that it followed from their original endowment, or whether you have to assume the existence of a specific Divine activity, I question if the alternatives are really valid. Because we surely cannot think of God as a Being altogether external to man; we cannot think of Him as having made the Hebrew race with a certain constitution, as a carpenter may make a chest. The carpenter is outside his creation. But God, though He is not His creation, is not outside it in external fashion. "In Him we live and move and have our being." He is the animating principle of the whole, always creating, always sustaining, ever bringing the new out of the old. So that the religious endowment of the Hebrews, which was nothing static, but was pre-eminently active and alive, was really God at work. Who can say where the human ends and the Divine begins? When high thoughts come to us or conscience warns, is it not the Spirit of God moving within us? Special endowment and special activity seem to me to come ultimately to much the same thing. The point is that these Hebrews reached such spiritual heights, that you can explain their achievement only by saying that God gave them a revelation of Himself incomparably richer than He gave to any other nation.

But is everything in the Old Testament revealed? No, not unless you adopt a theory of inspiration, which it is surely quite impossible to square with modern knowledge. It is sometimes forgotten that the Hebrews, a branch of the Semites, had an ethnic religion before they became the subjects of Divine guidance. That ethnic religion they did not all at once discard; indeed, the mass of the people never discarded it, nor has it been discarded to-day in Palestine. From that ethnic religion they derived, for example, the rite of sacrifice, the habit of worship under sacred trees, the habit of erecting pillars of stone or poles of wood for ritual purposes. Their own prophets distinguish clearly enough between the revealed and the non-revealed elements in their religion. Amos, for example, with a splendid daring, faces the ceremonialists of his day with the question, "Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" (v. 25).

Jeremiah states explicitly that sacrifice was no part of the original revelation given to the nation:—"For I spake not unto

your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices : but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people” (vii, 22, 23).

What you have in the Old Testament is the story of how God, making use of much of this material of ethnic religion, gradually and progressively led the nation to a truer conception of Himself. But the old rites and the old ways of thinking about God lingered on a long time. The Old Testament is full of these relics of a distant past ; they belong to revelation only in the wider meaning of the term, not to revelation in its narrower sense.

I must deal with one other point before passing to the constructive portion of this paper. What is the method of revelation ? When a prophet said, “The word of the Lord came to me,” what did he mean ? How are we to conceive of the psychology of revelation ? We cannot, I think, go further than the assertion that revelation meant a quickening or intensifying of the religious consciousness of the prophet. I doubt if we can maintain that any definite proposition was communicated by revelation. If we study the prophetic writings, we shall find that the prophets declare God’s will and purpose : they do not propound doctrine, though of course doctrine can be deduced from their utterances. Robertson Smith wrote as follows :—
 “The essence of true prophecy lies in moral converse with Jehovah. It is in this moral converse that the prophet learns the Divine will, enters into the secrets of Jehovah’s purpose, and so by declaring God’s word to Israel keeps alive a constant spiritual intercourse between Him and His people.” (*Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 249.) That we must so conceive of the manner of revelation seems to me to be indicated by the fact that the prophets preserve in a wonderful way their individuality. Each writes in his own style, uses his own imagery ; there is no trace of any mechanical dictation. There is an overmastering sense of spiritual control ; there is a vivid consciousness of contact with the living God ; but there is no audible voice of God, no loss of self-control in the prophet, except in the case of the trance or ecstasy, which belong to a lower level of prophecy. Revelation, then, is made through personality. We speak of the Bible as an inspired book ; we ought to speak of it as the record of the utterances of inspired persons. There is always, as

Dr. Matthews has recently pointed out in his Liverpool Lectures on *The Idea of Revelation*, a tendency to depersonalise revelation : "The record, the book, or the set of doctrines which are believed to enshrine the original revelation, seem, almost inevitably, to usurp the authority of the personal experience, which lies at the root of the religion, and to take its place" (p. 7).

We go on now to consider, and especially as regards their evidential value, some features of revelation in connection with the Old Testament and with Christianity. First, let us think about Messianic prophecy. One of the most valuable results of the newer studies of the Bible is that the scholars have enabled us to understand better the work of the prophet. We see how many-sided that work was. The prophet comes before us as the embodied conscience of the nation. He is social reformer, political adviser to kings, stern critic of the popular religion ; he interprets the lessons of the nation's past ; he insists that character and not ceremonial is the vital element in religion. All this is the work of the prophet in its wider aspect. But within this larger activity of prophecy is a more special activity, to which we give the name Messianic prophecy. The Hebrew religion put a Golden Age in the past, but it was also a forward-looking religion ; and its forward-looking character is seen most clearly in the prophets. Most of them were men inspired with a conviction that God had some great redemptive purpose in store for the nation ; that a better time was coming, that God would establish a Kingdom of truth and peace and equity. When or how this Kingdom would come they knew not. Each draws his picture of it in his own colours. At times they think of the coming of the Kingdom as imminent. In a political crisis, in the advent of an invading host, in the incidence of pestilence or earthquake, they see signs that the "Day of the Lord" is at hand. So conscious are they of the reality of the living God that they shorten their perspective. In the pictures which some of them draw is a central Figure, a Prince or King, who shall inaugurate the coming of the perfect Kingdom ; or a King-Priest, who shall offer for his people the true worship. One of them, the greatest, whom we call Second Isaiah, draws a picture of a Suffering Servant, who by his sufferings for his people is to redeem them. It probably is true that the Servant is the purified nation, or the faithful nucleus of the nation, yet does not an individual Figure show itself on the canvas ? I cannot

feel that the prophet had any clear vision of Christ, but I think he had a vision, however dim, of a personal Redeemer. The Messianic movement reaches its climax in the portraiture of the Suffering Servant, and here is the last word of the Old Testament upon the problem of suffering.

The centuries pass by. Prophecy proper dies ; its place is taken by apocalyptic. The hope of Divine redemptive action remains intensively alive, but it takes a new form. Despairing of redemption coming through the ordinary secular processes of history, the apocalyptic writers look for some sudden, catastrophic intervention on the part of God, who either Himself, or through some chosen Messiah, shall free Israel from its foes and establish a new Kingdom. What happens ? A Babe is born at Bethlehem, grows to manhood, proclaims Himself the World’s Saviour, dies on a Cross, rises again, and passes to the exercise of a spiritual sovereignty which has no parallel. We, as we look back upon the earlier movement of prophecy, and see the amazing fulfilment which it received in the Person and work of Christ, are compelled to say, “ Here is Divine design. Here is a directed Spiritual movement.” It is often impossible to read clearly purpose in history, because the scale of movement is so vast and complex. But surely there is purpose here ! Jesus, at any rate, claimed to be the fulfilment of this earlier movement. He adopted for Himself the rôle of the Suffering Servant. He saw in the Old Testament Scriptures a witness to Himself. I have always thought that the movement of prophecy with the fulfilment which it received in Christ presents peculiar difficulties for the sceptic ; because, though there was in the past a tendency towards Christ, there was no tendency to produce Him. His fulfilments of prophecy were so unique and original, the inner spirit of prophecy received in Him such a wonderful interpretation, so many lines from the past were proved by the event to converge on Him, that any other explanation save that of Divine design is excluded.

If it is a true principle for interpreting a development that you should look to the end rather than to the beginning for the discovery of the meaning of the development, then, as I have already said, it is a fair inference from the facts before us that the meaning of the evolution of our planet has to do with persons. The evolution has resulted in the production of persons, and appears to have been directed to that end. And we judge that

the Power behind the evolution is interested in persons. This consideration gives us a kind of general philosophical background for our approach to the problem of the Person of Christ. If the key to the meaning of evolution is to be found in personality, if it is God's purpose in creating to call into existence a society of free human spirits made in His image, who shall live in fellowship together under the principles of love and moral goodness, then it becomes less incredible that at some point or other in the evolution the Perfect Person should appear to set the standard for the growth of personality, and provide new motive power for the attainment of that standard. Now a common objection which is raised to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is that in an evolution you would naturally expect the final stage of the process to be the most perfect. If Nature has been slowly climbing towards personality, why should the Perfect Person appear at some point midway in the process, instead of at the end of the process? The objection may hold good for a naturalistic philosophy, which regards evolution as a self-contained process, in which what was latent in the beginning gradually becomes explicit. But for a theist the objection ceases to be formidable; for he can never think of evolution apart from the creative power which works in and through it. The new, as I have said, is always emerging in the course of the evolution; and to-day a school of able writers is emphasizing this conception of "emergent evolution," and is interpreting evolution in spiritual, though not necessarily in theistic, terms. At any rate, they have moved far away from the older materialism, and give to the universe a spiritual significance. Once we grant the existence of a Creative Will behind phenomena, and see in the laws of Nature that will in operation, we must allow to God the possibility of introducing a new factor at any moment into the evolutionary scheme. This the Christian believes that He did when Jesus Christ appeared. Nor is it simply a case of a Perfect Man appearing. Christianity reposes on the belief that God Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ revealed Himself to humanity. In Jesus we are to see the perfect revelation of the character and purpose of God, so far as that purpose and character were capable of being manifested through a truly human personality. The Christian's answer to the question, "What is God like?" is that "He is like Jesus Christ." Revelation, as we have seen, is made through persons. In the Person of Christ we have revelation at its best and completest.

Let me end this paper by some general considerations bearing on the problem of Christ's Person in relation to our central thought of revelation.

(a) We must at the outset make clear to ourselves the true dimensions of the problem. The problem of Christ's Person is far wider than the questions which inevitably arise when we try to think out what we mean when we call Him God. How could He be God and man at the same time? How are we to define the relation of the Two Natures in His undivided Personality? Thought is peculiarly active upon these questions at the present time. But they are only part of the problem of His Person. If we would judge of Christ aright we must take into account His work and influence, what He is doing now, as well as what He did two thousand years ago in Palestine. In the Christian scheme of thought the Person of Christ has an eternal significance. He is represented as now alive, continuing the redemptive work which He began on earth. He is represented as the spiritual centre of humanity, a source of life and energy for the world. And quite certainly Christian experience is an experience of Christ's power. You may try to explain it away, as much modern psychology does, as an illusion born of self-suggestion, but no one can deny that from the Epistles of St. Paul onwards there has been a continuous stream of experience which looks to Christ as a living, active Personality.

As evidence that there was a revelation of God in Jesus Christ the continuous testimony of the Christian consciousness seems to me of great value. If it is an illusion born of self-suggestion that the Christian receives life from Christ, it is strange that this illusion operates in ways quite unlike those in which ordinary illusions operate. Illusions, as a rule, are short-lived, or, if permanent, are confined to a few individuals who are reckoned insane or unbalanced. Illusions weaken and disintegrate personality, unfit the man who has them for his place in common life. But the illusion of Christian experience, if such it be, is continuous through the centuries, does not disintegrate or weaken personality, but on the contrary invigorates it. Is a judge any the worse judge for being a Christian? And there is this remarkable fact about Christian experience, which marks it off from the ordinary working of illusion, that it runs into the same mould wherever it occurs. The first century and the twentieth; the Chinaman and the Englishman; the peasant and the philosopher—the experience of all of these has the same content,

of a sense of sin, of forgiveness, of peace with God, of power coming into the soul from a source other than the man himself. All this points to an objective reality as the ground and cause of the experience. I argue, therefore, that the work of Christ is a very real part of the problem of the Person of Christ, and that the influence of Christ through the centuries is a material factor in a Christian apologetic which concerns itself with the idea of Revelation.

(b) A century or a century and a half ago miracle was regarded as of high evidential value. The miracles recorded of Jesus were adduced as testimony to His divinity. To-day the Christian's first line of defence is certainly not miracle. At the same time, the Resurrection remains as one of the foundation-stones of the Christian Faith. The Church arose on the belief that Jesus rose from the dead. The Resurrection helps to bridge the gap between Jesus the prophet of Nazareth, and the Christ, whom St. Paul in his earliest epistle "brackets" with God. The apologist for Christianity to-day would, I think, begin with the character and consciousness of Jesus as the main evidence that in Him God was in special manner revealing Himself to the world. From that position he would pass on to suggest that miracle was a natural accompaniment of such a Personality. This is surely the line taken by the writer of the Fourth Gospel. His word for miracle is "sign." He does not emphasize the element of the strange or marvellous in miracle, but rather regards miracle as a sign pointing to the Person, and intended to wake enquiry as to the nature of that Person. Much of our difficulty about the miraculous arises from our failure to define what we mean by miracle. To-day, I think, we are interested in the religious significance of a miraculous act, rather than in its aspect of wonder. And, after all, an event which occurs in the course of what we call natural law may have a deep religious significance. For example, if the crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites was made possible by the occurrence of an exceptionally low tide and strong wind, the fact that that combination of circumstances happened when it did is in a real sense to be called miraculous.

Now, when we study the consciousness of Jesus we realize how difficult it is, if we are to do justice to all the facts, to interpret Him solely in terms of manhood. Unlike all other men, He betrays no consciousness of sin or defect in Himself; He even claims to forgive the sins of others. He betrays no hesita-

tion in His spiritual announcements, never has to retrace His steps or own to a mistake. His consciousness of His Father is unclouded. He is aware of a unique relationship between Himself and God. He speaks with authority, claims the unswerving allegiance of mankind, offers life to men, offers rest and peace to the burdened ; and the event has justified this claim. The generations of mankind have found in Him the rest they crave and the satisfaction of their deepest spiritual needs. Unquestionably in Christian experience He has had the value of God. The problem is whether behind the value is a fact which corresponds to it. The framers of our Creeds in the long-drawn Christological controversies of the early centuries were concerned to conserve in their theological definition of Christ's Person the redemptive values which Christ had for experience. They could do this only by calling Him God ; and they meant that He was God ; because they saw that there was all the difference in the world between the belief that God selected a man to be the world's Redeemer, and the belief that God Himself in the Person of Jesus Christ came to earth as the Redeemer. You have taken the heart out of the Cross, for example, if you do not see in it the eternal love of God stooping to the very extreme of self-sacrifice. I think it true to say that at times in the official theology of the Church the deity of Christ has been allowed to overpower the humanity, and that full value is still not being given to the doctrine of His real manhood. One of the pressing problems of the moment is to re-think the relation of the humanity to the deity in His Person. But I am certain that we shall never be satisfied with an interpretation of Christ in terms of manhood alone. We shall always be compelled to find some metaphysical equivalent for the religious value which Christ has as God in Christian experience.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir George King, M.A.), in opening the Discussion, said : This Institute is a philosophical society, but it includes among its members some, perhaps, besides its Treasurer, who are far from being trained philosophers. It is, of course, possible that one day the experience of M. Jourdain may be ours, and we may discover

that we have in fact been philosophers from our earliest days ; but it is a little unfortunate that the Secretary should have placed one of us in the Chair to-day, and so compelled him to commence the discussion of Canon Storr's paper. It is, however, the privilege of the Chairman to propose a vote of thanks to the reader of the paper, and this I certainly can do *ex animo*, even though I seem to detect towards the foot of p. 118 an example of something with which my daily duties make me familiar—the adduction of an authority in a form which is correct but incomplete. As, however, I studied this afternoon's paper I came across one phrase which appears to me to be amply illustrated by the paper itself. It is on p. 114 : “The book reveals the author's mind.” For whatever difficulties some of us may feel about the earlier pages of the paper, the three closing pages show what is, or rather Who is, supreme in that mind. And I am persuaded that the author speaks, not only out of his own heart, but also to the heart of every member of this Institute, when he says : “You have taken the heart out of the Cross if you do not see in it the eternal love of God stooping to the very extreme of self-sacrifice.” For while the whole adventure of the earthly Life revealed a self-sacrificing love beyond all our imagining, that one oblation of Himself once offered is as much the crowning exhibition of the love of God's plan of Redemption as the Resurrection and Ascension are of its entire efficacy.

(The vote of thanks having been cordially passed, discussion proceeded.)

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : The argument from Nature and the supposed evolution of man set forth in the paper amounts to very little, and gives no revelation of the nature, attributes and character, of God, beyond “His eternal power and Godhead.” The claim that man at his best has “a sense of God and a desire to know God ” may be an academic view, but such a kind of person does not exist apart from the work of God's Spirit, as his powers have been vitiated by sin.

It is to be regretted that the construction of the argument of the paper introduces Christ as a link in the development of evolution. For whatever theory of evolution is put forward, He stands apart from mankind in the essential of being without sin.

Canon Storr has stated that the Hebrews derived from their ethnic religion the rite of sacrifice. Where is the historic evidence for such a statement? On p. 119, in the second paragraph, the lecturer gives a complete travesty of the facts. He says: “What you have in the Old Testament is the story of how God, making use of much of this material of ethnic religion, gradually and progressively led the nation to a truer conception of Himself.”

The plain fact is that everywhere in the Old Testament the only religion or religious rites which are sanctioned are those which have been revealed as the will of God, and all other rites, sacrifices, and practices whatsoever are unreservedly condemned as being offensive to God.

The paper also ignores the facts of the case (p. 119, para. 3) in asserting that “revelation meant a quickening or intensifying of the religious consciousness of the prophet. I doubt if we can maintain that any definite proposition was communicated by revelation.” This is begging the question. The prophets, in thousands of instances, claimed to speak with the authority of “Thus saith the Lord.” And it is an unfair deduction, and indeed a setting aside of plain facts, to impose this interpretation on their writings and speech. To affirm that “there is no audible voice,” places the person so arguing out of court. If revelation is supernatural, why may not its mode be also?

The statement made by the Canon, that the prophet had not any clear vision of Christ, seems to be dispelled by such passages of Scripture as John xii, 41, and 1 Peter i, 11, 12. From the apologetic, inferential and uncertain position of revelation as developed in this paper, one turns to the sublime revelation as presented in the Scriptures with the authoritative “Thus saith the Lord.” The Scriptural revelation has this supreme attestation, that Christ, who, as Canon Storr has truly remarked, “unquestionably in Christian experience has the value of God,” referred to the Old Testament revelation as “the Word of God which cannot be broken.” It is in this revelation that the Christian reposes his trust.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said: Is it accurate to say that God reveals Himself (p. 114) in His works and in the evolutionary process? The artist and the author reveal something about themselves in their works but do not, can not, fully reveal themselves. In the same

way we may learn something about God, His Power and Wisdom, from the study of His works, but what we learn will depend on human inferences. That these are precarious appears from the fact that different minds have drawn different conclusions from the same data. From the facts of Nature, some deduce that God is good; others can only see a fierce Nature, "red in tooth and claw." To call this "Revelation" is to use the word in a sense different from the meaning usually accepted. The Biblical words, Hebrew and Greek, convey the idea of uncovering that which was hidden—secrets, mysteries, the unknown future. The main idea of Revelation in the ordinary sense is that God has been pleased to make known to man what man unaided could never have discovered—God's Nature, Being, Will and purpose.

Is it true to say "man can discover nothing which God does not choose to reveal" (p. 116)? Man has discovered how to make (and use terribly) poison gas. Did God choose to reveal that? Is it not rather true that God has left it possible for man to discover evil things as well as good, but has not revealed them to man.

Is it true to affirm that "there has been an advance in religion, that animism and polytheism have given place to monotheism, and that monotheism has become more ethical" (p. 117)? There seem to be indications that the early religions (Egyptian, Assyrian) were largely monotheistic, and that animism and polytheism were later corruptions. Where have animism and polytheism given place to monotheism, except where the influence of the Bible has been felt?

To the unanswered question, "When does a difference in degree become a difference in kind?" I would venture to answer, "Never." You may make a ladder as long as you please, but the highest degrees will still be rungs, and not change into steps of a staircase. Is it correct to say that the Hebrews "had an ethnic religion before they became the subjects of Divine guidance" (p. 118)? The Hebrews were descendants of Abraham, and were not a nation till the Exodus. There is no trace of "worship under sacred trees" or of "erecting pillars of stone or poles of wood for ritual purposes" till after they entered into Canaan. The practices have not "been discarded to-day in Palestine." True; but amongst what people? Not Hebrews, but the peasant population (*Fellahin*), and there is good reason for believing these to be descendants of the Canaanites.

Can we go no further than “the assertion that revelation meant a quickening or intensifying of the religious consciousness of the prophet” (p. 119)? Is that more than an *a priori* conclusion from what we conceive would be or ought to be God’s procedure? At any rate the prophets seem to be of a different opinion when they assert, “The Lord said unto me,” and when they are reluctant to comply with their mission (as were Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel).

The paper asserts: “There is no audible voice of God,” but the Bible says there was—in Eden, at Sinai, when “the Lord spake unto Moses face to face,” to Samuel, to Elijah on Horeb, and when Isaiah says, “I heard the voice of the Lord” (vi, 8). Also in the New Testament there was the Voice at our Lord’s Baptism; again at the visit of the Greeks; and St. Paul not only heard a voice, but specifies that it spoke “in the Hebrew tongue” (Acts xxvi, 14).

The difficulty, “If Nature has been slowly climbing towards personality, why should the Perfect Person appear at some point midway in the process?” (p. 122), simply assumes that the production of the Perfect Person was the ultimate end and aim of the process. But if the coming of the Perfect Person was for the redemption of mankind, it could not be delayed till “the end of the process.” Is it adequate to say, “In Jesus we are to see the perfect revelation of the character and purpose of God” (p. 122)? Is it quite the same as to confess that He was God?

St. John’s “word for miracle is ‘sign’” (p. 124). Not the only one, for he also speaks of “the works,” and in one place couples signs with “wonders.” What are the chief “signs” recorded by him? The turning of water into wine, the feeding of five thousand, the opening of the eyes of one born blind, the raising of Lazarus. Not one of these can be called “an event which occurs in the course of what we call natural law.” What did the “signs” signify? What was their purpose? “Signs,” in the Old Testament as well as the New, were given to attest the Person working them, not merely “to wake inquiry” (p. 124). If it be true (I venture to doubt it) that “in the official theology of the Church the Deity of Christ has been allowed to overpower the humanity” (p. 125), that, I submit, is far less dangerous than the modern tendency

to allow the humanity to overpower, obscure, and even altogether deny the Deity.

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY agreed with the lecturer in the statement that divine revelation is progressive, and culminates in the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ. He proceeded: If sacrifice (p. 118) is only a relic of ancient ethnic religion, we must cut out parts of at least twelve Books of the Old Testament where sacrifice is commanded by God, as well as those parts of the New Testament which speak of the Sacrifice of Christ—in the Gospels, the Book of Acts, and Epistles, especially in that to the Hebrews, where the Old Testament sacrifices are spoken of as foreshadowing the death of Christ. I cannot see in Jer. vii, 22, 23, any forbidding of sacrifice; rather, *obedience* is demanded in the first place, the outward act of sacrifice not being accepted unless there is an obedient heart.

The paper might, more correctly, have been described as on Evolution, as that word, or some equivalent, occurs at least fourteen times, with the assumption that it is a *science*. The lecturer speaks of our Lord's redemptive work as having *begun* on earth and as continued afterwards; but our Lord Himself spoke of such work as finished on the Cross (John xix, 30). To my mind, the paper is dangerous, being a mixture of truth and fancy. Many a careless reader may approve what is good in the lecture and yet fail to detect the error which may be unconsciously imbibed along with the truth expounded.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said: The paper seems to me a dangerous one and somewhat superficial in character. For instance, it ignores the fall of man and the need for expiation of sin. On p. 118 the lecturer, in saying that he cannot think of God as a Being altogether external to man, seems to deny His transcendence. On the same page he speaks of the "rite of sacrifice" as belonging to the ethnic religion of the Semites (of whom the Hebrews formed a part), and claims that "Jeremiah states explicitly that sacrifice was no part of the original revelation given to the nation."* I would point out

* I add, what I communicated to the lecturer at the close of the meeting, the explanation which many commentators have given, from Jerome in the fifth century to the *Speaker's Commentary* in 1875, that God did not

to him that all the Four Gospels bear witness to our Lord's statement that Moses gave the Law to Israel in the wilderness, and in this He included the law of sacrifice, as is proved by the incident of the cleansing of the leper related in each of the first three Gospels—for our Lord told the leper to go and show himself to the priest, adding : “ Offer for thy cleansing the things that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them ” (Mark i, 44). This was an unmistakable reference to the “ law of the leper in the day of his cleansing ” (Lev. xiv, 1-9), where we get two birds, one slain and the other set free, to typify the death and Resurrection of our Lord. It is interesting to find that this particular law lay unused for some fourteen centuries (for apparently the only leper cleansed was a Syrian who would not go to Jerusalem at all) awaiting the Coming of Christ, in order that there should be a testimony at Jerusalem by each leper whom He cleansed, of His divine work in Galilee.

Do I understand that the lecturer denies the truth of this testimony of the Lord to the fact that Moses gave to Israel a law concerning sacrifice, and is not afraid to say that Christ was not the Truth in all He said ? I regret the suggestion, on p. 124, that there was any gap between Jesus the prophet of Nazareth and the Christ whom Paul “ bracketed ” with God, which needed the Resurrection as a help to “ bridge.” Surely our Lord, in all He said and did in His Galilean ministry, displayed His full Godhead as much as in His being raised from the dead.

Mr. H. O. WELLER welcomed the paper as a good attempt to solve the problem of harmonizing Revelation and Evolution. There was little to be afraid of in the term Evolution ; it was a term to which many meanings were attached, and sanctioned by common use. It could include Creation. He appealed to members who, like himself, might be labelled as conservative Evangelicals, to have patience with men who claim to believe as Evangelicals do, though they speak in different terms.

institute sacrifices for Israel until after they had broken His law at Sinai by making the golden calf. As Paul says of the law, “ It was added because of transgressions ” (Gal. iii, 19). Jeremiah was therefore perfectly accurate in saying that “ in the *day* that I brought them out of the land of Egypt ” God spake not nor commanded “ concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices ” (vii, 22).

Though the paper was good, there were nevertheless bad points in it. He drew special attention to the author's hesitating treatment, at the foot of p. 120, of a passage which Christ had read as definitely referring to Himself. There was no question possible in the unique circumstances: the "Servant" in the passage was our Lord, not in any sense "the purified nation" or "the faithful nucleus."

He suggested that active fighting against such Modernism as that of the author is a mistake, "for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught." Let such Modernism, upholding in deliberate terms the Deity of Christ, be put to the test of bearing fruit: so far it seemed barren enough, but time would show.

The Rev. MORRIS MORRIS said: This paper is an exposition of the main idea in modern theology, namely, that Christianity was not revealed from Heaven, but evolved from barbarism. Although the author entitled his paper "Revelation," he only means that evolution is the revelation of God; and he regards it as the only revelation. In taking this standpoint, theologians have followed E. B. Tylor, who, in his famous book, *Primitive Culture*, first published fifty-five years ago, begins by assuming that all culture (in which he included religion) is a product of evolution; and he looks to the "animism" of the Stone Age for the beginnings of the process.

There is much in Judaism, which Moses inherited from the simpler faith of the Patriarchs, and much in Christianity, which Christ inherited from Judaism. But there is something else besides. Moses not only inherited an old Faith, but transformed it by revealing something new; and so also did Christ. Those revealed elements are the very qualities which made them distinctive. In Christianity they constitute the backbone of the Gospel. Take them away and the Gospel disappears. But Tylor regards them as products of evolution, or, as Canon Storrs calls it, "revelation," and he directs theologians to value them accordingly.

The death of Christ in the New Testament is treated as the anti-type of the sacrifices of the Tabernacle which Moses instituted in obedience to a revelation received in the Holy Mount. But Tylor and his followers repudiate all this. They deny that such ideas were ever revealed either to Christ or Moses, and insist on regarding them as survivals of savagery which ought to be abolished.

Is there any ground for assuming that religion could not have been

revealed and must have been evolved? Evolution accounts for some things, but why assume that it ought to account for everything? It explains, under God, the development of species, but why conclude that it ought to explain their origin as well? “ Evolution,” said the late Lord Morley, “ is the most overworked word in all the language of the hour.” The Doctrine of Descent may be interpreted in two ways, namely :—(1) Evolution during Descent; (2) Creation during Descent. Tylor and his followers take their stand on the first. But although the Doctrine of Descent itself stands firm, all the evidence overthrows the evolutionary version of it, and establishes the other version—Creation during Descent. If the first version were true, there would have been a gradual transition from the Faith of the Patriarchs into Judaism, and from Judaism into Christianity; whereas we find a hiatus! Similarly, there would have been a transition from the Old into the New Stone Age, whereas there was an hiatus. All writers recognize it, and evolutionists admit that it should not be there. They call it an “ apparent ” hiatus, a “ so-called ” hiatus, “ the hiatus problem,” and so on, which is only explaining the facts by explaining them away. But the other version (Creation during Descent) would lead us to *expect* the hiatus! Evolution does its own proper work, but evolutionists, under the influence of Materialism, want it to take the place of Creation and Revelation as well; and that is where they err.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

When the hour arrived for the meeting to close, several gentlemen who wished to be heard had not been called upon. Summaries of the remarks which they intended to make are given below along with Written Communications. On the discussion as he followed it, the Lecturer has supplied the following rejoinder, hoping thereby to clear up misunderstandings :—

I divide what I have to say into two parts.

(1) *A brief statement of my own position.*

- (a) I accept the general view of the Bible known as the Higher Criticism. This does not mean that I necessarily accept all the conclusions reached by scholars, many of which may be open to revision. But I accept the general way of

looking at the Bible, which is the result of the scholarship of the last two centuries, and which is now taught in practically all the universities and theological colleges. Such teaching has for me greatly enhanced the spiritual message of the Bible.

- (b) I accept, in common with practically all scientists, the evolutionary theory. This, again, does not mean that I accept all the conclusions as to the *method* by which evolution takes place. Scientists themselves are not agreed on these matters. The fact of evolution is one thing: the method by which it proceeds is another.
- (c) In theological belief I am an orthodox Liberal Evangelical. Vague charges of various unorthodox views were brought against me by various speakers. I must refer them to my published works for refutation.
- (d) One charge only I will refer to, viz., that I am a *Modernist*. I am, if by that word you mean one who tries to present the unchanging truth of the Gospel in modern terms, suitable to the thought of the present age. There are many kinds of Modernists. The epithet is a convenient missile to hurl. But before the word is used of anyone it should, in fairness, be defined.

(2) *The main purport of my paper.*

Nothing, I think, in my paper, if it is carefully studied, lends any evidence to the charge that I am either a pantheist, or deny the transcendence of God, or substitute evolution for God, or deny miracle, or the Deity of our Lord. In the paper I tried to show:—

- (a) That it was God's nature to reveal Himself.
- (b) That He did so in an ascending scale, the revelation culminating in personality, and supremely in the Person of Jesus. In other words, man at his best is the truest index to the Nature of God.
- (c) That the old distinction between "natural" and "revealed" religion broke down; that it was better to speak of *degrees of revelation*.

- (d) That with regard to revelation in the narrower sense, one had to recognize that while there was a true revelation of God in the Old Testament (and, of course, in the New), it was embodied in a literature which contained many elements which could not be called revealed (in the narrower sense). Revelation supervened upon an already existing ethnic religion of the Hebrews, and upon an ethnic religion which they in part adopted from the Canaanites. Traces of this ethnic religion abound in the Bible. I said that sacrifice was part of the ethnic religion, it being common to all Semites, and indeed to many races. The amazing thing about the Old Testament is how God was able to use this existing material, purify it, and make it a vehicle of spiritual truth. Thus He enabled the writers of the Creation and Flood narratives, while preserving much of the form and imagery of a Babylonian narrative, to reach spiritual truths far in advance of anything that the Babylonian narratives show.
- (e) I did not think it could be maintained that there was an audible voice in revelation. It is beside the point to say, as was said, that the Bible says there was an audible voice. That begs the question. What I was asking was—What is meant when a prophet says God spoke to him? Mohammed said God spoke to him. Joan of Arc heard voices of God. Of course, if it is assumed that because a thing is in the Bible it is true, there is no room for argument. But I think that is to dictate to God the manner in which He shall give His revelation.
- (f) Finally, I tried to show the immense evidential value of Messianic prophecy. But I could not feel that in *Isa. liii* the writer had any vision of Christ. He saw (as I think, in opposition to the prevailing critical opinion) a *personal* figure of a redeemer; but I cannot feel he had any vision of Christ. We, looking back on the fulfilment that prophecy received in Christ, can see that the prophet was “speaking larger than he knew.”

My paper and the reception it received is an illustration of how in all discussion what really matters is the *presuppositions* with which

you come to the subject. My whole outlook was obviously quite different from that of my critics. We could not get in touch with each other, because we started from such different positions.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. R. P. HADDEN wrote: As to p. 116, is not the distinction between Natural and Revealed Religion a reasonable and *Scriptural* one? Does not Rom. i, 20, indicate that God's "everlasting power and divinity" can be "perceived through the things that are made"?

As to p. 118, can the writer tell us:—

- (1) Is the rite of sacrifice common to all religions?
- (2) Is anything known certainly, apart from the Bible, as to its origin?
- (3) When the writer speaks of an "ethnic" derivation, does he mean to rule out *Revelation*?
- (4) Is it not possible (if not probable) that the rite of sacrifice is the outcome of a primeval revelation, and that its occurrence in "ethnic" religions is no less a witness to such a primeval revelation than the sacrifices of Noah, and of Cain and Abel, in the Bible?

Mr. W. E. LESLIE wrote: This important paper should be considered in its perspective. The thought of the Churches has been increasingly divided into two opposing schools. Recently it has been contended that these divergencies are not essential, and that the best elements of both schools can be combined. Canon Storr writes from this point of view, and his subject is fundamental to the whole discussion. His *a priori* introduction is valuable despite one or two technical blemishes. He then turns to inquire how, in fact, Revelation has been transacted in history. His history, however, is not that of the Old Testament as it stands, but as reconstructed in conformity with theories of Revelation similar to his own. This is, of course, a *petitio principii* which invalidates his argument. But there is a graver matter. The difference between the traditional Old Testament and the "critical" concepts of God's self-revealing activities involves moral values. The Lord Jesus Christ always assumed the traditional Old Testament scheme, in which He regarded Himself and His work as pivotal. This is no

question of His attitude to this or that incident or document. Was He ignorant of His Heavenly Father's mind? If the "critical" reconstruction is correct, then His spiritual intuitions were at fault. I venture, therefore, to suggest that the position of the author is illogical, and that it contains implications that are fundamentally inconsistent with the Christian faith.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES, M.A., wrote: To me the Canon's language is so tentative and vague that more than one interpretation can be put on nearly all his positions. The word "Evolution," for instance, which occurs all through the paper, is nowhere defined. I suppose, however, one may take it in the usual Darwinian sense of progressive improvement from a lower to a higher species. This seems frankly assumed all through the paper.

"Evolution" rests on two great pillars—(a) physical development, and (b) moral and intellectual development. The scientific world has practically confined itself to (a) and ignored (b). They stand or fall together, but it is with the latter alone that I shall deal, and I shall content myself with citing two authorities, which can scarcely be contradicted.

The first relates to intellectual development, and is from Mr. Winston Churchill, who does not write as a partisan, and whose testimony on this matter is at first hand. After telling us that the four years of the Great War were but the "prelude" to the fifth, he informs us that the fifth (which was never fought) would have launched destruction on a scale never before dreamt of: "Poison gas of incredible malignity, against which only a secret mask was proof, would have stifled resistance and paralyzed the life on the hostile front subjected to it." Since then weapons even more wholesale in their destructiveness have been and are being prepared. "A study of disease, of pestilences methodically prepared and deliberately launched upon man and beast, is certainly being pursued in the laboratories of more than one great country. Blight to destroy crops, anthrax to slay horses and cattle, plague to poison, not armies only, but whole districts: such are the lines along which military science is remorselessly advancing. Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue, or enjoying wiser guides, it has got into its hands, for the first time, the tools by which it can unflinchingly accomplish *its own*

extermination. Death stands at attention, obedient, ready to shear away the peoples *en masse*, ready, if called upon, to pulverize, without hope of repair, what is left of civilization. He awaits only the word of command. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of man have at last led us. . . . And the causes of war are in no way removed" (*Nash's Magazine*, September, 1924).

This prospect would not be very terrible if *moral* development had kept pace with scientific. But has it? Never in the history of the world has Evolution had such advantageous opportunities of proving itself a great force for elevation and improvement than during the last hundred years, when science has made so many astounding inventions and discoveries. These inventions will be an untold blessing, or a fearful danger, according as the moral character develops. Alfred R. Wallace, after surveying the whole problem of moral progress in detail, gave his verdict just before the Great War. Here it is:—

"Taking account of these various groups of undoubted facts, many of which are so gross, so terrible, that they cannot be overstated, it is not too much to say that our whole system of society is rotten from top to bottom, and the social environment as a whole, in relation to our possibilities and our claims, is the worst that the world has ever seen." (*Social Environment and Moral Progress*, p. 153.)

Of course all Evolutionists take refuge in the *future*. Darwin did. Wallace did. Sir Oliver Lodge does. Their logic would be amusing, were not the issues so tragic. Here it is: Under the highest triumphs of science man's moral character is admittedly going from bad to worse with headlong speed: therefore the future progress and happiness of mankind is assured!

MR. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS wrote: It is distressing to learn from the lecturer that had he not adopted the views expounded he would have become an atheist. Upon that subject I will only make one observation, namely, that these views have made many people agnostics, and not a few out-and-out atheists.

The paper bristles with points for debate. I refer to two or three. The ethnic (tribal) religion of the Hebrews—what was it? It was the *true* religion, and that of Moses, Joseph, Jacob (Israel), Isaac,

Abraham, Melchizedek, Noah and Enoch *who walked with God*. To the lecturer it is a sort of embryo or amœba, out of which Judaism and Christianity have “evolved.” He assumes that the process was animism, via polytheism, to monotheism. So far as my observations go, this is not correct. The farther we go back, the surer we are to find monotheism. Our lecturer says “there is no audible voice of God.” That is surely “giving the lie” to many passages of Holy Scripture, *e.g.* Moses, Elijah and Isaiah in the Old Testament, and our Blessed Lord in the New, as well as Saul upon the way to Damascus.

Concerning the Messianic prophecies, I am content to rest upon our Lord’s own words—Luke xxiv, 25–27. The lecturer quotes Amos v, 25, but I dispute the deduction. Any way, with it he must accept the forty years in the wilderness and all its corollaries. The passage seems to mean, having for forty years sacrificed to the true God, they are now going to Moloch. We might apply it to many to-day, and ask: Have the holiest and best of your men been burned at Smithfield, Oxford and Gloucester for the truths of the Bible, and will you now make the Roman Moloch your god?

Lastly the lecturer quotes Jer. vii, 22, 23, but a very casual perusal of the passage shows that it means that in Exod. xx–xxiii no details of sacrifice are given, for the simple reason that the Tabernacle is not yet set up. Exod. xl shows the Tabernacle erected, and Lev. i–viii then gives details of the sacrifices.

Mr. F. C. WOOD wrote: As a boy I spent seven and a-quarter years as a chorister in Westminster Abbey, in the time of Dean Trench and Dean Stanley. In those far-off days I remember hearing with great delight Archdeacon (afterwards Bishop) Wordsworth preach a course of evidential sermons on the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. It was in the Abbey that I heard four chapters or more of Scripture read every day, and I took my part in the chanting of the Psalms right through every month. In that way I became familiar with the *letter* of the Word, and about five years later, at my conversion, began to know the *spirit* of it, partly, I believe, through frequently saying as a boy a heartfelt “Amen” to the daily prayer, “Granting us in this world the knowledge of Thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting.”

I do not like the constant use of the word "Evolution" in connection with our subject. As applied to "Revelation" I much prefer the word "progressive." I cannot agree with Canon Storr, in his paragraph on p. 119, as to how and in what measure "Revelation" came to the Prophets. That long paragraph seems open to grave exception. I do not so read my Bible, but I go very much farther. If I did not, "Revelation" would not mean much to me. Neither do I think there is much value in the quotations from Robertson Smith and Dr. Matthews. We need not theorise about "Revelation," because Scripture is so full of definite statements on the subject, and all we need is to give credence to facts stated. I am not impressed with the expressions "no loss of self-control in the prophet," "a lower level of prophecy," "no audible voice," and "that the prophets preserve in a wonderful way their individuality." Surely the Holy Spirit of God could use "personality" even while causing a prophet to write an exact message. If not, what kind of a God have we to do with? Were prophets given visions and spoken to concerning divine truth, only to wake up and write down just what they could remember, or to shape the message in their own language? Surely this was not the way Isa. liii was written. If Jehovah did not speak the actual words recorded, why the constant repetition of "Thus saith Jehovah," "The word of Jehovah came unto me," together with the divine signature at the end of so many of the communications, in the words "Saith Jehovah"? Why also the frequent addition of the solemn divine oath, and the use of the divine personal pronoun throughout the prophets—a thousand times at least in Ezekiel. I never speak of the prophetic writings as what the prophet "thought" or "conceived," but always of what Jehovah made known through them. These men "spake as they were borne along by the Holy Spirit," and apart from that never could have written what they did.

Prior to the order of the Prophets, God spoke to Abraham, Jacob, Balaam, Gideon, Manoah, Samuel and others, and later, very definitely, to Paul the Apostle. And what shall we say of Moses? Let us quote Scripture. "Hear now My words: If there be a prophet among you, I Jehovah will make Myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so: with him will I speak *mouth to mouth*, even apparently, and

not in dark speeches ; and the similitude of Jehovah shall he behold.” Moses therefore both *heard* and *saw*. Again it is stated “ When Moses was gone into the Tabernacle of the congregation to speak with Him, then he *heard the voice* of One speaking unto him from off the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of testimony from between the two cherubim, and *He spake unto him*.” At Sinai, even the people of Israel heard the voice of Jehovah proclaim the Ten Commandments.

About thirty years ago I began to mark a Bible, entirely to show as clearly as I could its claims to “ Inspiration ” and “ Revelation,” marking every expression where it is stated or implied to be from God. I am still trying to indicate every passage which refers to a previous scripture ; also every passage which shows a previous scripture to have been fulfilled—because fulfilled Scripture is a proof of “ Revelation ” and “ Inspiration.” I have been overpowered at times by the quantity and variety of the statements and evidences permeating the whole of Scripture, and showing the books of the Bible to be one organic whole—a “ Revelation ” of the mind, the will, and the works of the Lord.

Major LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S., wrote : It seems to me that the theory of Revelation set forth by Canon Storr hardly accords with the actual facts before us—facts regarding the Scriptures and the Jews. Canon Storr would, in conformity with certain modern tendencies, regard the Bible as being a product of the national genius of the Jews, instead of being—as the Bible itself testifies—the Word of the God who first called the Jews to be His witnesses, and then rejected them for their incurable opposition to Himself. To judge of Revelation, we must compare the Books of the Bible with the other literary productions of the Jews. The contrast is, I believe, somewhat striking. So far from the Jews being nationally endowed to produce the Bible, their inveterate tendency as a nation was to obscure and explain away the unpleasant testimony of the Scriptures. From first to last the Jews opposed and slew those who came to them in the Name of Jehovah. Finally they slew the Christ Himself, and they continue as a nation to reject Him to this day. That does not look much like a special endowment.

Note, too, that such slaying and such rejection were themselves foretold in the Scriptures ; as also the penalties which were to come

upon the Jews for the same. The *fact* of fulfilled prophecy—prophecies undoubtedly fulfilled to the letter hundreds of years after the last possible date for their promulgation—is utterly inexplicable upon any theory of “endowment.” It is, in fact, a standing challenge to all who adopt any theory of Revelation but that of the Bible itself. And the force of the challenge is felt. The strangest ideas are propounded to belittle the facts. One of the crudest of these suggestions, perhaps, is the one which would refer the “Suffering Servant” of Isaiah to the Jewish nation, or even to a “faithful nucleus” of the same. Even Philip’s Ethiopian had the critical sense to notice that the passage speaks of a single individual only, for he asked if it referred to the writer himself. Canon Storr asks (p. 120), “does not an individual Figure show itself on the canvas?” Unfortunately for the critics, nothing shows itself except an individual Figure.

Note one or two of the facts recorded about our Lord hundreds of years before His birth. He was to be of the family of David, to be born in Bethlehem, to appear before the second destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, to be rejected of the Jews, and yet sought of the Gentiles. All this came about. The greatest Jew who ever lived did appear as a descendant of David, born at Bethlehem. In spite of the superhuman beauty of His character He did suffer rejection and death at the hands of His own nation. Shortly afterwards the Temple and city of Jerusalem were destroyed for the second time by pagan hosts, and not long after that the extraordinary sight was seen of pagan creeds tottering to their fall before the rising Gentile faith in the rejected Jew. If anyone likes to pretend that such prophecies and such fulfilments are to be explained upon a basis of a national endowment of the Jews, he has something of a task before him. No adequate attempt to make good such a claim has, I submit, been offered by Canon Storr.

When we turn from considering the actual fact of Revelation, Canon Storr seems to ignore all testimony as to its method. He apparently assumes, in conformity with his theory, that when a prophet says: “The word of the Lord came to me,” we are to understand nothing more definite than happens in our own everyday experience; allowing, of course, for the difference in national “endowment.” He doubts (p. 119) if we can maintain that any definite proposition was communicated by revelation. It is hardly necessary

to point out that this is entirely opposed to the whole testimony of the prophets themselves, by whom the coming of the word of the Lord is invariably treated as being definitely objective to and wholly independent of themselves. And the “ proposition ” they quote as coming to them is generally definite to the last degree. That which came to Jonah was sufficiently definite and sufficiently foreign to his Jewish prejudices to cause his flight. Remember, too, the experience of the child Samuel; the objectiveness of the call, the unwelcome nature of the message, the exact forecast of the future. The fact that, the sense of the message having been imprinted upon Samuel’s mind, the child might be allowed to pass it on in his own words, can afford no argument against the purely objective nature of the revelation. The visions of Daniel were so wholly objective that he could seldom understand them without a special interpretation, and his last revelations were not interpreted to him at all, on the grounds that they were not meant for him but for those who should live in the last days, who alone would understand them. The “ still small voice ” which came to Elijah was objective, and so were the thunderings on Sinai. Sometimes an objective vision was given to one party and its interpretation to another; reference may be made to the handwriting on the wall, seen by Belshazzar and all his company, which could be interpreted by Daniel alone. When the exact method by which the word came is not mentioned, the implication always is that the coming was definitely objective, nevertheless.

How are we to accept Canon Storr’s statement that “ there is no audible voice of God. . . except in the case of trance or ecstasy ” (p. 119)? Was the child Samuel in a state of ecstasy when he ran to ask Eli if he had called him? Was Moses in a state of trance when addressed from the burning bush? Or Joshua, or Manoah and his wife, or the women at our Lord’s sepulchre when addressed by the angels of God? The message in each case was definite enough, and if the experience was a trance it was a trance which simultaneously affected all present—rather an unconventional feature in a trance—while leaving them in complete possession of all their normal faculties. We repeatedly read of a voice from Heaven being heard by saints and sinners alike, and St. Paul owed his own conversion to an objective experience which struck him blind.

It seems clear that we must either regard all such stories as elaborate fiction, or we must accept belief in the direct interventions of God in the past to reveal His will to men in a manner as objective as when one man communicates with another.

I am glad to see that Canon Storr apparently believes in the Resurrection of our Lord. I hope that he uses the word "Resurrection" in the sense which involves an empty tomb. I regret that he declares sacrifice to have been no part of the original Revelation to the Jews. From beginning to end the testimony of Scripture is to the contrary, and the two texts which he quotes to prove his contention are overburdened by the construction he puts upon them. Amos was repudiating sacrifices to Moloch and Chiun (v, 26), and Jeremiah's words certainly cannot be taken as denying the institution of the Passover. The Book of Genesis teems with the record of sacrifices, both before and after the call of Abraham. The whole emphasis of Scripture is upon the BLOOD, without which is no remission of sins. It was as the sacrificial *Lamb* of God that the Baptist announced the Christ; the Son of Man came for the express purpose of giving His life as a *ransom* for many, and it is as the *Lamb* slain from the foundation of the world that He appears before us in the last Book of the Bible.

The Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S., wrote: Canon Storr has presented the moderate Modernist view of the subject, which we can regard as authoritative. He has shown us how the theory of Evolution is applied to its exposition with the least possible intrusion of the supernatural. Intelligent and thoughtful persons find the solution of some of the difficulties presented without the use of any such materialistic lodestar.

I wish to point out that neither Nature nor Revelation can be accounted for without an unequivocal acknowledgment of the supernatural. The kosmos had a "beginning," and that "beginning" must have been due to an antecedent supernatural Almighty Power of Supreme Intelligence and with purposeful design.

Again, it appears to have been settled by undeniable scientific facts that all life, as we know it, is biogenetic. If that be so, then life cannot be accounted for by any theory of an evolution operating within the material elements of the world, and the conception of

an "emergent evolution" (p. 122) strikes one as a sort of backstairs way of escaping from the necessity of predicating the supernatural.

Again, whilst "His eternal power and Godhead" may, according to Rom. i, be deduced from the "things which are made," it is plainly manifest that only in the Volume of Inspiration have we an adequately full revelation of His character, will and purpose, in relation to His creature, man. In both spheres this revelation has been His own act and deed. In the Volume of Inspiration His revelation of Himself as our Creator is presented to us as the ground of His claim upon our obedience, service and love. Had He not revealed Himself thus, man could never have solved the mystery of his own origin, and it is upon this ground that the moral law, which is primitive and not Jewish, has been given.

Further, this fuller revelation has been necessary to solve the enigma of the remission of sins. The enigma was not in man's original condition, but came up with the entrance of sin. It is strange that the Canon should pass over the awful subject of sin with so little notice, and yet it is in that subject that the *raison d'être* for Scripture revelation exists. The "Plan of Salvation" cannot be found in evolution. Only God Himself, by the revelation of His own purpose and will, could tell us how He could be "just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Whatever an evolutionary process could be supposed to reveal to the whole race by slow degrees, it could not reveal to the individuals of a small minority of the race the whole body of truth contained in God's method of salvation—that the woman's seed should bruise the serpent's head; that the Second Person of the Eternal Trinity should become incarnate in human form; should by an amazing death meet the requirements of law and justice; should forgive the sins of him who believes, apart from his good works; should to the believer impart His Spirit to secure his final perseverance in the faith; should at death admit him to the everlasting fellowship of the Eternal and All-Holy God, and should one day rehabilitate the human spirit in a resurrected and glorified body. I say, these things could never have been known by an inquisitive search into the created universe by the flickering torchlight of an uncertain process to which, to conceal our ignorance, we give the name of 'Evolution.'

The Canon's attempt to bring Jesus Christ under the evolution theory is halting, dubious and uncertain. He averts his eyes from the fact that our Lord's personal claim is hostile to it. He claims to be an extra-kosmic Person when He declares "I am come forth from the Father, and am come into the kosmos : again I leave the kosmos and go to the Father" (John xvi, 28).

It is strange also that, with so much learning, the Canon should fail to understand, that Jeremiah, in vii, 22 and 23, is adopting the Hebrew method of emphasizing the matter which is of superlative importance by ignoring the secondary, when he says (p. 119) : "For I spake not unto your fathers . . . concerning burnt offerings . . . saying, Hearken unto My voice, etc." What had God said ? What commands were they to obey ? "Obey My voice and I will be your God and ye shall be My people." When David said, in Ps. li, 4 : "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned," did he think, after his blazing indignation against the rich man in Nathan's parable, that he had done no wrong in his adultery with Bathsheba and his murder of Uriah the Hittite ? When our Lord said (John ix, 3) : "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents," did He mean that absolutely or only relatively to the man's blindness ? Or again, in John xii, 44 : "Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on Me, believeth not on Me," did He mean that if we believe on Him we do not believe on Him ? Similarly, Jeremiah was not stultifying himself in his rebukes of the "priests" and them "that handle the law," and denying the old Mosaic economy. How can a man be a priest who has no "sacrifices" to offer and no law to obey and teach ?

May I, finally, remind the Canon that there can be no Christian experience without a previous knowledge of Christian Truth, and that the Modernist attempt to exalt Christian experience above the Scriptures is as dangerous to faith as it is essentially illogical.

The Rev. WILLIAM FISHER, M.A., wrote : On p. 118 of his paper Canon Storr says : "Jeremiah states explicitly that sacrifice was no part of the original revelation given to the nation." May I point out that, from the same evidence and by the same argument and ruling, the Ten Commandments were no part of that revelation ? The words "Hearken unto My voice" do not occur in the

story of Sinai. Are they not a keynote or summary of God's purpose in the Mosaic dispensation? They include as naturally and of consequence the ceremonial as well as the moral institution. Whether commandment or sacrifice, the whole value was in obedience. In his quotation Canon Storr stops short of the words “ And walk ye *in all the ways* that I have commanded.” And what of the Passover?

Mr. W. HOSTE, B.A., wrote: I am sure Canon Storr has placed the Institute under a debt of gratitude by so kindly consenting to read his paper amid his many calls. As an *alumnus* of his old school, I started to read his thesis with a sympathy and interest he will readily understand. I venture a few remarks.

With all admiration for the lucid style and exposition of the author, I felt a little like Mahomet's coffin when I had read the paper, for while the substructure of the closing pages seems fairly solid, it gets less so as you go back, and at last seems to vanish altogether. But to start with the more substantial parts, on pp. 123 and 124, I question whether it would be wise to set aside miracles as a first line of defence, in favour of subjective experiences (p. 123), which are personal, or even “ the character and consciousness of Jesus ” (p. 124), which can be suppressed as easily as the miracles, if the record may be challenged, when convenient. Certainly miracles *per se* prove nothing, for the Antichrist will perform such (Rev. xiii). But our Lord could not have been the Messiah without them, as His appeal to Isa. lxi, in the Synagogue of Nazareth, shows. John expressly cites the “ signs ” our Lord performed to prove that He was “ the Christ, the Son of God ” (chap. xx, 30), and our Lord Himself frequently refers to His works as His prime credentials to the world (*e.g.* John x, 37; xiv, 11).

I am afraid an attempt to explain the miraculous in the Bible as a miraculous coincidence of natural circumstances is a “ sop to Cerberus ” which will satisfy neither Modernist nor Conservative. I find it difficult to accept as adequate the lecturer's definition of the prophetic ministry (on p. 119) as merely “ a quickening of the religious consciousness of the prophets.” Does this exhaust such words as “ Men spake from God, moved by the Holy Ghost ”? Why then did they need, as Peter tells us, to search and enquire diligently

as to the meaning of their own prophecies? I think we may affirm without controversy that the prophets themselves took their ministry far more seriously (see *e.g.* Isa. vii, Jer. xxiii). I cannot suppress a feeling of surprise at the Canon's challenge on p. 119: "I doubt," he writes, "if we can maintain that any definite proposition was communicated by revelation" (*i.e.* to a prophet). I fancy it would not be difficult to cite a score of such off-hand, and Keith, in his well-known work on Prophecy, quotes, I should think, hundreds. Only the day after reading this statement I happened on Isa. xxxix, where the prophet definitely foretells the Babylonish captivity, at that moment an undreamt-of contingency, as Assyria was the national enemy—and that a full century before the events took place to the very letter. Our Lord, too, says of Moses: "He wrote of Me" (see Deut. xviii, 15), where he definitely foretells the raising up of the Lord as a prophet; and even the supposed "holy forger," of the Deuteronomy of the critics, must have had some prophetic gift, as Peter quotes this passage as referring to our Lord. Sir George Adam Smith writes in his *Book of Isaiah* (p. 267): "What none but prejudiced Jews have ever denied, this great prophecy, known as the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, was fulfilled in one Person, Jesus of Nazareth, and achieved in all its details by Him alone."

But it is on p. 115 that the substructure seems to fade away into mist, namely, where the lecturer assumes the Hegelian theory of the evolution of the religious idea—from animism to polytheism, and thence to monotheism. But are not the reasons for such a theory more subjective than real? Where in all the world have animists or polytheists been found evolving, apart from the Gospel, into true monotheists? Is not the tendency rather for polytheism to merge into pantheism? Indeed, the Word of God seems implicitly to deny that such a thing as Hegel's theory supposes has ever occurred, *e.g.* "Consider diligently and see if there be such a thing: Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods?" (Jer. ii, 10, 11). But Israel changed her God into idols, and this is how, as we learn from Rom. i, idolatry came about. I think it would be as true to the facts to exhibit a tramp's rags as the original sartorial idea as to quote animism as the original religious idea. And the curious thing is that even the degraded fetishists of Central Africa

all believe, in theory, without any evolving, in a supreme God, a rag, one might say, of a primitive monotheism.

If man was made in the image of God and in communion with Him, but lost touch through sin, we at any rate know where we are ; but if the Hegelian hypothesis be true, then logically we must adopt a brand-new religion, and that is exactly what many are doing. As a Modernist writer in the *Christian Century* of January 17th, 1924, puts it : “ Two world-views, two moral ideals, two sets of personal attitude have clashed, and it is a case of ostrich-like intelligence blindly to deny and evade the searching and serious character of the issue. Christianity according to Fundamentalism is one religion, Christianity according to Modernism is another religion.” This witness is true. They will no more amalgamate than the iron and clay of Nebuchadnezzar’s statue ; and I think the paper before us, though written with quite another object and spirit, goes to prove it.

Mr. G. B. MICHELL, O.B.E., wrote : The last five pages of this most interesting paper are very much better, and less questionable, than the earlier part of it. The essay appears to be an effort, laudable, no doubt, in intention, to infuse into the Modernist system the essential truth of Divine Revelation. To my mind, however, it will not succeed in conciliating Fundamentalists.

(1) In p. 114 there appears to be an assumption that any action on God’s part not in accordance with “ evolutionary science ” would be “ arbitrary.” In p. 118 it is stated that not everything in the Old Testament is inspired “ unless you adopt a theory of inspiration which it is surely quite impossible to square with modern knowledge.” In p. 117, in speaking of the prophets, it is declared that “ each writes in his own style, uses his own imagery ; there is no trace of mechanical dictation.” In each of these assertions there is a *petitio principii* which cannot be conceded.

(2) In p. 114, again, it is claimed that “ Stage succeeds stage in orderly evolution, and each stage prepares the way for the next,” and in p. 115, “ It is the ascending scale in Nature which is the important point.” Here it is assumed that the varying degrees of complexity in organisms, from the simplest to the most highly organized, form an arithmetical progression in time—a theory which is far from being proved.

(3) In p. 115 an important fallacy is stated thus : " Having made them, having given them this desire for God, this reaching out after a beyond, will not God want to reveal Himself to them according to their capacity at any stage to grasp such a revelation?" Yet in p. 116, *Love* is said to be essentially a self-revealing power. Would it wait to reveal itself until its object had attained, after a very long process of evolution, a certain stage of capacity to grasp it? Such is not the Bible doctrine.

(4) In p. 117 a specious, but erroneous, theory is expressed of the development of religion, viz. : " The crudities and superstitions which attach to religious beliefs, more markedly in their earlier growth, are due to man ; yet the fact that there has been an advance in religion, that animism and polytheism have given place to monotheism, and that monotheism has become more ethical, is indication that there has been divine control of the whole movement."

Now crudities and superstitions are by no means characteristic of the *earlier growth* of religion only, or even more markedly. They are as characteristic of the present day as they ever were, and in the highest civilizations.

Nor is there any proof of this supposed advance. Animism and polytheism have not given place to monotheism, nor has monotheism become more ethical. Quite the contrary. Monotheism certainly did not grow out of any less pure source. No heathen philosopher, either Greek, Indian, Egyptian or other, ever conceived a God at all like unto Jehovah. It is not a question of *degree*, but of essential *nature*. The attempt to show that the conception of Jehovah was a gradual growth in Israel is an absolute failure. It was a full and complete *revelation* from the first. The revelation of Jehovah never was either less or more "ethical." It was perfect and uncompromising from the beginning, and other forms of monotheism are either a parody or a poor human attempt at it.

(5) The propositions given in pp. 118 and 119 cannot be conceded for a moment. The truer conception of God in Israel owed nothing to the material of any ethnic religion. The latter certainly led the nation, not gradually and progressively, but promptly and rapidly, into ever-deepening disaster. The whole of this earlier part of

Canon Storr's otherwise valuable paper is vitiated by these unfortunate fallacies. It is to be hoped that some, at least, of the victims of the Modernist deception may be led by the latter part to re-examine with an honest mind the crumbling bases of this system.

In dismissing the assembly, SIR GEORGE KING, exercising his privilege as Chairman, remarked that personally he held the older view with a conviction as deep as that with which the reader of the paper held the newer.

687TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 29TH, 1926,

AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. A. H. FINN IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the following elections were announced:—As a Member, Captain Harold L. Penfold, B.A., M.Inst.C.E., and, as an Associate, Percy J. Sowden, Esq., B.A.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., to read his paper on “The Problem of the Septuagint and Quotations in the New Testament.”

*THE PROBLEM OF THE SEPTUAGINT AND
QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

By the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.

THE whole question of the quotations from the Old Testament which are found in the New is extraordinarily interesting and not a little difficult.* And its difficulty is many times greater for us prosaic Englishmen than for natives of Eastern lands. We have been so trained as to expect quotations made by anyone, and taken from any source, to be exact and accurate, both in wording and in material reference. Probably nothing

* The differences may be studied best in Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*, 1903; but E. Hühn's *Die Messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim*, 1899, and *Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente*, 1900, are full of good materials.

of the kind ever occurs to an oriental. Certain it is that the quotations in the New Testament from the Old are very far from answering to our own requirement. How is it that they are so inexact? Of course there is the primitive difficulty about verbal accuracy experienced by all writers who have not at their disposal concordances, or even the actual text for ready reference. But that is nothing. The memories of persons unaccustomed to much reading, who are obliged therefore to depend on what they hear, are often abnormal, judging by the experience of us who are decadents in such things. It is not wise to assume either forgetfulness, much less ignorance, of the true text which is professedly quoted, or even of its meaning.

No! The evidence of the Jewish scholars whose sayings are preserved for us in the Talmud and the Rabbinic writings proves the contrary. We may learn from it to estimate the true nature and worth of the quotations made by those other Jewish writers who composed the New Testament. Generally, no doubt, the quotations are accurate both in words and in subject-matter, but sometimes only in general meaning. So, for example, in Acts vii, 43, "I will carry you away beyond Babylon" instead of "beyond Damascus" (Amos v, 27). There is a parallel to this in Philo (*Leg. Alleg.* III, 3, § 8), when, in his quotation of Num. v, 2, "Let them send away out of the camp every leper," he substitutes for "out of the camp" the words "out of the consecrated soul," "replacing (as Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy says) the very words he is supposed to be interpreting by his own allegorical explanation."* More often the words are accurate, but the meaning is what we call wrong. So, for instance, the reference in Rom. ix, 24-26, of Hos. ii, 23, and i, 10, to the call of the Gentiles, when Hosea was really thinking of Northern Israel. But two Rabbis of the end of the first century and the beginning of the second gave the same interpretation.† This passage also illustrates a very common practice in New Testament and Rabbinic alike, the joining together of separate verses as though they were consecutive.‡ Sometimes there is even the

* *Philo's Contribution to Religion*, 1919, pp. 38 sq. See Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, 1895, p. 225. Cf. also 2 Cor. iii, 16, where St. Paul applies the language of Exod. xxxiv, 34, describing Moses putting off his veil when entering in before the LORD, to the veil being removed from the heart of a Jew when he turns to the Lord Jesus Christ.

† See my *Manual of Christian Evidences for Jewish People*, 1919, § 510.

‡ See *Manual*, §§ 465-7, where, by the by, the strange word "Nepheri" is a printer's error for "Stephen."

purposeful alteration of phraseology, often marked in Rabbinic by "read not" so and so (though that is the true text), but "read" so and so. This may well be the explanation of the queer rendering in Acts xv, 16-18 of Amos ix, 11 *sq.*

While, however, it seemed necessary to say a word or two, very briefly and cursorily, about the New Testament quotations in general, our subject to-day is more limited. It has to do only with the use of the Septuagint which is made in the New Testament. Yet this is perhaps a question of even greater difficulty than that of the quotations in general.

We all know that the extent to which the New Testament writers use the LXX differs immensely. The writer to the Hebrews—who he was matters not in the least, so long as you grant that he was not St. Paul, for that is wholly impossible—never quotes from the Hebrew direct, but always from the Greek. Trained in Alexandria, and writing, as it seems, solely for strictly Hellenistic Jews, it was natural for him to do so. Probably he did not know Hebrew himself. But St. Paul is different. The great Apostle, with all his world-wide knowledge of men, was a trained Hebrew scholar, knowing therefore not only Greek and Aramaic, but also his Hebrew Bible, being also thoroughly used to, and frequently employing, the methods of one who had been trained in those Rabbinic Schools which afterwards produced the Mishna and the Talmuds. So, again, there are in the First Gospel and in the Fourth a good many passages taken direct from the Hebrew. I doubt indeed whether the tax-gatherer for the government of Herod Antipas would have known much Hebrew, even if it was he who wrote the Gospel which goes under his name. But the author was writing for Jewish believers, and would willingly incorporate such references to the sacred language as he could. But St. John—and frankly, I am still unconvinced by the arguments adduced to show that the author of the Fourth Gospel was not the Apostle, but another of the same name—being a man of education, who was connected, as it appears, with those in high position in Jerusalem, may well have drawn upon his own scholarship in making some of his quotations directly from the Hebrew Bible. But what of the other writers? I do not know why St. Luke should have known any Hebrew; perhaps he was not even a Jew. And James and Peter and Jude, hard-working artisans, with Aramaic as their mother-tongue, and Greek as their medium of intercourse with a large number of their neighbours in Galilee,

what right have we to expect them to know Hebrew also? Anyhow, their writings hardly bear out the supposition that they did. Almost the same may be said of St. Mark, the presumed mouthpiece of St. Peter, and of the author of the Apocalypse. We should not expect Christian Jews untrained in the usages of the Rabbinic Schools to make much use of the Hebrew Scriptures, and in fact we do not find that they did.

But the interesting thing is that while the New Testament writers generally quote Scripture from the Greek, even in cases where it does not represent the Hebrew very exactly, it is not by any means always the Greek of what we call the Septuagint. For example, Dr. Swete, writing on St. Mark, says: "A comparison of the formal and direct quotations with the Cambridge manual edition of the LXX will shew that while St. Mark is generally in fair agreement with the MS. [B] which on the whole presents the LXX in its relatively oldest form, there are some remarkable variations. . . . (1) St. Mark manifests an occasional leaning towards the text of cod. A. . . . (2) In a few remarkable instances he agrees with the other Synoptists against the LXX. . . . (3) While his LXX quotations usually exhibit the same text as St. Matthew's and St. Luke's, he is here and there independent of one or both."*

So again, speaking of the Apocalypse, Dr. Swete says: "Many of the references depart widely from the LXX in particular words, where the writer of the Apocalypse has either rendered independently, or has used another version, or possibly a text of the LXX different from that which is found in our MSS." Dr. Swete goes on to say: "If it be asked whether there are traces in the Apocalypse of a direct use of the Hebrew Old Testament, the answer must be that the departures from the LXX may perhaps in every instance be otherwise explained."† You will observe then that throughout the New Testament we are not to be surprised if we find quotations from the Old Testament which are taken neither directly from the Hebrew nor from the LXX as we know it.‡ What is to be said about such passages?

Now at this point we find ourselves up against a fact of the severest import. No one knows—I speak under the correction of our best living Greek Old Testament scholar, Mr. St. John Thackeray—what is the Septuagint. Of course we have many

* *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1898, pp. lxxi, lxxiii.

† *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 1906, p. cli.

‡ Cf. Rom. xiv, 11, with Isa. xlv, 23.

manuscripts containing a Greek version of the Old Testament Scriptures. But the manuscripts differ among themselves greatly, much more, for example, than do those of the New Testament among themselves. They agree pretty well in extent, but differ in matter, and particularly in words and phrases. How are we to select which of them best represent the original version ?

Does some one say, That may be determined by the closeness of the Greek to the Hebrew ; the nearer it is, the better the Greek text ? Unfortunately that is precisely what is doubtful. I can understand much more easily that an inaccurate original translation was altered to correspond to the Hebrew by some learned Greek copyist, than that if the Greek originally represented the Hebrew with accuracy it should have been so altered as to diverge from it. In other words, Are those Greek manuscripts which are closest to the Hebrew to be preferred, or are those which are furthest off ? No one knows, and I greatly doubt whether anyone will know until we have more means for deciding than we possess at present. I suppose we all look every day at the newspaper accounts of discoveries in Egypt and the East, in the hope that something may at last have been found which will throw a flood of light upon this question, for of all questions it is perhaps the most fundamental for the study of Holy Scripture.

Meantime we have to do the best we can, making enquiries in all directions about the nature of the Greek version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint as we call it for brevity, and seeing whither our enquiries lead us. For example, was the LXX ever intended to be a literal translation, especially in the books of the Old Testament outside the Law ? Personally, I have the gravest doubts whether it was. I am inclined to think that it was rather a Greek Targum. You see the difference. The Targum purports to be a translation, but is, in fact, much more. As verse by verse was read in the Synagogue the *Meturgeman* "translated" the Hebrew into "a language understood of the people," let us say Aramaic. But as "the people" were by no means always educated, or advanced in knowledge mental or spiritual, he put in a word of explanation here, and a moral and helpful saying there, producing eventually much more than a translation as we use the term. Anyhow, that is what we find in all the written Targums which have come down to us, even in that of Onqelos, which is the earliest. The same procedure may well have been followed in the synagogues of Egypt, where the lesson as it was being read had to be put, not into Aramaic, but into Greek.

The translator may have thought more about the general sense, and about edifying the congregation, than about giving the literal meaning. For an exact translation sometimes fails in its very object just by reason of its exactness. Witness, alas! the attitude which many take towards that most exact of all translations, our own Revised Version. Had it only been a little more targumic, with due attention, of course, to the glories of our native tongue, it would have been much more acceptable to that large body of people who count exactness secondary to beauty of language and attractiveness of style.

Not that I wish for a moment to suggest that all the discrepancies of the Greek from the Hebrew are due to the fact that the Greek version was originally more of a Targum than an accurate translation. For whatever may have been the original text of the Greek, it is certain that now we have not got even that.

Some of its present errors are due to Greek copyists. It is also plain that in not a few cases the translators misread the Hebrew letters. "Tittles," as the differentiating corners of several Hebrew letters are generally called, are little things, and it is very easy, with failing eyesight unassisted by spectacles (as Canon Streeter has lately reminded us), to confuse certain Hebrew letters with others.

But with regard to misreading the Hebrew, a theory has lately been brought forward (or rather, I should say, is now in process of being brought forward, for the author has not yet given us more than half of his book), which requires from us some special attention.*

The author, Herr F. Wutz, was desirous of finding out what was the pronunciation of the Hebrew language in the centuries before Christ, for, as we all know, our present vocalization of the Hebrew consonants dates from five or six centuries after Him. Wutz turned therefore to the Septuagint, to see if it would throw any light upon this interesting subject. Naturally he thought first of the proper names, for these are generally not translated but only transliterated, and the transliteration indicates their pronunciation in Egypt two or three centuries before Christ. They gave him definite results, leading him to suppose that there are various stages in the method of transliterating such names. However that may be, and the absence of the second part of his book makes it difficult sometimes to follow his arguments, he noticed

* Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, Lieferung I, 1925.

that sometimes these names were translated, and translated wrongly, and further that the errors were sometimes due to mistaken readings of the Hebrew which was expressed in the Greek letters. A copyist, that is to say, read the Greek names as Hebrew words, and misunderstanding that Hebrew translated those words wrongly. This led Wutz to wonder whether other words besides proper names had been transliterated into Greek before being translated. To make a long story short, he thinks that the translators of the Greek version did in fact translate not directly from Hebrew documents written in Hebrew characters, but from *Hebrew already transliterated into Greek*. The Septuagint, he holds, is a translation from a *transliterated* text.*

Wutz is very sure of his theory, and very pleased with himself for discovering it. "To my greatest joy," he says, "I uncovered an entrance into the old mysterious building, an entrance which had been covered up for thousands of years. After the last obstacles had been overcome, brilliant sunshine poured in at once into the dark expanse, and the hieroglyphs on the walls, and the various contents, showed that I had stumbled on an ancient home of Egyptian learning. There lay rare and ancient writings, covered with dust and yellow with age, yes, half mouldered away, written in Greek characters but in foreign tongue. . . . Though the dust and mould of more than two thousand years lay thick upon those rolls, yet," etc., etc. (p. 4).

Unfortunately, we must add, assuming his theory to be true, that workshop has been already long since discovered, and its more obvious contents pillaged. Wutz, that is to say, shares the experience of many another explorer of Egyptian remains. Others have been there before him.

For so long ago as 1772 Professor Tychsen, of Bützow in Mecklenburg (previously one of the workers in that finest and most satisfactory of all missions to the Jews, Callenberg's mission from Halle), published a book called *Tentamen de variis codicum*

* Wutz gives innumerable examples, not all of which are convincing. But among them are (a) 1 Kings xi, 23, "Rezon son of Eliada *who fled from*," i.e. *'asher bārach mē'ēth*, **ΕΣΕΡ ΒΑΡΑΕ ΜΑΕΘ**, which in LXX A (B is absent) is **ΤΟΝ ΒΑΡΑΜΕΘ** (p. 102). (b) Judges i, 19, "For they had chariots of iron," i.e. *Ki rekeb barzel lāhem*, **ΧΙ ΡΗΧΑΒ ΒΑΡΑΣΕΛ ΛΑΕΜ**. The third word was corrupted to **ΦΑΡΑΣ**, and the clause translated, *ὅτι Ῥηχάβ διεστειλάτο αὐτοῖς*, "for Rechab gave them orders" (p. 165). *Διεστειλάτο* may represent *paratz* (1 Sam. iii, 1), or preferably *paras* (cf. Psa. lxxviii, 14).

Hebraicorum Vet. Test. MSS. generibus, following that up with a further defence of his theory in his *Befreyetes Tentamen*, 1774. In these two volumes he argued that the Septuagint was made from Hebrew MSS. already transliterated into Greek. Perhaps the fact that he seems to have combined this belief with the opinion that Aristeas' famous Letter concerns such transliteration more than translation, may have had something to do with its having passed out of the memory of scholars. No doubt Wutz goes far more into detail than Tychsen, and deals with the question more methodically, but essentially his arguments are the same.*

Hebrew manuscripts transliterated into Greek! What can have been the object of such transliterations? Of course, for languages to be written in alphabets of other languages is not uncommon. Turkish, having no alphabet of its own, is written in Arabic, Armenian, or Greek characters. Modern Jews write all sorts of languages in Hebrew letters, *e.g.* German, Spanish, Arabic, Persian. Occasionally too in mediæval MSS. Greek is found written in Latin uncials.† And, of special importance for our subject, while the first column of Origen's *Hexapla* was the Hebrew text in Hebrew characters, the second was Hebrew in Greek characters.‡ Some Hebrew Psalms have also been found transliterated into Greek, the separate words of which are given in the Supplement to Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance*, pp. 199-216.§

* Doubtless Wutz will refer to Tychsen in his second part. In the first he seems never to have heard of him.

† Dr. Minns refers me to the text of the Nicene Creed in the Gelasian *Sacramentary*, § xxxv (ed. H. A. Wilson, 1894, p. 53), and to the provision sometimes made for reading the Easter Gospel in Greek (*Ev. Spalatense* f^o 246^R, ed. Novak, 1924). A facsimile of part of the bilingual text of the Nicene Creed is given in Ehrle and Liebart, *Specimina codicum Latinorum Vaticanorum*, 1912, No. 20, MS. Corbeiensis, Cent. viii. The Creed was read at baptisms, first in the Greek and then in the Latin.

‡ See examples in Field. i, p. xiv.

§ A very striking example of transliteration is Professor T. Jarrett's edition of the whole Hebrew Bible in English characters, published in 1882. He hoped, I suppose, that English readers would find it easier to learn the language than if they had to learn the Hebrew characters first. I doubt this. But his work is very well done, and if I were to become blind I should certainly try to get a copy, for any reader of English could, after ten minutes' practice, read aloud any part of the Hebrew Bible in such a way that I could follow it. Those who remember the wearisome first month or two of their study of Hebrew will see the importance of this facility.

But what could have given rise to transliterations in Egypt? No doubt there were some excellent Hebrew scholars there—Wutz is never tired of speaking of the sound scholarship of the original transliterators and original translators*—but these scholars may have been but few. There must have been many Jews educated in Greek, but ignorant of Hebrew, who yet desired to read Hebrew aloud and accurately. Was it that the accurate pronunciation was in itself a matter of religion—as is common in certain stages of religious development—and thus was important for every one who read the Scriptures even if he was alone? Or was it that some members of synagogues, perhaps even some of the simpler minded officials, desired to read the sacred Rolls accurately but could not do so? These were not vocalized; they had only the bare consonants. What a boon to have the words in Greek letters, vowels as well as consonants, that thus the sacred words could be read aloud, for the benefit of those other Jews who could follow the Hebrew more or less, whether they themselves could read it or not!

Wutz' theory is interesting, and may prove to be important. But we are not in a position to come to a decision about its truth before we have all the author's arguments before us. We may well hope that the second part of his work may be issued at no great distance of time. But if the theory proves to be sound, it will have provided a new tool for the investigation of the true text of the LXX, and the light this throws on the Hebrew text of the second or third century before Christ.

But, even so, I feel sure that too much may be expected from it. Many of the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek can be explained more easily from errors of transmission common to all languages, or from confusion of Hebrew letters rather than of Greek, † and many others from the peculiar notions of the privileges of "translators" to which reference has already been made.

Now how does this new theory affect our special subject, the quotations in the New Testament? Wutz has hardly touched on this as yet, but, presumably, will do so in his second part. He is, however, plainly inclined to think that several of the quotations are taken, not from what we call the Septuagint, but from other perhaps merely local translations, themselves made from

* *e.g.*, pp. 4 *sq.*

† *e.g.*, Wutz, pp. 42, 85, speaks of the confusion between Δ and P, "as in the papyrus literature," but the confusion between 7 and 7 is much easier.

transliterated texts. It will be interesting to see what examples he gives of such New Testament quotations as he thinks are ultimately due to the misreading of such texts, or to the errors they contained.

We have seen that as regards the quotations from the Old Testament in general the New Testament writers do not by any means always give the right words, or even the right sense—for they employed the usual Jewish methods. And we have also seen that there is at least the *prima facie* possibility that some of their quotations were made from Greek versions of little importance and of little accuracy.

If all this is so, and much of it cannot be denied, what of inspiration ?

Did they think the Greek was inspired, and, if so, what form or forms of it ? And, again, if they made mistakes, were they themselves inspired ?

With regard to the first question, their attitude to the inspiration of the Greek, one asks what Philo's attitude was. "He assigns," says Professor Kennedy, "the same infallibility to the Septuagint translation as that which belongs to the original," for he accepts the Jewish legend as to the miraculous agreement of all the translators.* Philo went even so far as to treat the Septuagint as verbally inspired *in cases where it differs from the Hebrew*. For in the opening section of the *De Agricultura* he lays stress on Noah being called in Gen. ix, 20, a husbandman (*γεωργός*), and not merely a worker of the land (*γῆς ἐργάτης*), though the Hebrew has only "a man of the land."† Philo, therefore, was not like many a reader of the English Bible, who is ready to assert that it is inspired, yet, when pressed, answers that he does not mean the Authorized Version as such but only the original for which it stands. Philo, on the contrary, attributed to the Septuagint inspiration for itself, and not only in so far as it truly represents the Hebrew. This seems also to have been the case with the writers of the New Testament.

Secondly, if this be so, surely a curious light is thrown upon the nature of the inspiration of the New Testament writers themselves. We all believe in their inspiration, but have the haziest

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 30 *sq.*

† So, on Lev. xvi, 17, the force of his argument in three places depends on the absence of "all" in the Greek text which he used, although it is present in the Hebrew, and in all the existing manuscripts of the LXX (*Ryle, op. cit.*, pp. 212 *sq.*).

ideas as to its nature and extent. *A priori*, we should have said that inspiration would save from error, especially (we should have added) in so fundamental a matter as accuracy in quotation from the Old Testament. But no, their inspiration did not save them from inaccuracy. It is natural, no doubt, to say, If a person is inspired of God then he must say this or that, and, in particular, cannot say this or that other. But I suppose we have no right to formulate an *a priori* theory of this kind, and that God wishes us rather to examine what inspired persons actually do say and do not say, and then build up our theory upon a series of inductions from the observed facts.

The writers of the New Testament were indeed in close touch with God, but evidently He was not pleased to keep them from error in their use of the Old Testament. For where the Hebrew and the Septuagint differ these cannot both be inspired with a verbal inspiration, and presumably it is the Hebrew that is inspired, and not the "translation" of it.

In other words, facts show that the inspiration of the New Testament writers did not so far overcome their natural powers as to save them from literary errors. Have we any right to expect that it should ?

DISCUSSION.

Mr. H. ST. J. THACKERAY, the well-known authority on the LXX and its problems, attended by special invitation of the Council, and discussed the paper at some length. He divided his treatment into three parts : (I) The Source of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament ; (II) The Septuagint Text and its relation to the Masoretic Hebrew text ; and (III) A recent theory to account for certain errors.

I.—As to the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, they bear testimony to the wide influence and popularity in Palestine of what may be called the normal source, the LXX. Occasionally one meets with independent renderings—and that is not surprising—especially in the first and fourth Gospels and the Apocalypse. One notable example of diversity of practice is presented in a single book—in *Matthew* there are quotations in common with the other Synoptists, taken from the LXX ; but a group of eleven "proof-texts" ("that it might be fulfilled") come from another source, an independent version, and derived, apparently, from some early "Testimony

Book." Were such already in Greek before being incorporated in Matthew ?

II.—Though strictly applicable only to the Greek Pentateuch, the term Septuagint is commonly used to designate the whole collection of Greek Scriptures—the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings—translations and books of Greek origin, made *mainly* at Alexandria in the last three centuries before Christ. As to the character of the translations, it may be said : work on the *Law* is good ; there is liberty without licence ; work in the *Prophets* is less so, but still there is a sense of reverence for canonical Scriptures ; the translator of Isaiah was unequal to his work : as to the *Writings*, they are mainly free paraphrases.

Where is the " true " text of the LXX to be found ? That is an unsolved question, possibly insoluble. There is Swete's Manual edition, there is the Larger Cambridge Text ; the final text is a problem for the future. The long history, wide diffusion, and mixture with later (rival) versions, produced a great variety of text. (This applies mainly to books after the Pentateuch, in which the Greek text is fairly established, and there are only minor variants.)

The period 1st–2nd centuries was a turning-point in the history of the text ; the LXX was taken over by Christians, and it, or other versions, was quoted in proof of their tenets. There was a consequent alienation of Palestinian scholars from the LXX, and rival MSS. by Palestinian or Asiatic scholars appeared in the 2nd century, to meet the demand for a version nearer to the Hebrew text of their day (**A**, **C**, and **Θ**). The Hebrew text had not stood still, and there came a revision, *circa* A.D. 100. These new versions were partly based on earlier work : one finds traces of **Θ** in the New Testament quotations from Daniel, and of **C** in Josephus. Were these local versions ? Origen, in his *Hexapla*, set himself to correct the LXX by means of later versions ; his LXX column is a mixture of old and new, and led to a serious mixture of texts. In the 4th century, Jerome speaks of three recensions in use in different parts of the world—Hesychian (Egypt), Lucianic (Syria and Asia), Eusebian (Palestine). The work of isolating, or identifying, these recensions, and getting behind them to the " original " text, still remains. Our earliest MS. is B.

I come to the relation of the Greek and Hebrew texts, to ascertain the merits and defects of the LXX.

(1) With many imperfections, the LXX often preserves (or points the way to) the restoration of a text better than the Masoretic ; it has the great merit of going back a few centuries earlier than the Rabbinical revision, *circa* A.D. 100 (*see*, for example, Ps. lxxvi).

(2) Was the text a targum ? There is not much trace of this in the *Law* and the *Prophets* : they are much nearer the Hebrew than are the Aramaic targums, but there is occasional interpretation, *e.g.* Lev. xxiii, 11 (τῆ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης). Like the targums, it avoids anthropomorphisms, *e.g.* Exod. xxiv.

(3) But there are many errors of *eye* and *ear* ; there is constant confusion of radical letters, especially *resh* and *daleth* (" Edom " and " Aram "). There are other variants which indicate *dictation*.

III.—Of the theory of Wutz, I cannot express opinion without careful previous examination. It is interesting, and possible, in view of the concrete instance of transliteration in the second column of Origen's *Hexapla* ; but was there any necessity for such an intermediate stage ? The ordinary confusion of letters by translators will account for much, without a transliteration stage. How is it to be detected and proved ? What purpose did it serve ? To fix pronunciation of an unvocalized text ? For the synagogue reader ? That might apply to Palestine, to the school of Akiba and Aquila, but would it apply to Alexandria ? I doubt if the theory will clear up many obscurities, and my impression is that the examples quoted by Dr. Williams are not convincing.

In conclusion, Mr. Thackeray expressed sincere thanks to Dr. Williams for a paper that could not fail to stir helpful thought.

Dr. THIRTLE : I join in the sincere thanks already expressed to Dr. Lukyn Williams for the paper to which we have listened. In the nature of things, there are points that must still be regarded as open ; but it seems to me that we may hope for more light in due time when the investigations of Dr. Wutz, to which our attention has been directed, shall reach their conclusion. Singular to say, those investigations receive remarkable support, if, indeed, they have not, in some degree, been anticipated by researches conducted by Chief Rabbi Dr. Moses Gaster, and recently given to the world in the Schweich Lectures (1923) in a volume entitled *The Samaritans*. Incidentally, Dr. Gaster found himself face to face with the subject

of the LXX, and on grounds of Jewish tradition, and inferences reached after prolonged investigation, he has come to the conclusion that the LXX was made from a transliterated copy of the Hebrew text. He maintains that, for Jews unacquainted with the Hebrew language, such a transliterated version was assuredly provided; and he further tells us that in the British Museum there are numerous fragments of such documents as prepared for the use of Karaite Jews in comparatively recent times. Such a text, then, as lies at the base of the *Hexapla* of Origen was behind the Greek version known as the LXX, and, so far as the Books of Moses are concerned, both of these approximate more or less to the text preserved by the Samaritan community, and known as the Samaritan Pentateuch.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Gaster gives reasons for believing that the origin of the LXX must be traced, not to Egypt, but to Palestine, and that the Greek version came into existence for a specific purpose, namely, to safeguard the Jewish people from the Samaritan schism: in a word, it was in opposition to what has come into history as the Samariticon, that is, a Greek translation of the Samaritan recension of the Mosaic Law, of which mention is made in early Christian writings. Dr. Gaster finds in the shortcomings and mistakes of the scribes reasons for the conclusions thus advanced, and he gives substantial form to the Samariticon, which hitherto has been a disembodied shade in literature—a thing of doubt in the region of Palestinian writings. May we not indulge the hope that, on the strength of the case presented this afternoon, research may go forward and yield important results when more is known of the conditions, ethnic and religious, out of which the LXX version came into being?

The New Testament quotations from the LXX raise a question that is deeply interesting. As Dr. Lukyn Williams has pointed out, in some cases they were from the Hebrew text, in others from the LXX, or some Greek version. That is to say, some of the writers, in their quotations, went to the original, while others went to what may be styled a Targum, or paraphrase. Can it be questioned that there is a place for both text and interpretation? In particular, we must recognize a demand for the Targum in connection with written arguments demanded in missionary labour, as we find it in such a writing as the Epistle to the Hebrews, prepared for Greek-speaking

Jews. I would suggest that, while serving as a practical substitute for the original text, a Targum need not be regarded as setting aside the proper authority of such text, and that to quote a version does not imply contempt for the original. No such thought was in the mind of Ezra the scribe when he ordained that, by using a paraphrase, the sense should be given when the Law was read; nor is such an idea entertained by translators into, say, our own modern English, however confident they may feel themselves to be in the execution of their versions of Holy Scripture. One may use a text or Targum at convenience, without making for such version the claims that properly belong to the original text; for example, if one quotes Weymouth or Moffatt, one does not for a moment call in question the higher authority of the text, which all translators are glad to acknowledge. There is room for the version as well as the original work, and the New Testament writers seem to have found no difficulty in using one or the other as circumstances demanded. Is it worth while to suggest that in doing this they acted without judgment, and apart from direction which we are not competent to discuss? If an interpretation—call it a Targum—is accepted as supplying a rendering—practical though not literal, and so accepted by men “in touch with God,” as Dr. Lukyn Williams expresses it, or under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as we believe was the case with the New Testament writers, the result was canonical. And does not canonical integrity supply a safeguard against error and imply inspiration in the New Testament sense of the word?

Many may recall that, some forty years ago, when the Salkinson-Ginsburg translation of the New Testament into Hebrew, for distribution among the Jews, was given to the world, the translators were careful to place in the margin, as alternative readings, the Masoretic text of passages wherein, in quoting the Old Testament, the New Testament writers had followed the LXX version. By such a measure, followed in some degree by Franz Delitzsch in his Hebrew New Testament, the translators indicated a disposition to regard the LXX as having the nature of a Targum, and as lacking (for Jews, at least) the character that properly belongs to the Masoretic text. In similar manner, the New Testament writers, in their quotations, used the Greek Targum, sometimes without question, at other times with modification. May we not accept their judgment

and follow their lead? For one thing, we shall find the LXX of service as throwing exegetical light upon many a passage—for at least it is an interpretation; and moreover, by reason of its antiquity, we may at times consult it with confidence for the solution of questions that arise in the criticism of the text.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS expressed his agreement with the lecturer's position, that it was not for us to dictate to Almighty God that He must only communicate with us through flawless literature, although he did not think the three instances quoted by the lecturer on pp. 153 and 154 as mistakes in quotation were really anything more than applications (by the speakers in two cases, and the writer in the third) of the passage quoted to a new situation; and he thought this was in accordance with the unique character of the Scriptures, in that no prophecy was confined to its particular subject—"for men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. i, 21).

He remembered receiving a letter in which the writer declared that a Bible with a single clerical error in it was no Bible for him; to which he replied that, whether his correspondent used the Authorized Version or the Revised, or any other translation, his Bible must necessarily contain many errors. His correspondent then declared that he meant the autographs, which, of course, he had not got, and never would have. But this question of accuracy raised no difficulty if we recognized that the Bible was not an end in itself, but rather the vehicle which God used to communicate His mind to us, so that our faith would not be in the Book but rather in the God who gave the Book. This was illustrated by the Apostle Paul's encouragement to his fellow-passengers in the storm on his way to Rome, when he told of an angel having visited him in the night with a message assuring him of the safety of all on board, so that he could tell them to be of good cheer for, as he said, "I believe (not the angel, but) God that it shall be even as it was told me." Therefore, as a plain man, he still accepted the Scriptures as a God-given revelation, and had no fear from mistakes of quotation and the like, even if they could be proved to exist.

Mr. Roberts further inquired as to an English version of the LXX issued some years ago by S. F. Pells, and, at the conclusion of the meeting, he was informed by Dr. Thirtle, Chairman of Council,

that the publication in question was a translation from the Greek by Charles Thomson, first issued in the United States over a century ago. The better-known English version of the LXX, however, was made by Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, and published in this country about eighty years ago. The contention of Mr. Pells that the Greek version carries higher authority than the Hebrew text cannot be said to command the judgment of scholars having all-round knowledge of the subject. Mr. Roberts also inquired with reference to other Greek versions of the Old Testament, those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Of these it may be said that they survive in fragments only, and were obviously designed to meet (and express) Jewish prejudice in a definite sense; and they were made upon principles different from those which dominated the LXX translators.

The CHAIRMAN'S remarks: My own studies in the LXX have been chiefly confined to the Pentateuch, so I am hardly qualified to say much about the quotations from the later books.

One instance of agreement with the Hebrew text is worth noting. Both the Epistle to the Romans and that to the Hebrews give a correct version of Deut. xxxii, 35, instead of the LXX, probably due to a various reading.

That most of the New Testament quotations are taken from the LXX is only natural. Those who wrote in Greek would inevitably use the best-known Greek version, even if it were not precisely accurate, just as English writers and preachers will often use the familiar Authorized Version, though they are fully aware that the Revised is more technically correct. Only where the popular version is glaringly wrong or unsuited to the particular argument would they have recourse to some better version or an independent rendering of their own. This would account for quotations where part agrees with the LXX and part with the Hebrew.

As to the theory of Herr Wutz, in the instance alluded to by Mr. St. John Thackeray (p. 158, *note*), the transliteration ΒΑΡΑCΕΛ is open to question (I do not know whether Herr Wutz had any authority for his transliterations, or whether they are only his own idea of how the words would be transliterated. The second alpha is superfluous, and the sigma should rather be zeta. Even then

it has to be guessed that the word was afterwards corrupted into PHARAS to account for the Greek rendering. There is, I think, a much simpler explanation from the Hebrew. If the initial beth of the word "Barzel" were mistaken, as it might very easily be, for a caph, and the final lamed dropped or disregarded because of the lamed immediately following, the word could be read as CARAZ, "to proclaim" (a word not found in Biblical Hebrew, but found in the Talmud and in the Targums*). That would at once account for the Greek *διεστείλατο*, and as the verb would need a subject, the preceding "Rekeb" was taken to be a proper name.

In the Pentateuch there are several instances of words transliterated, not translated, but these appear to be words the translators did not understand, and there are other indications that the translators were more familiar with Greek than with Hebrew. One such transliteration is suggestive. In Gen. xxviii, 19, the LXX has it that the name of Bethel was *Ὀὐλαμμὰς*, taking the word "'Olam ("of old") as if it were part of the name. As the word is elsewhere translated correctly enough, this suggests that they were working from a document in which the words were not separated, and that would also account for BARAMETH in 1 Kings xi, 23.

Is it quite fair to characterize the variations in New Testament quotations indiscriminately as "errors" (p. 162), and thence to infer a theory of inspiration?

It is asserted that in the reference in Rom. ix, 24-26, "the meaning is what we call wrong" (p. 153). It is, of course, true that Hosea's prophecy referred to Northern Israel, while St. Paul is writing about the call of the Gentiles. Does that constitute a wrong meaning? Is it not rather a case of applying the same principle to parallel cases? Just as there was the promise that Northern Israel should yet be called "My people," so it was part of the divine purpose that the nations which had formerly been "not My people" (Lo-'Ammi) should be sharers in the same privilege.

Again, Acts vii, 43, is part of the speech of St. Stephen, and Acts xv, 16, 17, from that of St. James. The "errors" then (if error there be) are due to the speakers, not to the historian. His task would be limited to recording correctly what was actually said.

* It is also the common Arabic word for "preach."

But is there error at all? St. Stephen was addressing an audience familiar with the words of Amos, but also familiar with the fact that the actual carrying away had been very far beyond Damascus. His substituting "Babylon" would be an intentional reminder of how more than amply the prophecy had been fulfilled. If St. James spoke in Greek (which may be doubtful), all he did was to condense and rearrange the familiar Greek version of the words of Amos, even though that included a different reading of the Hebrew.

Mr. St. John Thackeray spoke of the softening down of anthropomorphisms in the LXX. For a considerable time I have been engaged in a minute comparison of the three texts of the Pentateuch—Hebrew, Samaritan and Greek. From this I find that this tendency to soften down, fairly common in the LXX, is much less common in the older Samaritan. That shows that the dislike of anthropomorphic expressions was a gradual growth of later ages. [Hence it would follow that the Hebrew, in which there is no such softening down, is the earliest of the three.]

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

MISS HAMILTON LAW: May it not be that in some cases the various renderings in the LXX, about which we have been hearing, are owing to some connection of thought in the Eastern mind? To take an ordinary Arabic word which is in daily use in the Near East, as an instance, the word "sagada" means carpet. Also, this word "sagada" means "he worshipped" (3rd person sing., past tense), and is the root of the verb "to worship." The idea behind the word appears to be prostration—lying flat—one might almost say humility. God in His greatness possibly meant to give more than one thought in the inspired words of the translation of the Scriptures.

MISS L. M. MACKINLAY: This is confessedly a difficult subject. To me the solution is found in our Lord's quotation of Ps. viii, 2. Instead of "ordained strength," He said "perfected praise" (Matt. xxi, 16).

These words of His supply the ellipsis in the psalm, explaining *what* was in the mouth of "the babes"—praise—which brought power over the enemy. His addition to the Psalmist's words were no mistaken quotation, but on purpose. If we accept divine inspiration

of the Apostles' writings, may we not say that in those instances where their quotations differ from the Old Testament the alteration was also to supply the ellipsis? Then, it matters not what translation they quoted from, the changed words were divinely inspired at that moment, as an explanation of the Old Testament passage, sometimes showing it was of local application as well as a future prophecy, which interpretation was not apparent without divine revelation.

The Rev. J. M. POLLOCK : Some of us are so profoundly convinced as to the equal inspiration of both Old and New Testaments that we must question the main conclusion of the writer of the paper, viz. "*facts* show that the inspiration of the New Testament writers did not so far overcome their natural powers as to save them from literary errors." When we find the Holy Spirit, through the Apostle Paul, building an argument on a single letter of the alphabet, as in Gal. iii, 16, we may well pause before we commit ourselves to such a conclusion. "Facts" may apparently point to the conclusion arrived at by the lecturer, but if I may venture a criticism of his paper, it is that he has provided us with extremely few, if any, examples of such facts. And the explanation given by the lecturer of such apparent examples is not the only possible one. May there not be in the Old Testament Scriptures deeper meanings and applications than appear on the surface of the text, and which can only be brought out by an interpretation rather than by an actual quotation of the text? I prefer the explanation of the variations given by Dr. C. I. Scofield in his "Reference Bible," viz. "the rule applicable to *all* modifications of the form of quotations in the New Testament from the Old Testament writings is that the Divine Author of both Testaments is perfectly free in using an earlier statement to recast the mere literary form of it. The variant form will be found invariably to give the deeper meaning of the earlier statement." (*Note on Heb. x, 5.*)

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O. : With reference to the lecturer's opinion that the LXX (outside the Law) was a Greek Targum, I would hazard the conjecture that in the historical portions sacred MSS. were not the sole basis of this Targum, the departure being a maximum in the books translated last; and in this connection

it is interesting to note that Simeon ben Gamaliel (Rector of the School at Jamnia after Bar-Cochba's revolt) considered that Aquila's version was based on an Aramaic Targum.

With regard to Biblical quotations in general, I would point out that inspiration, in the fullest sense, does not necessarily demand verbal repetition. The Bible has its message for every age and race, and contains much more than lies on the surface: *cf.* Ps. lxxviii, 2; Prov. i, 6; ii, 4; Is. vi, 9, and our Lord's usual method of teaching (Matt. xiii, 34).

If, therefore, a statement or argument is one reinforced by the Old Testament *that* interpretation (for the sake of lucidity) is necessarily brought forward which explains the apposite teaching contained in the text in question. For instance (Matt. ii, 23), "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene," is not a "quotation" from any prophet, but a brief epitome of apposite Old Testament prophecy. The recognition of this fact is the basis of all expository teaching; and the New Testament is pre-eminently the exposition of the Old Testament.

With regard to translations in general, the consideration arises that words are intended to convey initial ideas, and that the best translation is that which best conveys the ideas in question; parallel verbiage is a secondary matter. Consequently, owing to the differences between languages in genius, idiom, etc. (and especially where the comparison is between an Oriental language and a Western one or a primitive and a modern language), in order to convey accurately to the ordinary hearer in good idiomatic language the original ideas, the best translation will often partake of the nature of a Targum, as the italicized words of the Authorized Version testify; the brain is reached through the senses, a fact which was grasped by the translators of that Version, appointed to be read in churches, and therefore listened to by the outward ear.

Mr. HOSTE regretted that absence from London prevented his being in his place to hear Canon Williams read his interesting and suggestive paper. He sent a few remarks.

It would have been a great boon for the uninitiated to have had more concrete instances of the presumed misquotations of the New Testament writers, and some more definite explanation of the passages, *e.g.* Luke iv, 18, our Lord's quotation from Isa. lxi, 1, where

the Hebrew, the LXX, and the Greek Testament are at variance. I remember the late Dr. C. H. Waller saying that Hebrew is so full as a language that it is often difficult to say which of two complementary meanings it contains, if not both. May not the above passage in Luke be explained by the root *pā-kāch* in the word *p'kāch-kōāch* ("opening of the prison")? Was not the saying of the Rabbis, that giving sight to the blind was a miracle reserved for the Messiah, founded on the LXX of this very passage?

Philo was no doubt a remarkable man and religious philosopher, but his belief in the equal inspiration of original and translation would to-day hardly be compatible with a sane outlook. I do not see that his gloss "out of a consecrated soul" for "outside the camp" is parallel with the substitution of one geographical locality for another. Amos no doubt refers to the captivity of the ten tribes, and Stephen, addressing the descendants of Judah, brings the quotation up to date by substituting Babylon for Damascus because their ancestors had been carried there.

Is not the point of the quotation in Rom. ix simply the possibility of persons "not the people of God" becoming so? If the lost tribes would one day regain their place, why not Gentiles who had also been "not His people"?

The Canon does acknowledge the difficulty of the whole question of the New Testament quotations from the LXX, and utters such a wise caveat on p. 153 (end of first paragraph) that one cannot repress a feeling of disappointment that he should close upon p. 161 with the hypothesis that the writers of the New Testament regarded the LXX as equally inspired with the original. "This seems" he writes "to have been the case with the writers of the New Testament," and then, on a mere "if this be so," he enunciates a theory of inspiration, compatible with inaccuracies as to matters of fact (which may be otherwise explained) a theory which many will feel to be quite untenable. It seems that we are asked to believe that the Hebrew text *as we have it* can alone claim infallibility. But is it certain, for instance, that the LXX translator of Deut. xxxii, 43, merely inserted out of his own head the words "And let all the angels of God worship Him," and had not before him a Hebrew text containing these words, subsequently quoted in Heb. i, 6?

LECTURER'S REPLY.

In the course of some remarks by way of reply, Dr. LUKYN WILLIAMS thanked Dr. Thirtle for calling attention to Dr. Gaster's volume on *The Samaritans*, and intimated that it had been in his mind to study the book, though hardly expecting that it would treat so definitely of the issue raised by his paper.

He also sends the following notes :—

Since this article was in proof, the first part of a striking essay, on "The pronunciation of Hebrew according to the transliterations in the *Hexapla*," has appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. xvi (April, 1926), pp. 333-382. Some material may also be found in Driver's *Samuel*, 1913, pp. lxv-lxix.

With regard to the ignorance of Hebrew on the part of Hellenistic Jews, a Hebrew Christian friend who lived some years in Palestine (the Rev. L. Zeckhausen) tells me that he never met there a Jew who could not understand people who spoke to him in Hebrew. "How much more in the first century!" He thinks St. Stephen, like a modern *maggid* (a popular preacher), freely introduced into his speech traditional stories and interpretations, as indeed Rashi does. Further, he adds, if Stephen's speech had been originally spoken in Greek, this would also have been the language of the Ecclesiastical Court (*Beth-Din*) before which he was tried. But this is unthinkable.

688TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 26TH, 1926,

AT 4.30 P.M.

WILLIAM COLDSTREAM, ESQ., B.A., LATE I.C.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht Stanton, Ph.D., D.D., as one whom he had long known in the Punjab, and valued for his learning and for his missionary work among Moslems, to read his paper on "The Qur'an and its Doctrine of God."

*THE QUR'AN AND ITS DOCTRINE OF GOD.**

By the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, Ph.D., D.D.

“THREE threads are woven distinctly through the web of Muslim religious thought. There is tradition (*naql*), there is reason (*'aql*), and there is the unveiling of the mystic (*Kashf*). They were in the tissue of Muhammad's brain, and they have been in his church since he died” (Macdonald, *Muslim Theology*, p. 120). Or, we might put it, Scripture, Theology, Mystical Experience are integral factors in all mature religious thought, certainly in Judaism and Christianity. However men may protest, none of these elements can be entirely absent from such thinking, though the emphasis and the proportion may vary greatly; and the nature of religious teaching

* Quotations are from Rodwell's translation. Fuller references are given in *The Teaching of the Qur'an* (S.P.C.K.), Subject-Index, pp. 75-110.

will also vary according to the adjustment of the credal and ethical elements.

Accordingly our subject has a twofold bearing ; first, on the claim of Islam to be a historical development of Judaism and Christianity, especially in its doctrine of God ; and second, on the relation of this doctrine to the developments of Islam forced upon it by modern thought and life.

MODERN MOVEMENTS IN ISLAM.

These movements have been going on for a century throughout the educated Moslem world, in Turkey, Egypt, Persia, Indonesia, and on the largest scale among the seventy million Moslems of India. From a doctrinal point of view the school of Sayyid Ahmad of Aligarh (known as *nechari*, i.e. upholders of the law of nature) have claimed to revive the *Mu'tazila* or Moslem Rationalism of the early centuries which abated the asperities of extreme fatalism and the crudities of verbal inspiration, and eliminated the miraculous generally. They have remained rather a tendency than a sect. This movement was followed by a more constructive effort on the part of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian (in the Panjab), founder of the Ahmadiya or Qadiani sect. He claimed to be the Mahdi, or Guided One, who should recall Islam from apostasy, the Christ spiritually returned for the same purpose, and later, even Krishna, reincarnate for the Hindus. Freedom in dealing with the Qur'an was gained by allegorizing. He taught that the command to fight for the faith meant striving by persuasion, not by weapons. It was this that recently brought the sect into collision with the 'Ulama of Kabul, resulting in the martyrdom of several Qadianis. They are found chiefly in the Panjab, but also throughout India and in Central Asia and Africa. The more modernist members of the Ahmadiya broke off from the conservatives at Qadian, and made their headquarters at Lahore. They, too, hold to the literal inspiration of the Qur'an, but gain a modern meaning by rationalist interpretation with an occasional dash of scientific phraseology. Of late this section has reverted to Sunnite orthodoxy. Both branches of the Ahmadiya are active in propaganda among Western nations. The Lahore branch has its mosque and offices in Woking ; the Qadianis hope shortly to open a mosque in Putney.

The other organized modern sect is the Persian body known as the Bābī-Bahāi. In 1844 Mirza Muhammad 'Ali of Shiraz

laid claim to be the *Bāb* or "Gate" of revelation which many Shi'ahs were expecting to be opened. He produced a scripture which he called the *Bayān* or "Exposition," superseding the Qur'an. He was executed in 1850, but his movement persisted in spite of violent persecution; it was reshaped by a successor, 'Abdul Bahā, into a kind of liberal deism, with social and ethical teachings largely based on Christian ideas. From him the religion in its new form has taken the name of Bahāi. The adherents in Persia are estimated at 200,000, and they are widely scattered in other lands. The spread of Bahāism has no doubt helped towards the toleration at present extended to Christianity in Persia.

In the unparalleled reshaping of a Moslem people that is now taking place in Turkey the doctrinal element is far less in evidence than the national and social. Islam is still the official religion of Turkey, but the country is breaking away from the quranic legislation as to marriage, criminal justice, and the like, and when promulgating the new Civil Code in the Angora parliament, the Minister of Justice recently predicted as its effect that "the past thirteen centuries would be swept away, and a fruitful era of civilization begin." It is thirteen centuries since Muhammad promulgated the law of the Qur'an. But here, too, life is linked to creed and the one must affect the other.

Faced in many lands by the life and thought of a new age, Islam is struggling with the difficult task of adjusting its early mediævalism to the demands of a modern world. In so doing the progressive Moslem generally seeks to disown the accretions of his schoolmen and to recur to the one sacred volume as the sufficient expression of faith and practice incumbent on the true Moslem. The quranic doctrine of God has, therefore, much more than an academic interest. Never in the history of Islam has it been brought into such intimate contact with the Christian doctrine, and the results of that contact may perhaps be more reassuring than the candid self-criticism of the Christian Church supposes. Certain it is that the being and nature of God is often represented by the modern Moslem teacher in the light of New Testament ideas. On occasion He is even spoken of as "Father," and the first chapter of the Qur'an is referred to as "the Lord's Prayer of Islam." An average Woking mosque sermon might, in large part, be taken from a collection of Christian discourses. In the Turkish reformation it is the ethical side on which the

approach is most in evidence, but this is bound to affect the conception of the divine character; indeed, the danger there is that of a practical elimination of God. Consciously or unconsciously the Moslem world is seeking after a conception of God which will prevent this disaster. What does it find in the Qur'an ?

THE NATURE OF THE QUR'AN.

In some respects, no doubt, the Qur'an is a highly composite structure, and the study of the elements that went to make it up, and the stages of their incorporation, as well as probable editings by the prophet or others, is fascinating and fruitful. But here we can only deal with the volume as a whole, accepted by the Moslem community for thirteen hundred years. The Qur'an claims to be a scripture like the Pentateuch or the New Testament. It is about the same in bulk as the latter, but, unlike it, is the work of one man who professed to recite the words of God Almighty which he had heard in the Arabic tongue from the angel Gabriel (whom he called the holy spirit), hence its stories, equally with its commands, are divine utterances. Its chapters (*surah*) are divine oracles, divided into verses with more or less of rhythm. Their arrangement is confused, nevertheless it is possible to discern the outline of the growth in teaching during the twenty-one years of Muhammad's prophetic career.

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

The Scripture itself is the revelation, *i.e.* the unveiling of divine mysteries or teachings. It is literally *Kalāmu'llāh*, the Word of God. This is asserted most elaborately in respect of the Qur'an itself, but the same is taught of other scriptures. The most characteristic synonym for scripture is *tanzīl* = a missive or rescript sent down from Allah to his apostle. For mankind it is an admonition (*tadhkirah*) to guide them. Inspiration, as the divine afflatus by which the message is conveyed to the messenger, takes a secondary place. The nearest term for it is *wahī*, but this often covers the objective message as well as the subjective method of its imparting. *Wahī* is the speech of Allah to man; it is the source of the quranic oracles, and it was conferred on Noah and other prophets. A conception closely connected with revelation is that of "guidance" (*hudā*). It is from Allah only, but it may lead either to good or evil, for he leads astray whom he will. The guidance was accepted by

Muhammad, as it is by other believers, but rejected by infidels. It was given by the former prophets, and in the Law and the Evangel, and last by Muhammad in the Qur'an, and is to be imparted to others.

THE QUR'AN AS THE FINAL REVELATION.

The bare name occurs in the volume eleven times; with the article "the Qur'an" thirty-six times; with the pronoun "this Qur'an" fifteen times. Generally it applies to one of the oracles or one of the *surahs*, but sometimes to the whole collection, as when it is said in v. 101; "If ye shall ask of such things when the (whole) Qur'an shall have been sent down, they shall be shown to you." It is revealed piecemeal to Muhammad, telling him what he did not know. Its verses are established in wisdom and are set forth with clearness. It is a revelation (*wahî*), a missive (*tanzîl*), an admonition (*dhikrâ*), the Scripture (*kitâb*) *par excellence*, the Word of Allah (*kalâmu'llâh*) in the strictest sense, which descended on the Night of Power, a transcript from the preserved Book. It is the Cord of Allah which binds men to him as long as he pleases; the Discerner (*Furqân*); discriminating, yet lucid and direct, for it is revealed in plain Arabic through the prophet, who is a man of the people. It is a glorious scripture containing good news; it agrees with itself and teaches by repetition, through similitudes of every kind and verses which are both figurative and explicit. It is the final revelation in which there can be no change, absolutely free from error, and comprising all secrets both of Heaven and earth. Yet provision is made for changing circumstances. Muhammad was accused of forgery because he substituted one verse for another. His reply is: "What he pleaseth will Allah abrogate or confirm, for with him is the Archetypal Book" (XIII, 39); and if he cancels a verse or makes the prophet forget one it is only to grant him one equally good or a better (II, 100). Muhammad is to listen carefully to what he hears from Gabriel and not to be hasty in the recital of this Arabic Qur'an while the revelation of it is incomplete. It must be recited with care and in measured tones, and listened to in silence.

This revelation is its own proof; unbelievers cannot produce its like. Only Allah knows its meaning, but believers accept it as all from Him. In others it increases unbelief and rebellion, but whoso rejects it will be lost.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE QUR'AN.

The records of Arab tradition as to belief in God are scanty. To the Moslem Arab the age before Muhammad was the "days of ignorance." To record their errors was superfluous or sinful, and the Qur'an, which, as the miracle of divine eloquence, challenged all previous literature, effectually set aside the study of such pre-islamic traditions as existed. From the Qur'an itself and allusions in pre-islamic poetry we gather that among the pagan Arabs, more especially in and about Mecca, the idea of a supreme deity was not unknown. He was called *Allah*, the Mighty One, or *Rabb*, the Lord, and was regarded as the creator and preserver of the world. He was called upon as helper in peril and invoked in oaths or vows. He was worshipped in prayer and sacrifice, and a special portion of the offering was set apart for him, but it was not forbidden to worship others. In fact, when the Ka'ba sanctuary was cleansed after the conquest of Mecca by Muhammad, we are told that no less than 360 idols had to be removed. As elsewhere, the worship of the inferior deities who stood nearer to man than the mighty Lord was generally preferred. They were regarded as His sons and daughters and possible intercessors with Him. *Allāt*, as a consort of *Allah*, is mentioned in the Qur'an, besides other goddesses. But they are ineffectual helpers and cannot intercede for their worshippers at the day of judgment; on the contrary they, with them, will be cast into the fire.

More important is the background of Judaism and Christianity from which the bulk of the Qur'an is derived, largely in a distorted form. That derivation took place, partly through tradition already current among the tribes of Arabia, partly through experience of travel and intercourse, partly through personal inquiry from Jews and Christians on the part of Muhammad; never through scrutiny of the original records. Inasmuch as the monotheism of the New Testament is based upon the Old Testament, it is the latter that principally comes into view here. The acquaintance of Muhammad with Judaism and Christianity was not only second-hand and fragmentary, but also coloured by the impure media of Talmudic tradition, apocryphal gospels and Eastern heresies. In the case of the Jewish faith this does not essentially affect the doctrine of God, except for the strange blunder that "the Jews say: Ezra is a son of God" (ix, 30), and this is not further followed up. But in the case of Christianity, its followers

are roundly accused of tritheism (iv, 169); "Say not three; God is only one God; far be it from His glory that He should have a son." "They surely are infidels who say: 'God is the third of three (i.e. besides the Messiah and his mother), for there is not God but one God'" (v, 77). At the Day of Judgment God will say: "O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto mankind: 'Take me and my mother as two gods, beside God?'" and He will say: "It is not for me to say that which I know to be not the truth . . . I spake not unto them aught but that which thou didst bid Me: 'Worship God, My Lord and your Lord.'" In contrast with the sexualized polytheism of Arabia, God is One, unbecgetting, unbegotten (cii, 1-4), the angels are not His daughters (xlhii, 14-19). As against contemporary Christian thought, the title "Mother of God" (*theotokos*), given to the Virgin Mary, is misunderstood as meaning that she is the consort of the Divine Being and that the Sonship of Jesus is a physical relationship. The Holy Spirit, as a divine Person, had been eliminated by the Qur'an, and the name given to the archangel Gabriel. We know also that there were early Christian sects in the East, such as the Collyridians, whose doctrine of the Trinity was on these lines, and we are assured by Professor Macdonald (*Aspects of Islam*, p. 247 f.) that "in the Syrian Desert, not very far over beyond the Dead Sea, there are still tribes who call themselves Christians and who worship a Trinity consisting of Father, Mother, and Son."

Whether Muhammad was absolutely illiterate or not is a moot point, but it is certain that he never read either the Old or the New Testament, for there is no evidence to show that these were extant in Arabic at his time or long after. It is clear that the doctrinal background of his prophecy, even as to its central dogma, was cloudy and confused. The shape which he gave to it was chiefly determined by his personality and his religious and political experiences. If it is true that the theology of the Qur'an fundamentally affects its ethic, it is also true that its ethic helps to interpret its theology.

THE UNITY OF ALLAH.

If the average Moslem is asked: "What is the way of salvation?" he will reply: "Faith in the *Tauhid* (Unity)"; and if asked: "What is the chief of sins?" the answer comes: "*Shirk*," i.e. "associating" (others with God). In this he

faithfully reflects the teaching of the Qur'an. God the One is the supreme Reality, the Thing that really matters. It is this that gives its peculiar dignity and power to the Qur'an, despite its evident lapses and flaws. The absoluteness of Allah stands out first in contrast to polytheism with its importation of the sexual element into the divine nature. God is transcendent. The creature has no community of nature with the Creator, yet the action of the Creator is described in the boldest anthropomorphisms. He is nearer to man than His neck-vein; settles Himself upon His throne; stands upon the watch-tower; plots against the plotter; seizes the rebel by His lying, sinful forelock, and summons the guards of hell. His majesty is absolute. So in the "Verse of the Throne" (II, 256): "Allah! there is no god but he, the Living, the Eternal. Nor slumber seizeth him, nor sleep; his, whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth! Who is he that can intercede with him save by his own permission? He knoweth what hath been before them and what shall be after them; yet nought of his knowledge shall they grasp, save what he willeth. His throne reacheth over the heavens and over the earth, and the upholding of both burdeneth him not; and he is the High, the Great." And in what is probably the latest verse of the Qur'an (v, 120): "Unto Allah belongeth the sovereignty of the heavens and the earth and all that they contain; and he hath power over all things."

The only attitude of the creature is that of adoration, praise and commemoration of His Name. These are the elements of which the set prayers (*Salāt*) of Islam consist rather than of petition.

THE NAMES OF ALLAH.

As in the Old Testament, God has revealed Himself by names which reflect the different aspects of His character. "Most excellent titles hath God; by these call ye on Him" (VII, 179). These excellent titles are the *Asmāu'lhasnā* or "beautiful names" found in the Qur'an or derived from its phrases. They are most commonly reckoned as ninety-nine and recited from a rosary with that number of beads. Broadly speaking, they are reproductions of Old Testament names with a tendency to dwell on the attributes of force, such as the Dominator (*Qahhār*), the Haughty (*Mutakabbir*), the All-Compelling (*Jabbār*), the Avenger (*Muntaqim*), the Slayer (*Mumīt*), the Gatherer into hell (*Jāmi'*), the Misleader (*Muzill*).

The relationship with the Old Testament is specially noticeable in three very common names. *Allāh* is the contraction of *Al Ilāh* = The Deity, answering to the Hebrew *Eloah* and *Elohim*. *Rabb*, with the meaning of Lord, corresponds to *Adonai*, though from a different root. *Rahmān* = Merciful, was a Jewish form of the root RHM, synonymous in Hebrew and Arabic, and its adoption by Muhammad caused questionings which were appeased by the addition of the Arabic form *Rahīm*, so that the invocation of Islam, *Bismi'llāhi' Rahmāni'r Rahīm* (In the name of God, the Merciful One, the Merciful) contains a standing tautology. The leading Old Testament ideas of absolute power, benevolent rule, and mercy to the weak and erring, are carried on, but their fulfilment in the revelation of the New Testament is eliminated. By the consensus of divines *Allāh* is regarded as the "Name of Essence"; the others are only Names of Attribute.

MORAL AND METAPHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES.

The acid test of all religious thought is the reconciliation of these two categories. How is this envisaged in the Qur'an? This brief review has shown that the metaphysical qualities of self-subsistent unity, omnipotence and omniscience are impressively set forth in terms well suited to the mentality of Arabia in the prophet's age and indeed of no inconsiderable portion of humanity. The constant repetition of the attribute of knowledge is striking, a kind of prophetic re-insurance, remaining in reserve in case the oracle should be wanting in accuracy, and indeed such a provision is made in the words: "What He pleases will God abrogate or confirm; for with Him is the source of revelation (XIII, 39). And again: "Whatever verses we cancel or cause thee to forget, we bring a better or its like (II, 100). But it would be unfair to demand from the prophet-missionary the clarity and balance of a trained theologian. Indeed had he displayed these qualities he would probably never have drawn men as he did and still does. Over against an enervated and divided Christendom and a powerless Arabian paganism, Muhammad is proclaiming the reality of God which has mastered his mind and thought and is still the force behind all that is true and strong in Islam.

The moral attributes are there also. Foremost His mercy which is shown in indulgence to the weakness of His creature and in the provision of an "easy way" to the recovery of the

divine favour which frail man may have forfeited by his negligence or transgression. And there is also His justice in virtue of which He punishes and rewards both here and hereafter. But the element of justice is weak. Among the "Beautiful Names" it occurs only once (*'Adl*) and that not as taken from the Qur'an but from Tradition. It does not seem to enter into the glory for which He is adored, nor does it curb His almightiness, for not only can He lead astray whom He will, but He can and does permit in the specially favoured one what would be reprehensible in others (as in the matter of plurality of wives) (xxxiii, 49-52). The New Testament idea of conscience as God's witness in the heart of man is not brought out in the Qur'an. The absolute power is irresponsible, as far as moral standards which we know of are concerned. The attribute of Holiness, so strongly emphasized in the Old Testament, is reflected in the *Quddus* (= *Qādosh*) of the Qur'an, but it is there used only once in LIX, 23: "He is God, beside whom there is no deity, the King, the Holy." The meaning is obscure, and little light on it is gained from Moslem divines. It would seem to convey rather the transcendent aloofness of God from the creature than His absolute separation from evil as negating His moral perfection. *Al Wudūd*, "the Affectionate," occurs twice (XI, 92; LXXXV, 14) in connection with Mercy and Indulgence. Allah is affectionate to those who are obedient to His messenger and ask His forgiveness. This falls far short of the New Testament designation of Love as an inherent divine attribute, the necessary forthgoing of His nature, in fact the ultimate "Name of Essence." That "God is love," determines the exercise of His Power, His Wisdom and every other quality. The quranic idea of God has fallen back from this supreme reconciliation of the metaphysical and moral attributes of God. The former dominates the latter, Power overrides Justice.

This view of the divine character is borne out in the teaching of the Qur'an on Creation and Judgment.

Creation is an act of Allah's absolute power. "He is the wise Creator. When He desireth aught his command is but to say: 'Be, and it is.'" "He turned to the heaven which was then but smoke, and to it and to the earth he said: 'Come ye, whether obediently or against your will.' They said: 'We come obediently.'" The details resemble those of Genesis with Talmudic supplements. "He it is who hath made the heaven and the earth in six days: His throne had stood ere this upon the

waters, that He might make proof which of you would excel in works." He created the earth in two days, then placed the firm mountains upon it and made the whole fruitful in four days, and spread over it the vault of heaven without pillars, with the sun and the moon, each moving swiftly in its sphere. Creation is made to set forth Allah's truth; all creatures are a sign from him, and join in praising him; even the shadows, as they rise and fall, are prostrating themselves in worship before him. Creation is a sign to convince unbelievers, while it witnesses the goodness of Allah to men. The creation of man is twofold: the first of water and of dust making male and female, the second by sexual procreation which is repeatedly insisted on in detail as a proof of Allah's power over man and His care for him. As Allah has brought forth all things, so He will call them back and remake creation at the resurrection.

Yet there seem to be traces in the Qur'an of hypostases or personal distinctions within the deity; though here interpretation is uncertain owing to the lack of clearness in Muhammad's reminiscences of the teaching which he had heard from Jews and Christians. At the creation of the seven heavens Allah revealed to each its own *amr*, i.e. command or bidding (see XLI, 11 (cp. Ps. cxlviii, 6). In XXXII, 4: "He ordains the *amr* from the heaven to the earth"; and in LXV, 12: "It is Allah who hath created seven heavens and as many earths; the divine *amr* cometh down through them all." We are reminded of the Memra or divine Word of the Targums, an emanation from God which carries the imperative message of His will to the creation. Connected with this *amr* is the idea of the spirit proceeding from God. "They ask thee of the spirit (probably Gabriel). Say: The spirit *proceedeth* from the command (*amr*) of my Lord" (xvii, 87). In the plenitude of his power Allah bestows him. "Exalted beyond the dignities, Lord of the Throne, he sendeth forth the spirit *proceeding* from his *amr* on whomsoever of his servants whom he pleaseth, that he may warn of the Day of Meeting" (xl, 15). Muhammad claims to have received this spirit: "Thus did we inspire thee with the spirit *proceeding* from Our *amr*" (xlii, 52). But still more emphatically is this gift of the spirit claimed for Jesus: "Some of the Apostles We have endowed more highly than others . . . and We have given Jesus, the Son of Mary, manifest signs, and We strengthened him with the holy spirit" (ii, 254). The addition of the title "holy" in this passage is almost certainly an echo

of Christian phraseology. The clash between the discordant elements is shown in IV, 169. "The Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, is only an apostle of God and His Word which He cast into Mary and a spirit from Him." This close linking of Allah, His Word and Spirit, reminds us forcibly of the prophetic utterance of the servant of Jehovah in Isa. xlvi, 16: "From the time that it was there am I, and now the Lord Jehovah hath sent me and His Spirit." It is through the Word and the Spirit that Allah reveals himself, yet in the next verse the conception of a Divine Trinity is rejected with horror.

The quranic doctrine of Predestination is very explicit though not very logical. For the purposes of exhortation a power of choice is assumed, but the hearers are often reminded that this power itself is in the hands of Allah. The determinism of the Qur'an is summed up in the word *qadar*, i.e. measuring. The well-known word *qismat* is not used in this sense in the Qur'an, but its meaning is the same, viz. apportionment. *Qadar* expresses the divine act or decree which determines the apportionment of the lot of all things, animate or inanimate. As for the future it fixes the weal or woe of sentient beings in the life to come, so in the past it determined the creation of all things, the actions of men, belief and unbelief, obedience and disobedience, and all the events of life as well as its limits, for Allah's behest is a fixed decree even in accidental matters such as that of the wife of Zaid (XXXIII, 38). The fate of men and cities is written in their book, on a clear register, containing all secret things. Yet those who use this as an excuse for their unbelief stand condemned; "The truth is from your Lord, so let him who will believe; and let him who will disbelieve" (XVIII, 28). And even to Muhammad, Allah says: "What befalls thee of good it is from Allah, and what befalls thee of bad it is from thyself" (IV, 81). But a survey of the whole leaves the matter summed up in the words "Allah do all beings in the heavens and in the earth adore, whether they will or no" (XIII, 16). Had he pleased there would have been no idolatry. "Allah is the Creator of everything; He is the One, the Dominant" (XIII, 17).

The contrast to the New Testament is brought out most strikingly of all in the quranic rejection of the idea of Fatherhood in God. "He is God alone" seems to involve: "He begetteth not," because the prophet could only understand this in a physical sense. The absolute Power may allow of indulgence to the weak and erring or to the special favourite, but never of any

likeness of nature between the Creator and the creature. As a creature man is *'abd* (slave); as a believer he has added nothing to this status. The insistence of the Qur'an on the bounty and benevolence of God in the creation is frequent and sometimes eloquent, therein following the Bible; all the more marked is the entire absence of a divine image of man, the starting-point of the Old Testament and the culmination of the New. To the Qur'an Incarnation can only connote defilement. A Kingdom of God there is, but it is the Kingdom of Power only; the Kingdom of Grace that overcomes sin through Divine and sinless suffering is not so much denied as ignored; Jesus was not crucified.

How far does the quranic ethic correspond to this conception of God?

Islam is obedience to God as speaking through His apostle. He rules both faith and state. Religion is to be propagated by physical force as well as by preaching. The Islamic law of death for apostasy, which for twelve centuries crushed out evangelism in Moslem lands, is in essential accordance with quranic teaching. It extends into social life. Not only is it laudable to fight to spread the faith. Slavery, polygamy and easy divorce are all legitimate, and woman, as the weaker, is subject to according disability. Yet further, to the very root of ethical conception does this contrast go. The Qur'an puts forward an admittedly imperfect man as supreme guide in religion to supersede the perfect Man set forth in the Evangel. The modernist Moslems who see this difficulty seek to meet it on the ground that the ethic of Jesus, while ideally the highest, was impracticable for ordinary mortals, and therefore a less exalted but more practical example is better suited to humanity. If the quranic conception of God as ultimately above morality were sound, then it might be a suitable expedient on the part of the arbitrary Ruler to devise an "easy way" which He could accept, though falling short of moral perfection, and to send a prophet who gave an example of that way. But that way lies the denial of a God who is worthy of absolute devotion and unshakable belief, and it is against that danger that the Qur'an offers no effectual safeguard.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: Dr. Stanton has pointed out with a good deal of force that the Quranic doctrine of God has much more than an academic interest. In a brief sketch of the developments

of Islam forced upon it by modern thought and life, he cites some of the consequent disintegrating movements at work in different parts of the world. This is of extreme interest and importance from the point of view of missionary work, as many iron barriers are now being broken down, and doors are being opened for the entrance of Christianity.

Perhaps the paper concedes a little too much on p. 183, para. 1, in affirming an exact correspondence between the Biblical and the Qur'anic connotation of the titles of God. In any case, the conception and elaboration of the doctrine of God in the Qur'an is immeasurably below the revelation of the title and meaning assigned to Jehovah in the Bible. For instance, let anyone take any passage or collate any number of passages from the Qur'an, and place them side by side with, for example, such majestic, glorious and awe-inspiring passages as Isa. xl, and at once the contrast is apparent, and the inferiority of the Qur'an revelation of God appears. Where can a section be found to compare with the words (Isa. xl, 15, 17), "Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance : behold He taketh up the isles as a very little thing. . . . All nations before Him are as nothing ; and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity."

There are, moreover, two notable matters which are absent from the Qur'an, (1) great prophetic utterances, and (2) the conception of the holiness of God and its correlation to man's life.

After all, the Quranic conception of God is very limited in range, notwithstanding the fact that it presents God as Creator, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Governor, Judge, Rewarder of the actions of men, and the God who investigates and adjudicates upon men's matters on the Day of Resurrection. In chap. xv of the Qur'an there is this remarkable statement concerning God : " He hath created the heavens and the earth to *manifest His justice*." It is this attribute of Justice which receives more notice than any other in the Qur'an. The marvel is, considering all things, that the Qur'an has maintained such immense influence for thirteen centuries.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said : Dr. Weitbrecht Stanton is so thoroughly master of his subject that it would be very rash of anyone

to criticize his utterances. Yet there are a few questions I should like to ask for my own information, not by way of criticism.

How far is the term "prophet" (*Nabī*) applied to Muhammad in the Qur'an? In the Muhammadan profession he is called "apostle" (*Rasūl*).

What of Muhammad's claim to be the promised Paraclete? The story, as I heard it, was that Muhammad, anxious to find some authorization for his mission in the New Testament, came across a not very erudite Christian who confused the word *παράκλητος*, Comforter (John xiv, 16, 26), with *περικλυτός*, the Illustrious. Muhammad therefore claimed that his own name, the Praised One, showed that he was the Illustrious One promised.

Is not the essential meaning of *tanzīl* something "sent down," not necessarily a "missive or rescript," but a message sent down, whether written or oral?

Would not "submission" be a better rendering of *Islam* than "obedience"? Submission would, of course, include obedience, but has a somewhat wider scope.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: I am sure that we have all greatly enjoyed the lecture to which we have just listened. Since so many millions of Muhammadans are our fellow-subjects in the Empire, we ought to know more about the religion which they profess. I hope that the lecturer will often come again and give us several lectures upon this little-known subject.

I have several times read in the Qur'an and tried to get some light upon the tenets of Islam. I have found the Qur'an very vapid and insipid. Even such *surahs* as "He Frowned" seem without much meaning. I imagine that Muhammed was an Arab youth who came in touch with Christians (I presume Nestorians), who taught him something of the New Testament. Read the *surah* "Mary" and other places to see how tenaciously Muhammad holds the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, which some so-called Churchmen have abandoned. He must later have come in touch with Jewish Rabbis and got fired with an ambition to become a prophet. Knowing his Abrahamic descent through Ishmael, he seems to have become attracted to Judaism and repelled from the debased and almost idolatrous practices of professing Christians. It is to his credit that he rejected all idolatry and alcohol.

I was wandering one day in the Garden of the Virgin at Heliopolis. I had been wondering how it came to pass that Islam had almost swept away the Eastern Churches, when I noticed an Egyptian statue in a sort of rockery and, as usual, with the head broken off : then it flashed upon my mind : “ Surely God permitted Islam to destroy a corrupt Christianity because, but for that, might not even the Church of Athanasius have become utterly and entirely corrupted by idolatry ? ”

Travelling for a day in India with an intelligent Muhammadan, he said to me : “ Why do not the Christians and Muhammadans unite to destroy Hinduism, that horrible and debasing form of idolatry ? ” “ Well,” I said, “ it is to the credit of Muhammad that he destroyed idolatry in Arabia, but in some respects you Muhammadans are farther off from God than these Hindus. These men have a sense of sin and are seeking an atonement. I do not find that in you. You have no Infinite atoning Saviour to put away sins for ever by substitutionary death.”

At the All Nations Bible College we had an ex-Muhammadan student, who said : “ That was what I sought, but what I sought in vain in Islam, but found in Christ—forgiveness to the repentant sinner through the death of the Son of God.”

When in Bankipore I was the guest of a well-known leading Indian Muhammadan. After a great deal of discussion, in which *perhaps* I scored, he brought out his great artillery. “ You Christians are often drunkards and we never.” (“ Never,” I mused, for, alas ! I had heard sad stories of secret drunkenness even amongst them.) But I said nothing except this : “ I own that in this matter Muhammad set a good example, but all Christians are not drunkards ; and true Christians *never*,” but before I could get any further he almost shouted : “ Your religion is drink ; your highest religious ceremony, to which all must go, compels you to drink alcohol.”

I was glad to be able to say : “ I am an abstainer. I never drink alcohol. All the ministers that I know are also abstainers, and at the service we call the Lord’s Supper we use the wine that is guaranteed to be *non-alcoholic*, and known as ‘ Tent ’ wine.”

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS pointed out that the alternative title of the Institute was “ Philosophical Society,” and he was disappointed

that the lecturer, while inserting much irrelevant matter about present-day Muhammadan sects, had not shown philosophically how the Qur'an doctrine of God had led to Christianity being superseded by Muhammadanism in Palestine, its native country, and over vast regions from the Persian Gulf to the confines of Constantinople, and from the Arabian Sea to the Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar itself is named after a Muhammadan), all within a century of the death of the Prophet. These were the lands of the Apostles, and of the great fathers of the Church, such as Jerome, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius, Origen and Clement and Cyril of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine (in his latter years), and were permanently conquered by the followers of the Arabian prophet.

If, as is the case, a religious man takes his character from the God he worships, this conquest can only be accounted for by recognizing that the Qur'an set forth a better doctrine of God in His unity than was prevalent among the Greek Christians of that time, who had, by their speculations on the relationships of divine Persons to One Another, deprived their doctrine of God of all reality.

It is to the shame of Christianity that in the city where our Lord died the chief religious building, erected on the site of Solomon's Temple, contains these words written round its dome—"God is One; there is no Son of God"—a denial, however, which implies the insistent claim of the Son of God to recognition.

While the message of the Old Testament seems to be "There is one God," in contrast to polytheism, that of the New is rather "God is One" (Gal. iii, 20, &c.), because He is now revealed in three Persons.

Mr. Roberts was privileged to have the friendship of a Muhammadan priest who had been converted to Christianity and became a medical missionary, and he remembered his telling him how, in reading the Old Testament with a Jew, in his unconverted days, he had found no difficulty in interpreting the prophecies of Isaiah concerning the victories of the Servant of Jehovah as applying to Muhammad, but found that those concerning the sufferings of God's Servant had no application to the Arabian prophet, but must refer to that Lord Jesus, whom he was thus led to accept as his Saviour.

Mr. HOSTE asked the lecturer how far a sense of sin or a recognition of the holy claims of God against the sinner were present among Moslems? He remembered visiting Bangalore in 1910, and being taken by a friend to meet a company of a reformed sect of Moslems, who were willing to meet with Christians on a sort of half-way platform. He was warned "to be very careful not to go too far." Paul's sermon on Mars Hill was chosen for consideration, and as long as the majesty of God and the folly of idolatry were the truths dwelt on things went well, but as soon as there was the slightest reference to the need of a Saviour the ice seemed to get thinner and thinner; and when at last the speaker determined to take a definite plunge and bare witness to the fact that God was Infinitely Holy and had righteous claims against the sinner, and that all had been fully met by the Perfect Atonement of Christ, to be received by faith, opposition was quickly aroused. Mr. Hoste remembered a certain General Haig, much interested in Christian missions in North Africa, saying how, on one occasion, when dining with an Arab Sheik in that country, he expressed his admiration at the devotion of his fellow-guests (Moslems all) who at a certain moment, fell to prayer in the most zealous and apparently reverent way. The Sheik only remarked, "Is all your baggage securely locked? for there is not one of these men who would not cheerfully rob you if he got the chance." Mr. Hoste supposed that the Christian sermons with which the lecturer said the Moslem addresses at the Woking Mosque would bear comparison, would be of the Modernist or Unitarian type.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES said: I should like to ask the lecturer if he does not think that Muhammad's conception of God, as given in the Qur'an, is a very degraded one; *firstly*, in promising "the faithful" a sensual Paradise of the grossest kind?—a promise which must encourage Moslems to value and cultivate the animal appetites of our nature; *secondly*, in the shocking idea that part of the pleasures of Paradise will be the witnessing of the tortures of the lost (*surah VII*); and does not this tend to justify the cultivation of the malicious passions of the mind? *thirdly*, in exhorting "the faithful" to propagate Islam by the sword (*surah XLVII*).

If Muhammad's "voices," or revelation, came to him from above

(as he always maintained that they did), do not the foregoing facts show that he was "disobedient unto the heavenly vision?"

I am given to understand that nowadays educated Moslems are somewhat ashamed of such teaching, and either twist the words into a different meaning, or else fight shy of discussing the subject altogether.

THE AUTHOR'S REPLY.

In acknowledging the kind reception of his lecture, Dr. Weitbrecht Stanton remarked that he had intentionally put the modern sects of Islam in the foreground, both because they were endeavouring to adapt the quranic idea of God to the exigencies of modern thought and life, and because it is they who use the idea so modified as the basis of their propaganda in Western lands.

The supersession in the Near East of the Christian conception of God by that of Islam illustrates the adage *Corruptio optimi pessima*. A lifeless speculative creed was superseded by a crude but virile one. It teaches us still to stress the first article of the Creed of undivided Christendom, "I believe in One God."

Muhammad is called both *Nabi* and *Rasul* in the Qur'an, the first as the recipient of revelation from Allah, and the second as its messenger to mankind.

The sense of sin as contrariety of will to God is undeveloped. God is merciful to those who commit only venial faults and avoid great sins, the chief of which is *shirk* (polytheism).

The character of God as manifested in the ethic of the Qur'an is touched on briefly in the last paragraph. The new doctrines of Islam are two: first the apostleship of Muhammad with his view of Allah, and second the command to fight till all acknowledge Him. The unity of the One God consists in His power: the unity of His Kingdom welcomes the co-operation of force.

689TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1, ON MONDAY, MAY 17TH, 1926,
AT 4.30 P.M.

MAJOR LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Miss L. E. Cotesworth as an Associate.

A motion of condolence to Mrs. H. E. Fox and family, on the decease of Prebendary H. E. Fox, M.A., a Vice-President, and long a much-valued Member of our Society, was moved by Mr. A. W. OKE, B.A., F.G.S., seconded by Lieut.-Colonel MACKINLAY, and passed unanimously, those present signifying their assent by standing.

The CHAIRMAN, in calling on Dr. Schofield to read his paper on "Religion and Science," said :—

"There is probably no subject of greater interest to us to-day, as Christians, than the question of the relations between Religion and Science. Every religion, if it is to have any hold upon men at all, must have a basis in facts whose credit stands unshaken. This is peculiarly true of the Christian religion; and I do not suppose that there is a person here present who has not had to face the question as to how those things which he takes to be facts, proved by modern Science, affect his attitude toward the historic faith of his fathers.

"I think we are peculiarly fortunate, therefore, in having a man like Dr. Schofield here to-day to give us his own conclusions on this matter. As we all know, we have in Dr. Schofield both a convinced Christian and an eminent scientific worker, who has given far more years of careful thought to this subject—with far greater knowledge of Science in general behind that thought—than most of us, even in such an assemblage of thinking Christians as this, could hope to equal. It is with great pleasure that, on your behalf, I now ask Dr. Schofield to read us his paper."

RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D.

THE present position of Science has been so ably set forth by Karl Pearson in his *Grammar of Science* and elsewhere that I have no intention of attempting any general survey of either Religion or Science in my remarks. My principal object is to point out by what means the two, which in the last

century were so violently dissevered by geologists, evolutionists, and the concurrent wave of materialism (that wellnigh wrecked belief in the spiritual universe), have been brought together in the present century, by means so unexpected and unforeseen as to be well worthy of our consideration to-night.

We must remember that Religion and Science were once united, and dwelt together in peace : the one busy with the study of the invisible and spiritual, and the other with the wonders of the visible and material. But, as in the story of the Prodigal Son, Science gradually wandered further and further away from its parent, and sojourned for long in a far country. It is the manner of its return home that forms such a fascinating story, differing as it does so widely from that of the prodigal in the divine parable. He "came to himself," and repentance brought him back to his father's house ; but it was not so with scientists. Their return is perhaps better described in Francis Thompson's well-known lines on the subject :—

" In vasty dusk of life abroad
They fondly thought to err from God ;
Nor knew the circle that they trod ;
And wandering all the night about,
Found them at dawn where they set out."

But when the day completed the circle of their journey,

" Lo ! they were standing by His side."

We may add, to their own intense surprise.

In their homeward journey I think scientists have already passed the dawn of the poet, and the brightening day of reconciliation lies before them. For the wonder of the story is the way in which the spiritual was revealed to men who were exclusively searching for the material ; and how in their " last analysis " of visible matter scientists found nothing but the invisible force of an omnipotent Will.

The ties of Religion and Science are indisputably those of near relations, preferably those of father and son, for there can be no question that Science sprang from Religion. Science in its infancy was inseparable from Religion, its leaders being monks who pursued their researches in monasteries under the care of the Church. Previously to this it was in the hands of learned Rabbis who, before the Renaissance, were masters in Science, as Professor Einstein is again to-day. The subsequent history of Science, however, bears a strong resemblance to the story so

pathetically told in Gosse's classic work, *Father and Son*, where the son so strictly brought up is seen rebelling in his riper years against his early instruction, and diverging widely from it. Science has indeed retrograded even further than this, in both denying and repudiating its parent in more ways than one; and until lately there seemed but little prospect of reconciliation. But the history of Science in modern times shows us the miracle has now occurred, and that Science has recovered itself, through the staggering revelation that has burst upon it, that all matter is but the expression of an inscrutable "force" in action. This at once transformed, for the advanced scientist, the visible into the invisible; the material world entirely disappeared in the concept of almighty force, which in Christian phraseology is none other than the "God in whom we live, and move, and have our being." My object in this lecture is briefly to study this reconciliation of "father and son" in its various stages, and to show the present relations of the two.

It may be well if I point out, first of all, that the great advances of Science to-day are due, not so much to any increase in mental acumen or grasp, or to the work of any special scientific genius or intellectual giant, as to our wonderful modern instruments, and to modes of research which were utterly unknown a century ago—or indeed, as regards some of them, half a century ago. I refer more especially to the development of spectroscopy, the ultra-microscope, the liquefaction of air and other gases, the discovery of radium, and the amazing advances in chemistry and electricity. It is due to electricity alone that we can for the first time absolutely see the molecule, and thus arrive at the most modern hypothesis of matter, which is, as we shall see, the knell of the "material" and the final triumph of the "spiritual." It is not, however, for a moment to be supposed that this was the aim or object before modern scientists. They had no axes to grind, no preconceived theories to convert into facts; their researches indubitably were entirely and solely on behalf of truth; and none can question the purity and loftiness of their motives, nor doubt, as I have said, that the result at which they have now arrived was neither welcomed nor expected.

Biologists and scientists, indeed, had sought indefatigably to eliminate "spirit" from the scientific world. Dualists, or philosophers who believed in matter and mind as two distinct entities, were until recently all regarded as back numbers, and, indeed, obstacles to scientific progress. I well remember at

Harley Street the many desperate efforts of Haeckel and his numerous followers on behalf of monism—the gospel of material unity and the denial of mind and spirit—seemed at one time all but crowned with success, all mental and vital phenomena being merely mechanical action and chemical explosions of matter.

But what surprises Science had in store for these monists! Even before we lost Huxley, that great materialist had alarmed his friends by his utterances in his last Romanes lecture, in regarding the soul as an entity with laws of its own; and soon after the dualists could lift up their heads again, for here and there among scientists the words “vital force” were heard once more.

Had Science stopped here, and the position of mind and matter as distinct entities been absolutely established, monism would have perished and have been buried among the many errors of the past, without even a tombstone to perpetuate its dishonoured memory. But Science still progressed, by the aid of its modern instruments of precision, especially by advances in electricity and by the revelation of the disintegration of the atom in radio-activity, to discoveries of a truly momentous character.

Scientists are apt to speak of “discoveries” as if of established and demonstrated truths, but surely “hypotheses” would be a more suitable word, seeing that practically most of what they so name is a matter of theory and surmise and imagination rather than of fact; for here, scornful though Science may be of imagination and faith, it has to trust to both, in its modern path, to a truly surprising extent. Ether, for instance, is generally spoken of as a proved fact, although the fiercest disputes still rage as to its nature, or even as to its existence. The concepts with regard to it (for there are no percepts) range from that of an inert gas one million times lighter than hydrogen (Mendeléef) to that of a substance 480 times denser than platinum (Professor Reynolds), or millions of times denser than iron, so dense indeed that all matter compared to it is like an imperceptible mist (Sir O. Lodge). This ether, he points out, vibrates more times in a second in the smaller waves of light than there are *letters in all the books* in the British Museum Library! This requires an elasticity and density so amazing that the material world is as gossamer compared to it. When we are further told that this purely imaginary substance possesses energy in every cubic millimeter equal to a million horse-power, we do not feel so much inclined to contradict such a statement as to wonder

how the information was obtained. In 1926 Sir Oliver Lodge, speaking of the construction of the universe, says: "All is built up of two units—positive and negative electricity united by a third, radiation or light or ether" (*Creation and Evolution*, p. 10). He also says of the same subject: "First we postulate an undifferentiated and extensive substance, the raw material out of which everything is composed, and which we call the ether of space. We must then imagine this knotted up here and there into minute specks of two kinds, protons and electrons, or positive and negative electricity—the 'knotting' being accomplished by a process of which as yet we have no clue. Next, we must suppose these electrical units running together . . . and forming . . . 92 different patterns, which constitute the atoms of matter" (*supra*, pp. 66, 68).

"So far we have been trying to follow a process of which we have no real knowledge" (*supra*, p. 72).

It must be remembered that these hypotheses (not facts) belong to the "ether" school, of which Sir O. Lodge is the leader, and other schools of scientists deny much of the above *in toto* with authority as great as, if not greater than, Sir Oliver: so that as regards ether, at any rate, all is as yet hypothetical.

But while the immaterial ether is coming to be regarded as a fact, matter is dissolving into a fiction. So that, as ether, which no one has ever seen or perceived nor apparently could see, has become real; matter, which constitutes all that we either see or perceive, becomes a mere idea, having no existence apart from the thinking mind; consisting either of spaces in the ether, or of invisible movements and strains of force in it. The result, as scientists do not hesitate to affirm, is that when these ethereal ripples or motions cease, as they must do eventually, the universe will vanish as a dream, and

"Leave not a wreck behind."

"Matter," says Alfred Russel Wallace, "is force and nothing but force; force is will and nothing but will, and that the Will of one supreme Intelligence."

Professor Tyndall said long ago, "We know no more of the origin of force than of the origin of matter; where matter is, there force is; for we only know matter through its force."

From the doctrine of the conservation and dissipation of energy, it is deducible that the duration of the earth as a living planet must be strictly limited in time. It must have had a

beginning, and at the beginning was furnished (by some one) with a store of energy which it has been losing ever since ; and when the store is exhausted, the bankrupt earth will be numbered among the dead planets.

Seeing that all that is visible is resolved into the invisible, as is now scientifically believed, and is said to consist in its ultimate basis of nothing but centers of elastic strain in a purely hypothetical ether ; and when, moreover, this is seen to be nothing but kinetic force, which is not an entity at all, has no existence in itself, and is but the expression of will, we have indubitably reached a new monism.

This time, however, instead of its denying the existence of mind and expressing all in the terms of matter, and so degrading the whole concept of man and the universe as was done not so long since by distinguished scientists, monism now affirms there is nothing but what is of the nature of spirit as opposed to our concept of visible matter. It is the material that has disappeared, and the revolution effected is complete, and the new monism holds the field. Those dualists who fought for the double entities of matter and spirit have achieved a victory they never dreamed of in the new monism, wherein this time the things that are seen are proved to be temporal, and only the unseen and its expression in the universe remains. One may add that while fifty years ago Science declared, in opposition to Heb. xi, 3, that things which are seen *are* made of things which do appear, it now asserts the opposite, and witnesses to the truth of Holy Writ that "things which are seen are *not* made of things which do appear." It is not too much to say that this aspect of monism was wholly unexpected, and that in arriving at this point scientists were led by "a way that they knew not." In simple honesty they pursued their researches, and the reason why the results were so often contradictory and sometimes appeared absurd was because of the absolute truthfulness of their scientific reports. The ignorance of Science has become also greater than it ever was, simply because of its advance in knowledge ; for the fact remains that every fresh truth discovered raises more questions than it solves, and after all it is only the wise who know how ignorant they are. In face of this it is well that the present attitude of scientists is so markedly humble and unassuming.

Let me here recapitulate. The scientist, in finding that mind and spirit could not be eliminated from the *organic*, turned with relief to the material *inorganic* world, in the illusion that he was

exchanging what was doubtful and inscrutable and invisible for that which was certain, intelligible, and visible. But how complete the disillusion, when first ether and then electrons appeared ; when at one cruel blow the solid atom, which had so long posed as the corner-stone of the scientists' physics, was shattered by the explosions of radium, and all his material elements gradually melted away, leaving him nothing but a Something, which he called "force," for want of a better word ! But is force a creation of Religion or Science, or is it not the real reunion of the two ; and are we not at length within sight of reaching ultimate truth in the long-suspected unity of all ?

Is not force itself not so much an entity as the expression of the will of the Creator, setting indeed the emphatic seal of Science on the apostle's wonderful address to the Greek philosophers on Mars Hill—"For in Him we live, and move, and have our being" ?

There is no doubt that such a conclusion was anything but palatable to many scientists. Many a kick, and many a struggle, was made by the more conservative to avoid being drawn over the edge of the fall—the stupendous fall—of human pride, in the revelation of One greater than themselves. They felt they were already in the rapids above their Niagara ; they tried to grip the solid shore of the material, but it crumbled beneath their fingers, and they were swept over—not to destruction, as they fancied, but into the presence of the great origin and unity of all—God Almighty !

Such is the present position of Science, and it is one that is endorsed in different ways by the highest authorities.

And now we can see why this monograph is written. It is simply because, in his studies, the writer was irresistibly impressed by the new monism. Himself a dualist so long as monism meant the material only, he has joyfully become a monist at last, now that monism means that spirit and mind are practically all !

Dr. R. C. Macfie emphatically says : "Nothing more spiritual than matter can be conceived. Matter is really energy and nothing more than energy—the energy surely of the Spirit in whom 'we live, and move, and have our being.'"

More remarkable still, in his latest book, *Ether and Reality* (1925), Sir Oliver Lodge's last word is "God"; for in his final analysis he can find no other word for ether than that it is the very garment of God (p. 16).

Perhaps I may here be permitted to illustrate what seems to me to be the present position of Science by a childish experience that many have had, and can recall in after years. A child's first pantomime used to be, in the unsophisticated days—now, alas! gone for ever—an event never to be forgotten. The excitement of taking one's seat before the drop-curtain, and the ensuing hour's enjoyment, can only be experienced once in a lifetime. But all this was as nothing compared with the child's feelings at the unveiling of the final transformation scene. The child, absorbed up to this moment in the entrancing story, quite believes that nothing can exceed it in wonder—when, lo! the dim suffused light that now fills its view slowly brightens as a gauzy curtain is raised. Veil after veil is withdrawn, and gradually the golden glory grows and glows, until, the last screen gone, the radiant vision appears, surpassing all ever seen before, and the child's enraptured gaze bespeaks emotions too deep for words.

I trust this simple illustration is not too vivid a picture of the soul of a great scientist to-day, whose whole career has been filled with growing wonder at the marvels of nature, but who now, in his advancing years, armed with the mighty weapons of modern research, takes up the investigation of matter. As he proceeds further, veil after veil disappears, and he discovers that what he had ever regarded as stationary and immobile is in incessant, bewildering motion. Matter itself dissolves bit by bit under his eyes before it vanishes away—first into ether, then into electricity, then into energy or force; and even here the process does not stop, for, as the last veil disappears, he perceives that this force is the expression of an absolute will which is the one great Cause of all. Thus, by a path he knows not, step by step along the brightening road of modern research, he finds himself, as the last cloud dissolves, standing in the perfect day, in the unclouded presence of the divine

“ We clasp our shadows tight,
 Bidding them shield us from Thy light;
 Till one by one they melt, they pass, they fall,
 And Thou art all ! ”

Geographically it is remarkable how we find that Religion and Science are everywhere found together; there is no spot where Religion flourishes without Science, or Science without Religion.

Everywhere on earth, with the highest and purest forms of Religion the most modern Science flourishes, whereas a degraded form of Religion is generally accompanied by a low development of Science.

Of late years the fact has become more and more obvious to scientific explorers, that the further they progress in their researches the stronger are the indications of the underlying unity of all sciences ; and this perhaps accounts for the fact that in all great scientists we find a deep-rooted instinct to try and discover unity in multiplicity, and identity in diversity, which is nothing more than an instinctive groping for the idea of God.

Hume long ago remarked : “ Events may seem at first to be loose and separate.” But soon we see that

“ Nothing in this earth is single ;
All things by a law Divine,
In one another’s being mingle.”

This is nothing less than the discernment of intelligent purpose in the mechanics of the universe.

If a table turns without a visible cause we exclaim : “ This is the work of a spirit ! ” : but every atom of the table is incessantly revolving with incalculable speed : is not this also the work of a spirit ?

It is idle to say that motion is as natural as rest ; this the mind refuses to believe. If a face should grow out of clay without any visible moulding hand, we should say it grew by spiritual power ; and thus, in the development of an egg, Huxley says we appear to be in the presence of an unseen modeller, which amounts to the same thing.

The atomic theory (especially in its more recent form) doubled the mysteries and wonders of life. Any artist could mould a bird out of clay, but where is he that could fashion so much as a little-finger nail out of dancing molecules ? The germ in an egg contains countless molecules in incessant motion which are all alike ; and yet if these are subjected to gentle heat they all begin to make various structures, which will become the organs, bones, beak, and feathers of a bird ; and every single atom must occupy its right place, for every one is needed. If we were to take all the letters in Shakespeare’s plays and jumble them together, and then shut them into an egg-shell, and were to find that by gentle warmth the letters arranged themselves into the plays and sonnets, it would be far less wonderful than the forma-

tion of a chicken. When we consider that the atoms in an egg which construct all the molecular combinations of a chicken—its veins, arteries, bones, muscles—are at first exactly similar in proportion and position, we shall experience no surprise that scientists in their study feel instinctively they are in the presence of an unseen and mighty force, far beyond all human conception. After this, why quibble about miracles ?

The very existence and possibility of Science, equally with that of the scientist's mind, postulates God ; for all scientific researches are based on the hypothesis that nature is intelligible—that is, constructed by mind. If nature were the result of the caprice of an irrational being, like the scratches left by a cat on a wall, no science would be possible. All Science truly so-called is a sincere attempt to decipher the handwriting of the Almighty on the universe ; but it proceeds on the belief that the writing is there and that design is a fact. Design, of course, may be equally shown in constructing anything in a natural product, or in inventing a machine to make what is artificial ; but in both cases the article is a product of the mind and not of a machine, only in the one case it is primarily, and in the other secondarily, produced. So if all nature is intelligible, and Science reveals plan and order everywhere, a mind must have produced it, great enough to be capable of such work. All this very familiar line of argument is well summed up by Herbert Spencer : “ The one absolute certainty is, that we are ever in the presence of an infinite and eternal Energy from which all things proceed ” ; but which, not accepting Christianity, he states is unknowable.

Science, however, is limited to the investigation of phenomena ; it is mainly a study of facts ; it stops short of first causes as before an impenetrable barrier, which it is not the function of Science to remove. Many biologists go further, and say that Science is the study of things that can be known and proved, while revelation deals with matters that are unknown but are to be believed. This distinction, however, on careful investigation will not stand. The language of the Bible always is, “ we know.”

Knowledge, however, is of two sorts—personal and hearsay. The verification of any facts must be personal, and it is the ease with which this is accomplished in scientific facts that makes its truths readily proved. When it asserts that water consists of H_2O , it knows that almost anyone can produce it by uniting the gases in this proportion. This, then, is first-hand knowledge.

Curiously enough, there are scientists who deny that this sort of knowledge can be arrived at in Religion, for, as a matter of fact, the absolute reverse is the case.

Hearsay evidence is, indeed, of less value in revelation than in Science; it is everywhere condemned, and no man can be truly said to be a Christian whose religious knowledge is wholly hearsay. "We speak that we do know; we testify that which we have seen," is not the language of those who value second-hand evidence.

I submit, also, that the possibilities of personal verification of the truths of revelation are, in their own sphere, as simple and evident as those of Science. In Science the introduction of a certain chemical into a fluid can be relied upon to produce a definite change in every case; and in Religion it is the same. Take any man or group of men the world over; introduce into the heart the truths of revelation, and certain results will ensue, and can be as positively predicted as those of any chemical action. Of course, both Science and revelation insist that the experiments must be conducted according to fixed conditions. The latter, for instance, being a moral force, will not tolerate experiments, *qua* experiments, but only for the moral benefits of those involved.

Capron well points out the close connection of Science and Religion in the opening words of revelation, where the five essential concepts of Science, according to Herbert Spencer, are all brought together in the first two verses of Genesis. "In the beginning," being *time*, "the heavens"—*space*, "the earth"—*matter*, "the Spirit of God"—*force*, "moved"—*motion*. These are the five essential scientific concepts—time, space, matter, force, and motion. It is also possible that in the word "brooding," or hovering, we see an indication that the special form of motion was molecular and not molar.

Sir Oliver Lodge has perhaps gone into the subject of my lecture more fully than any other scientific writer. He states that in their products Religion and Science are opposites. "Science cultivates a vigorous, adult, intelligent, serpent-like wisdom, an active interference with the course of nature; religion fosters a meek, receptive, child-like and dove-like attitude and resignation to the divine will"—forgetting, perhaps, that Christians are also to be "wise as serpents."

In one sense it is true that Science and Religion have no point of logical contact, for the essence of scientific knowledge is by

discovery and induction, that of religious knowledge is by revelation and deduction. Revelation is also occupied almost exclusively with much which is unknown to Science, and which no research can ever make plain. Another distinction between the two is that Religion accepts truth on authority, Science on proof. Authority is the *bête noire* of the scientist—there is nothing he dislikes and distrusts more ; the most rabid anarchist is not more impatient of the slightest authority than the meekest scientist. It is only great scientists, that is, men who are something more than scientists, who can breathe the air of heaven. The man of science who is nothing else cannot live in the pure religious atmosphere ; in it he would die of inanition ; he requires what he calls the solid food of fact. In a similar way, the religious man living in the cold, dry atmosphere of Science could not breathe, and would die of asphyxia ; he requires Faith. As a matter of fact (though they may not know it), both require both.

So far we have spoken of revelation and Science as the two revealers of truth ; but on closer research a third voice is heard of a most inscrutable nature. Proof of truth by experience we can understand, and also revelation from the supreme Being is quite intelligible to us ; but what are we to think of a voice that proclaims truth to us from the recesses of our own being ?

Three voices really speak to us of external truths : (1) The voice of Science—this is *reasonable* and requires proof ; (2) The voice of conscience within, unconditioned in space and time, speaking of laws—this is *instinctive* and requires no proof ; (3) The voice of revelation, which alone reveals causes—this is *authoritative* and also requires no proof. The voice of conscience lies in the borderland of Religion, for its real form and character have never been fully disclosed ; all we can do is to listen to it.

Theology is the scientific exposition of what we know of God and His relations with all created things. Science is the attempt to discover the working of God's providence in nature ; the expression of His will in those laws which to Science are known only as observed uniformities, sequences, and coexistents.

The standing controversy between Christianity and Science is not whether the world is made by a great first Cause, but whether it is controlled by a living Personality accessible to prayer, influenced by love, able and willing to guide our spirits until they become in some sort akin to Himself : and there can be no doubt that there will be ever those who affirm and those who deny this. Mathematical proof is impossible ; for none can attain to the

knowledge of God through the intellect, but solely through the heart. Cardinal Newman, among other leaders of thought, strongly insisted on this. In this sense we may say of the divine what one reads in the temple of Isis at Saïs : " I am that which is, and which was, and is to come, and my veil has no man ever lifted." Revelation alone has made known to us what is known of the unknowable.

The substitution of spirit for matter, and even of God for ether, although it postulates a Creator, is only, at most, a first stepping-stone to Christianity : and to very many it is not even this.

The faith in a Saviour from sin, with its creed of the Virgin birth, atoning death, and physical resurrection, touches science at no single point.

Hence Christianity proper must be distinguished from theism, of whose relations with Science we speak, which comprehends the first part alone of the address on Mars Hill.

It is only at the end of that memorable oration that the great apostle reaches the tenets of Christianity proper.

Sir Oliver Lodge's recent utterances are as strong in denying the fundamentals of Christianity as in asserting the Creative power of God.

We thus see that it is not so much Religion in its pure theism, and even in its general revelation, as Christianity itself that is in conflict with Science ; and let none think that theism and Christianity are identical. The former is at any rate suggested by scientific research, but not the latter. Sir Oliver Lodge says that the situation between *Christianity* and Science is, that while the belief of our fathers was " As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," and that man fell, and is now far from his Father's house, to which he is privileged to return at the cost of the Son of God ; Science teaches that man is the one event towards which creation moved, the crowning glory of organic life, the product of a ceaseless evolution, the heir of all the ages, with head erect and brow serene, knowing of no fall, requiring no Saviour, and confident in himself.

But Science does not teach all this. There is no contradiction nor connection between Science and Christianity, but we see the impassable gulf which lies between Science and Christianity as opposed to the *rapprochement* and correlation between Science and theism. The whole scheme of philosophy is the advance and culture of what the Bible calls " the natural man " ; while the whole aim of Christianity is to replace him with a being a

distinct grade higher in the scale—the spiritual man (a true super-man), one whose life is no longer in time, but is “hid with Christ in God”—words which, however mystic, certainly point to an origin and a destiny superior to that of the natural man.

While, therefore, we cannot co-ordinate Science and Christianity, Science and Religion (apart from the spiritual doctrines of Christianity) are correlated and have much in common. It will, of course, ever be a problem to bring into a unity the dualism of physics and morals without destroying the distinct character of either, and some conflict between Religion and Science will ever persist; and yet there will never be disruption, as they are both parts of one whole.

One word, in closing, about miracles. The real difficulty now between Theology and Science is in these, which raise the question: Does the Author of miracles sometimes alter His works and laws? There appear to be laws in nature which are invariable, and phenomena are produced by the operation of these; but still invariable elementary laws, when used by will power, can produce varying phenomena.

In saying a word or two on miracles, then, we must first be careful to maintain that they are not due to a suspension of natural laws, but to the power of some higher law. A miracle is always, to those who read it aright, a revelation of some greater law. Natural laws are not suspended when I throw a ball into the air, or when an apple “climbs up” into a tree; it is only the introduction of a stronger force—life. Gravitation, space, light, sound, heat, can all be modified by superior forces. What we call the laws of nature are but a few fragmentary instances that we have discovered of the eternal order of the entire universe. God’s powers are as wonderful in His continuous acts of which we think nothing, such as the bringing of a chicken out of an egg, as in His occasional acts which we deem miraculous and incredible.

The line drawn between the natural and the supernatural is purely arbitrary, and is rather the expression of our own ignorance than of any truth. It is constantly being moved backward and forward by fresh discoveries and theories; in fact, it does not really exist at all. Of course, in the miracles of which we speak we postulate the action of God, whom we also regard as the Author of all natural laws. If we admit that a mere earthly king, such as Ahasuerus (or Xerxes), could counteract, so as to

render futile, the changeless laws of the Medes and Persians (which alter not) by a decree which paralysed their action, how impossible is it for any sane man to deny that the Creator of the universe can do the same with His laws !

In order to understand the cause of miracles we must first of all understand all natural laws. It is essential, however, as I have pointed out, that no miracle be frequently repeated ; otherwise, though just as marvellous, it is soon called a natural event, and all surprise ceases. We read in Scripture of an iron axe-head made to swim in the water ; and the same Bible constantly speaks in anthropomorphic language of God's arm stretched forth in power. Now, any of us can keep an axe-head floating by holding it level with the surface of the water, and if one could render one's arm invisible this would be called a miracle.

The necessity of miracles was evident when Christ was on earth, to prove His supernatural mission, and also in the early establishment of the Church. Hence the real value of miracles at that time. Of course, the fact of their actual occurrence rests upon the testimony of those who saw them ; and we must ever remember that the greatest miracle of all, the physical Resurrection of our Lord, was established in the teeth of most determined opposition, and in the midst of sceptical disciples, and was never, so far as is recorded, publicly denied by either Jew or Gentile, but became the corner-stone of the Faith that conquered civilized humanity.

Returning to our subject, we may say that Religion and Science are as the Mary and Martha of knowledge, and the contrasts are well marked between the two.

We have busy Science exploring the riches of the provision for human need and comfort stored in the universe, bringing into all our homes the hidden treasures of the earth, and the results in all the applied sciences are brilliant. There is nothing we use or enjoy but has been enriched to us by the deft hand of Science ; our complicated marvels of machinery do all but think and speak—they have every power but that of life. It is thus that the patience, the self-renunciation, the service of what Kipling calls "the sons of Martha," is rewarded, and enjoyed by the "Sons of Mary."

When we turn to Religion, however, we find, as in Mary, an ear open to unchanging and eternal truth that never varies, and to deductions from it which are solid ground. The rock of revelation was revealed two thousand years ago to give a firm

foothold to man, and stands unshaken "far down the ages now" by the storms of time or the blasts of adverse thought.

All and more that Science by the hand of Martha brings us of material comfort richly to enjoy, the words that Mary receives bring to us spiritually; and thus the whole man is blessed by the ministrations of the two sisters, Science and Religion. But there are still those so deaf that, while they accept all the Martha service, will not hear the word from Mary; and there are those so blind that, while they can hear the word of revelation, cannot appreciate the service of Science. We require both of God's gifts—reason and revelation—along the whole of the pathway of life. The two are well expressed in their value and unity in Tennyson's well-known lines:—

"Thou wilt not leave us in the dust,
Thou madest man, he knows not why,
He thinks he was not made to die,
And Thou hast made him—Thou art just.

"We have but faith; we cannot know,
For knowledge is of things we see,
And yet we trust it comes from Thee,
A beam in darkness; let it grow.

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
Yet more of reverence in us dwell;
That mind and soul according well
May make one music as before."

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: It is with considerable diffidence that I comment upon Dr. Schofield's paper, since I am so much younger a man; but I think we will all agree that Dr. Schofield has given us a most excellent bird's-eye view of the subject before us. It is a most striking fact, of which he reminds us, that matter is, so to speak, passing from our ken. Matter resolves itself into force, and force into will; and if we are to have, as most of us desire, both an explanation and an unification of material phenomena, then we are bound to postulate One Infinite Creator behind the universe. This fact hands the modern scientist over, bound, into the hands of Religion. Between Religion, as such, and Science there is no longer any necessary conflict at all. What Dr. Schofield goes on to show us, however, is

that there *is* a conflict between what often passes for science and *one* religion, namely, Christianity. That is only too true, for Christianity speaks, as no other religion does, of the sinfulness of sin, the irrevocable Justice of God, and man's need of a Saviour.

Early last year I happened to be reading some papers before the Indian Science Congress at Benares, and, between sessions, the members of the Congress visited the various Hindu shrines and sacred places of that very religious centre. As we were going over the Buddhist remains in the vicinity, a fellow geologist remarked to me that Buddhism seemed to him to be almost identical with Christianity, and he asked whether I did not agree. I told him that, on the contrary, there seemed to me to be a fundamental difference between Christianity and *all* other religions, Buddhism included : all other religions, Buddhism included, talk of man's power to redeem himself ; Christianity alone speaks of man's need for an Infinite Redeemer, namely, God Himself, Incarnate and dying for our sins. This, then, introduces us to miracle, or Divine Intervention, which is essential to Christianity as it is to no other creed that I know of. Dr. Schofield recognizes this by pointing to the essential Christian facts of the Virgin birth, the vicarious death, and the physical resurrection. These are things which, unfortunately, too many men of science strenuously oppose to-day, although nothing in Science can disprove them.

All that the man of science can point to is recurrence of phenomena. As Dr. Schofield has shown, the facts of reproduction are, intrinsically, a greater miracle than almost anything abnormal that we could conceive of. Being sufficiently often repeated, however, they become commonplaces, and are dismissed as being due to natural law. The fact remains, though, that what is fundamentally as inexplicable as any "miracle" is continually happening before our very eyes, and therefore Science appears to be powerless to deny miracle by any scheme of valid reasoning. Certainly we cannot oppose it upon the grounds of its inexplicability. On the other hand, if people fall back upon a *prioristic* reasonings, and object that God would not suspend or interfere with His own natural laws, we can point out that sin itself is, according to Scripture, an *intrusion* into nature.

I maintain that God could reasonably meet that intrusion by a counter-intrusion. There is nothing in Science, so far as anyone can

show, to oppose the facts of Redemption as put before us in the Bible.

I am sure that you will join with me in thanking Dr. Schofield most heartily for his most interesting and instructive paper.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : The paper submitted by Dr. Schofield is of considerable interest. The lecturer's statement that Science sprang from Religion is rather inaccurate : it would be more accurate to say that religious persons were the first to undertake serious scientific inquiry. The problem of Religion and Science, according to Dr. Schofield, stands in the same relations as father and son or Martha and Mary. The arguments presented in the paper do not appear to sustain such a view, and it is not clear that the history of the relation of Science and Religion, with the constantly recurring conflicts and antagonisms, does so either.

It is well to consider how far, admitting all the claims of Science, and especially modern Science, the argument carries us. In reality a very little way. If, for instance, the teachings of the Bible are taken as the basis of Religion, it becomes clear, on reflection, that the number of possible themes on which Science can speak are extraordinarily few compared with the mass of themes which form the bulk of revealed Religion. It is above all things necessary that we should preserve the proper proportions in assigning to Science and to Religion the respective spheres and scope which belong to each.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS pointed out a slight inconsistency in Dr. Schofield absolving the scientists from any bias in their investigations, while he affirmed that they had not welcomed the theistic conclusion to which these investigations brought them, and had indeed detested having to make the admission of a First Cause.

He also suggested, while agreeing with Dr. Schofield that man's intellect was infidel, that it is needful to bring in the conscience as well as the heart in order to have true religion. He quoted, " By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which appear " (Heb. xi, 3), as showing that scientific men had only recently reached a truth which had long ago been revealed in

Scripture, namely, that the apparent universe originated from what was unseen.

He felt the only safeguard against the doctrine of theism (which Science now recognizes as a needed postulate) becoming pantheism was the recognition of God as a moral Being. This He must necessarily be if He was the Creator of moral beings like ourselves. Upon this, of necessity, follows the revelation of God in this character, in the Person of Jesus, as we have it recorded in the New Testament.

Mr. Roberts regarded the miracles of Christ, which were all of them works of beneficence to man, as the necessary consequence of a divine Person being surrounded by human misery; for this He could not do otherwise than relieve, so far as was consistent with those moral attributes of God which He had come to reveal.

Mr. W. HOSSE understood the lecturer to say something as to matter having now disappeared and having no real existence, and that consequently we may henceforth comfortably style ourselves monists, because all is spiritual; but would it not be more correct to say that our views of matter, having been too crude, have had to be modified? To deny the existence of matter is to confound matter and spirit. Certainly it does not seem logical to infer, from Heb. xi, 3, "the things which are seen are not made of things which do appear," that the resultant creation is spirit. The verse only means, he would suggest, that God did not need visible materials to create the visible worlds.

He did not know that it was possible in the most ultra-microscope to see a molecule. If a molecule appears, as the lecturer describes it, like a swarm of bees, each bee is, therefore, also visible and represents an electron; but if there are as many electrons (or is it atoms?) in a thimbleful of water as there are thimblefuls of water to the Atlantic, as we are informed—or, to use another simile, if the size of the electron is to the atom of hydrogen in the ratio of a pin's head to the dome of St. Paul's—it must require very good eyesight, even in a super-microscope, to see the ultimate particle. May not what the lecturer said have been merely some form of radiation?

If the electrons are "point charges of negative electricity," surely we must be careful not to confound matter and spirit, lest we give

countenance to the blasphemous concept of a modern heresy. But how, then, can we accept the discovery which the paper professes to announce, and accept the theory that we are monists on the spiritual plane ?

Rev. Dr. H. C. MORTON said : To my great regret, I only succeeded in reaching the room in time to hear the eloquent close of Dr. Schofield's paper, and I should not have arisen had it not been for the remark he made, that wine is always fermented, and that the wine made by our Lord at Cana must have been fermented wine. I am quite sure that is a mistake. The Hebrew word *yayin* sometimes means grapes in the cluster, and grapes in the cluster are neither fermented nor intoxicating. There have always been two kinds of wine.

Col. HARRY BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., writes : The wine at Cana, in Galilee, is contained only in Greek (original) records : the varieties of Hebrew words which denote the various products of the grape have nothing to do with the subject. The one question in this case is, What does *oinos* mean in Greek ? and the one possible answer is " wine."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Dr. SCHOFIELD replied : What Mr. Ruoff says is true ; but the question is—Why did religious persons undertake serious scientific inquiry ? The answer undoubtedly is—Because they thought it to be part of their religious work to study the works of God. So that, I think, my view *is* maintained.

I do not think the " inconsistency " of which Mr. Roberts speaks has in reality any existence. What I tried to convey was that nowhere does bias in any way influence the researches of scientists. The molecules are seen, but not the atoms ; and it is to the ultimate construction of these that I referred. If Mr. Hoste is prepared to state that force, of which they are composed, is material, then he seems to me to stretch the word. He seems on doubtful ground when he asserts that " visibility is confined to what is material." Ghosts have been seen : are they material ? Dr. Norton seems to introduce a side-issue, not relevant to the paper.

690TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 31ST, 1926,

AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., B.A., LL.M., F.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., to read his paper on "Evolution."

EVOLUTION.

By MAJOR L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

WE have among us here, in London, the tomb of an "Unknown Warrior." That warrior is, like all the rest of us, regarded as being a product of evolution. In other words, he is supposed to have been connected by a vast and unbroken chain of genetic connections with some of the lowest—and possibly the first—forms of life that ever appeared upon this planet; forms of life which, more primitive than any known to science to-day, were themselves derived by some spontaneous process from inanimate materials.

That is how I would briefly define the doctrine of evolution,* which I propose to discuss this evening; so I wish to ask all present to note the primary fact about this doctrine that it is,

* Commonly called "Organic" evolution.

essentially, a doctrine of continuous and unbroken *genetic connections*. Nor is this doctrine limited to the question of our own origin. Far from it. We are told, on the contrary, that every living creature round us to-day—whether animal or vegetable—has similarly arisen from primeval protoplasm. People may indeed quarrel as to the method, or causes, of evolution, but they practically all agree as to its fact; all forms of life, from the eagle to the whale, the oak tree, the humming-bird, the elephant, the bee, the daisy, and the ostrich, etc., are regarded as the tips of the twigs of a tree, which, however far separated they may seem to be, can yet be traced back, through various groups of branches, to one common trunk from which all have sprung. Even so, we are told, can science trace back all terrestrial forms of life, through interminable ancestries, to one common origin.

Now if this doctrine of genetic connections and a common origin were put before us in the name of Philosophy, few objections could be opposed to it. It has all the merits of a finished creed. As a concept of nature it is unified, simple, and most comprehensive. It co-ordinates any number of facts in a most attractive manner, and strongly appeals—as we are repeatedly assured—to the “modern mind.” Now that is a very strong argument in its favour as a philosophy; for every philosophy finds its basis, as Le Roy assures us, in a “frame of mind.”* Our own generation, then, having acquired a frame of mind very different from that of our ancestors of a century ago—in that we are attracted by uniformitarian ideas as strongly as they were appealed to by catastrophic ones—evolution as a creed is undoubtedly better suited to ourselves than it was to them. Consequently it “does not pay,” as they say, to oppose evolution nowadays. Those who write against it, however ably, never find their works received with the same favour as those which are written in its support. Thus probably everyone has heard of Mr. H. G. Wells’ writings on the subject, although Mr. Wells is no research worker, has no first-hand knowledge of the subject, and so has none but borrowed ideas to pass on to others; but how many have heard of the works of a leading zoologist like Fleischmann, a scientist of European reputation, who flatly denied that evolution could be regarded as scientifically established? It is significant that no one ever attempted the task of directly opposing Fleischmann; but he was thoroughly

* *A New Philosophy: Henri Bergson*, p. 12.

abused instead, and soon forgotten. When men of science find that the open expression of serious doubts upon the subject are treated after this fashion, it is natural that they incline to keep them to themselves. Nobody likes to be boycotted and reviled. Although, therefore, the great majority of scientific workers certainly do accept belief in evolution, we have no reason to suppose that they all do so, even if we seldom hear of their openly opposing it. There are reasons for their keeping their doubts to themselves. When Canon Barnes,* for instance, was loudly proclaiming that no man of science had openly come forward to oppose his declaration that man was certainly descended from an ape, few seem to have noticed that a sarcastic letter from a man of science did appear in *The Times*, remarking that the worthy clergyman seemed to be very sure of himself, and inviting him to name the actual species of ape from which man was descended. That was probably about as far as a professional scientist could safely go, in opposing evolution, if he did not wish to call down a storm of abuse upon his head from qualified and unqualified critics alike; yet the hostility of the writer was none the less patent for all that, and his question was—scientifically—a most pertinent one. It was a question which could not be answered, and Canon Barnes never attempted to answer it.

Why, then, is evolution regarded as science and not philosophy? † All the real arguments in its favour are essentially philosophic and not scientific ones. When we are told—as we are at once, whenever we begin to question the scientific foundations of evolutionary belief—that evolution is a more “unifying concept” than creation, that it suits the “modern mind,” that it appeals to known rather than to unknown causes for its

* Now Bishop of Birmingham.

† I should, perhaps, define my use of the terms “science” and “philosophy.” I define a “philosophy,” therefore, as being “a method, of explaining and co-ordinating facts, which suits a certain type of mind”; while “science” refers to “knowledge derived from the objective examination and verification of facts, and the study of their *necessary* implications.”

(I see that *Cassell's Dictionary*—the only one by me at the moment—defines a philosophy as “a particular system upon which natural effects are explained”; and science as “truth or knowledge ascertained by observation, experiment, or induction.” There is not much apparent difference between these definitions and my own, so I hope I am using terms in a fairly normal way.)

effects, etc.—all these are purely philosophical considerations. They simply amount to this : that we have laid down certain conditions to which a philosophy of nature must conform in order to please ourselves,* and evolution alone conforms to those conditions.

There is no doubt that a “unified concept” of nature is more pleasing to our minds than any other ; but the actual truth of such a concept remains to be established quite apart from any question of our tastes. To say that evolution suits the “modern mind,” which will no longer tolerate suggestions of creative interventions, merely amounts to saying that we intend to believe what we like. And the appeal to “known causes” is also peculiarly ineffective, however attractive it may be to some minds ; for, as the late Duke of Argyll pointed out, the great objection to all modern theories of transformism is simply this, that they “ascribe to known causes unknown effects.”†

Natural Selection, for instance, is a “known cause” ; but in trying to argue that it might have produced such a structure as the eye, Mr. Darwin ascribed to that known cause a wholly “unknown effect.” Although he wrote with all the dignity and polish of his superior education, Mr. Darwin often contributed no more to actual science than Uncle Remus did when he suggested that guinea-fowl were spotted because a cow once dipped her tail into some milk and splashed it over their ancestors. For the splashing of milk is also a “known cause” ; although Uncle Remus ascribed an “unknown effect” to that cause when he suggested that the splashing might leave permanent marks on the birds, which would be inherited by their offspring. In other words, the determination to appeal to known causes does not necessarily lift the philosopher into the ranks of scientist, but has a dangerous tendency to reduce him to the level of the fable-monger. There was often no fundamental difference in principle between Mr. Darwin’s reasonings and those of Uncle Remus.

* J. S. Mill tells us that it is the aim of the Physical Philosopher to determine “what are the fewest and simplest assumptions, which being granted, the whole existing order of nature would result” (*Logic*, 3rd ed., vol. i., p. 327). That is all very well for the philosopher, and suits our bias for unification ; but the scientist has to deal in facts, not assumptions, and see what he can actually prove.

† *Primeval Man*, p. 44.

Nothing has struck me more forcibly than this, that belief in evolution generally appears to be quite independent of scientific evidence. Whether he knows it or not, the average evolutionist is—so far as his belief in evolution goes—not a scientist but a philosopher. Whenever he is driven off the particular facts to which he appeals, he invariably falls back upon philosophic considerations. The wholly natural and unconscious way, too, in which he does this, shows where the foundations of his belief really lie.

It is worth remembering, therefore, that the more cautious evolutionists have often shown their own appreciation of the fact that belief in evolution is, after all, a philosophic rather than a scientific matter. Thus Dennert, when reviewing Fleischmann's works, frankly admits that his own continued belief in evolution "involves a creed," and so must be regarded as a philosophy.* A first-rate modern palæontologist like C. Depéret renders a warm tribute to certain of the older palæontologists, who believed in separate creations to their dying day: in criticizing the beliefs of these men, Depéret does not attempt to show that the same were opposed to the facts, but merely questions their merits as a "philosophy."† In Depéret's view, then, evolution is not so much science as a superior philosophy to that of creation. Messrs. Thomson and Geddes, in their attractive little work on "Evolution," trace the views of Darwin and Lamarck back to their origin not in scientific facts but in the popular social doctrines of their day, which they *read into* the facts. Thus, the writings of each of these leaders in evolutionary thought were, according to Messrs. Thomson and Geddes, "The philosophic epic of a great nation at its epoch."‡ Now that is all very fine, but it says very little for evolution as a matter of demonstrative fact. We do not believe that the world is round because Galileo wrote a philosophic epic about it, based upon contemporary social doctrines, but because he proved it by unquestionable facts of permanent value.

But, some will say, is not evolution also proved by the direct evidence of fossil successions, and by the indirect evidence of

* *Am Sterbelager des Darwinismus*, Eng. ed., pp. 131, 142, etc.

† *Transformations of the Animal World*, pp. 121–2.

‡ *Evolution*, p. xii; cf. p. 215. Similarly, Depéret comments (p. 60) on the "bursts of social philosophy which mark nearly every page" of Hæckel's *History of Creation*. There is a closer connection between social philosophies and evolutionary beliefs than most people realize.

many converging lines of testimony drawn from the facts of embryology, comparative anatomy, and geographical distribution ?

Well, I would reply, I do not think so ; and the writers I have quoted apparently do not think so either, or they would hardly refer to evolution as a philosophy when all is said and done. The fact is that there is no real "convergence" of evidence in favour of evolution. A number of different supposed "lines of evidence" are indeed commonly quoted as if they bore undoubted testimony to descent, but one need never go beyond the writings of evolutionists themselves in order to reject every one of them in turn ; for every single one has been emphatically repudiated, as evidence for descent, by leading evolutionists themselves. It would be easy to multiply quotations to this effect if space permitted me to do so ; but it does not. It must be sufficient to point out that while the testimony of "Rudiments" has been appealed to with the utmost confidence by scientists like Haeckel, and ex-priests like Mr. Joseph McCabe, it has always been regarded as far too uncertain to be trusted by more able thinkers like Huxley and P. C. Mitchell. The supposed evidence of embryology was also regarded askance by Huxley, and has been rejected altogether by experts in embryology like Sedgwick and Ballantyne, T. H. Morgan who called it "*in principle false*," and Carl Vogt who denounced it as "absolutely and radically false." And so we might go on through the list. What I particularly wish to point out here, however, is the fact that Huxley himself rejected, either as double-edged or as inconclusive, all lines of evidence save that of palæontology. Any other kind of evidence, said he, "remains mere secondary evidence. It may remove dissent, but it does not compel assent. Primary and direct evidence in favour of evolution can be furnished only by palæontology."*

* Address to celebrate "The Coming of Age of the *Origin of Species*," 1880. The same thing has been said by others ; especially (it is important to note) by men whose studies lie more particularly among living structures, and who thus only turn to palæontology because definite proofs of evolution cannot be obtained elsewhere. Thus, Prof. G. H. Parker of Harvard University, writing on "Zoological Progress" in *The American Naturalist* for Feb. 1908, says : "It is plain that the history of the animal kingdom is to be sought for not through ingenious speculations on the recent group of animals, but by persistent and patient exploration of the fossil-bearing rocks" (p. 121). Similarly, as Dennert points out, the embryologist Hertwig "makes not the least mention" of the evidence of embryology, but "evidently regards as the sole really empirically and inductively serviceable proof of Descent, that which is drawn from palæontology" (*op. cit.*, p. 140).

This, then, narrows down the issue ; and here I would join issue, for the purposes of a short paper.

So I would ask : Is it the case, as Huxley supposed, that palæontology can give decisive evidence in favour of evolution ? Let us remember, what we remarked before, that the doctrine of evolution, or descent, is essentially one of uninterrupted *genetic connections*. Is it the case that palæontology can establish the *fact* of such connections ? It is a question, you see, of the quality of the evidence. Is such evidence, in the nature of things, capable of establishing what it is called on to establish ?

Huxley evidently thought that it was, but he never explained why he thought so ; indeed one might quote his own remarks elsewhere, in order to show the limitations of that very sort of evidence. A fossil, said he, which takes an intermediate place between other forms, simply affords presumptive evidence in favour of evolution, since it indicates a possible route along which evolution may have travelled. Presumptive evidence, then, was the most that Huxley himself, in his more critical moments, felt that he could secure by finding intermediate forms in palæontology. He could not prove the fact of descent, but only point to a possible route for descent.

This is worth noting, for it leads us to ask : How is the fact of descent to be established ?

Let us consider for a moment how it is established in actual practice. Let us return to the "Unknown Warrior," to whom we referred at the beginning of this paper. Why is he "Unknown" ? I presume that his "identity disc" was lost. This so-called "disc" is a small plate of metal or other suitable material on which is stamped the regimental number, name, and unit of the soldier ; and it is carried on his person into action, in order to facilitate his identification should the subsequent operations leave his body as one of countless dead upon the field. This small piece of actual *historic* testimony is thus regarded as likely to afford, through the regimental records, better evidence as to the dead man's relationships than could be obtained by any other means.

Note this. Genetic connections are, in practice, decided by *historic* evidence, and that alone. It is a significant fact that no one ever dreams of appealing to even the most august assemblage of palæontologists to decide who a dead man's father was. We sometimes find corpses exposed in a mortuary for recognition ;

but we never find them being sent to the South Kensington Museum for that purpose. Historic evidence by the humblest person who actually knew the deceased in life, is worth more than all the help that the greatest palæontologist in the world could give in deciding the parentage of a dead man. In other words although descent is, essentially, a doctrine of unlimited genetic connections, there is no method known to science whereby even one single step in descent can be established apart from historic testimony.

Nor would anyone, I believe, admit this fact more frankly than the present Keeper of Geology at South Kensington. Firmly as he himself believes in evolution, Dr. Bather clearly stated his opinion, before the British Association in 1920, that palæontological succession is, in itself, no proof of descent. "The palæontologist" he pointed out, unlike the zoologist, "cannot assist at even a single birth."* In other words, no one ever actually saw one fossil "ancestor" being born of another. The element of historic testimony is thus wholly wanting in palæontology, and the clearer thinkers realize that there is nothing adequate to take its place.

Dr. Bather himself is inclined to supplement the evidence of succession by considerations drawn from the ontogeny of the forms; but this at once raises the whole question of the soundness of appealing from ontogeny to phylogeny. Many expert embryologists, as we have seen, have utterly rejected the theory of recapitulation; and it is interesting to find such an authority on embryology as Hertwig turning altogether from speculations based upon ontogeny to the facts of palæontological succession, while a most eminent palæontologist like Dr. Bather deliberately rejects succession as such, and makes his own essential appeal to ontogeny.

Nor is this abnormal. The most diverse ideas meet us, when we compare the efforts of various evolutionists to justify their creed. In palæontology itself, the existence of the most widely conflicting views is notorious. "What one writer," says Dr. Scott, "postulates as almost axiomatic, another will reject as impossible and absurd."† The whole trouble is, in my opinion,

* *Advancement of Science*, 1920; "Geology," p. 7.

† Article on "The Palæontological Record," in *Darwin and Modern Science*, p. 189.

that people have accepted as science a belief which lies outside the limits of scientifically demonstrable fact ; and so they cannot agree in their attempts to set it upon a scientifically satisfactory basis. The flaws which escape the notice of one man are only too patent to another. Messrs. Darwin and St. George Mivart were both firmly convinced of the fact of descent ; but while Darwin regarded the existence of structural homologies as "utterly inexplicable," except upon a basis of common descent,* Mr. Mivart showed that an appeal to homologists, if consistently applied, must end in a *reductio ad absurdum*.† Modern evolutionists, therefore, have much to say about "convergence" and "homeoplasmy," etc., in order to explain away those cases of structural homologies which cannot possibly be due to common descent. One might well ask, though, whether such facile jugglery is really admissible in science. One is tempted to sympathise with the blunt language of Carl Vogt—himself an enthusiastic evolutionist—who denounced the whole appeal to homologies as a "dogma." One thing is certain, he tells us : "the dogma, 'like formation, like descent,' on which all our phylogenetic studies rest, cannot pretend to universal validity. The *Onchidium* with the eyes of a vertebrate is no offspring of a vertebrate, nor the vertebrate of an *Onchidium*."‡ It is a singular fact that even Haeckel, that arch constructor of fossil "pedigrees," both knew and admitted, in his less elated moments, that there could be no actual proof that animals were genetically connected along the lines proposed by himself. Neither fossil successions themselves, nor any considerations drawn from the facts of their ontogeny, their vestigial structures, and whatnot, could ever amount to an actual proof of their genetic connections. "All ideas we can possibly form," said he, "about the stem history of any organism, even after the most critical investigation, are and must remain hypotheses" (*The Story of Our Ancestors*, p. 6). "It is self-evident" he elsewhere remarks, "that our genealogical history is and ever will be a fabric of hypotheses" (*Systematic Phylogeny*, vol. I, Preface, p. vi).

It is worth remembering this. On the testimony of Haeckel

* *Descent of Man*, 2nd ed., reprint, 1906, p. 35.

† *Lessons from Nature*, p. 176.

‡ *Die Natur*, March, 1889. Similarly Prof. Otto declares that : "Homology of organs is no proof of their hereditary affiliation" (*Naturalism and Religion*, p. 123).

himself, evolution is and must ever remain a "fabric of hypotheses."

What then, I may be asked, is my own attitude to the subject as a working geologist? I reply that I hold to the Baconian definition of a true scientist.

"If any human being desire," said Bacon, "to attain to clear and demonstrative knowledge instead of attractive and probable theory, we invite him as a true son of science to join our ranks" (*Novum Organum*).

Now the best that an honest man who knows the facts can say about evolution is, that it is "an attractive and probable theory." But that is precisely what Bacon refused to regard as science. It was only the man who turned his attention from just such things as that, to matters of demonstrative fact, whom Bacon was prepared to recognize as a true son of science.

Accepting the same ideal, therefore, I decline to discuss questions of ætiology. I try to keep to the less pretentious, but safer, matters of actual and demonstrative fact. The exact characters of particular fossils, the nature of their associates, the nature of the sediments in which they are found, the precise localities in which they are found, and the successions of types to be found in those localities—these are matters of fact; and they are demonstrative facts, too, since any man may go to the places I name, and either confirm or correct my observations on the spot. There is quite enough here, in the way of true science, to keep a man occupied all his life—even if he has a whole life to give to the study. The arranging of fossils into hypothetical genetic trees, however, is, in my opinion, nothing but a dangerously attractive way of wasting time and piling up structures which others will probably have to demolish before long. Yet no one, I believe, could indulge in the pastime more easily than myself, if I thought it right to do so. Only the other day, when reading a paper on the succession of certain echinoid forms in the lower Tertiaries of India, I was asked by a friend of mine, one of the palæontologists present, whether I did not regard the various species I was describing, as being the members of a locally evolving group. The temptation to regard the modifications of type, found at different horizons, as evidence of progressive evolution through descent, was almost irresistible; and I am sure that nobody present would have objected had I yielded to the temptation. But alas for the demonstrative value of such ideas! All

that I could really claim was what I did claim—a local succession of types. That was demonstrable. But whether the types were successively derived from each other, or successively created, or were simply contemporaneous forms which succeeded each other locally on account of locally changing conditions, who could say? One might choose any theory that happened to jump to one's fancy, for none was demonstrable.

That is why a man like C. Depéret remarks of all supposed fossil ancestries that: "The genealogical trees we are able to draw up by relying upon morphology and on chronological series are subjective to the feelings of each observer" (*Transformations of the Animal World*, p. 114).

In other words, we may accept or reject them as we like, for there is no necessary truth in any of them. It is worth remembering that Depéret himself (one of our foremost authorities on mammal remains) will have nothing to do with the famous fossil "ancestries" of the horse, which Huxley long ago regarded as "demonstrative" of the truth of evolution. According to Depéret, these fascinating series of bones are nothing but "pretended pedigrees" and "deceitful delusions."* Depéret implores his fellow palæontologists to remember that evolution is still "*only a theory*, which requires to be proved," quoting the words of Zittel (another leading authority) to that effect.† How its truth is ever to be proved, in face of Depéret's own admissions, it is not easy to see.‡

The truth is, that, *historic* testimony being necessarily absent in palæontology, the very multiplication of specimens only leads to an *embarras de richesse*. Where you have only a single *Archæopteryx*, you feel certain that birds have descended from reptiles, and quote that particular link. There is no competition. Where you have an abundance of three-toed and other types of horse-like creatures, however, you begin to feel the oppression of rival claims, and wonder which to choose. So there are many supposed genealogies of the horse, and you only have to examine enough of them to find that the modern

* *Op. cit.*, p. 105, etc.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 117-18. The italics are Depéret's.

‡ As Prof. Scott remarks: "From the very nature of the case, complete demonstration is impossible" (*The Theory of Evolution*, p. 168). From the very nature of the case, then, evolution must continue to remain "only a theory."

horse is the only animal common to the lot.* There is not a single supposed "ancestor" whose claims have not been flatly denied by the most excellent authorities.

And when you get an unlimited amount of evidence, as you do when you examine the members of a living species, you find that no man in his senses would attempt to name the actual father of the "Unknown Warrior" apart from historic testimony.

In other words, the more we get of the evidence, the more clearly we see that that sort of evidence cannot of itself do what we wish it to do. The essential factor is historic evidence, and that is missing.

Now the early believers in creation helped the evolutionists considerably at times—and the cause of real science not at all—by the assumptions they made. It was *assumed* by such men as Alcide d'Orbigny and Louis Agassiz, that a newly created form must always be specifically distinct from previously created ones. Hugh Miller also pleaded urgently for this idea. But it was not a Scriptural idea at all. In the book of Exodus we are told that Aaron stretched out his rod and smote the dust of Egypt, and it became lice in man and in beast (viii, 16-19). Now that was an act of special creation, and we are told that the Egyptians had there to recognize the actual hand of God. We have no reason to suppose that these "lice"—or whatever species the Hebrew word may imply—were different from already existing ones; and so we see that the Bible itself not only admits of identical species being created more than once, but it even allows of both creations of the same species being in existence together. Scripture thus refuses to limit itself in the way that Hugh Miller and others wished; and so how can science oppose it?

Neither the fact that individuals belong to the same species,

* Sir J. W. Dawson's remarks on this subject are worth remembering. After pointing out that the modern horse has been traced back to *Palæotherium* in Europe, and to *Eohippus* in America—these being, as Depéret shows, two entirely different forms—he goes on to say: "Both genealogies can scarcely be true, and there is no actual proof of either. The existing American horses, which are of European origin, are, according to the theory, descendants of *Palæotherium*, not of *Eohippus*; but if we had not known this on historical evidence, there would have been nothing to prevent us from tracing them to the latter animal. This simple consideration alone is sufficient to show that such genealogies are not of the nature of scientific evidence" (*Modern Ideas of Evolution*, p. 119).

nor even the fact that they appear side by side in the same sediments as co-existing members of the same species, can serve to prove that those individuals were not separately created, if the Bible be true. Philosophy may oppose with its whole armoury of objections, but science is disarmed. Science can only point to sequences of forms, their similarities, and their differences. If a Creator exists, who can and does create a finished article in a moment exactly like other articles normally begotten, then nothing in science can witness against His doing so. Remember how Satan invited our Lord to command stones to be made into bread (Matt. iv, 3, 4): if the Bible is true, the invitation was a real one, and our Lord never rejected the suggestion as impossible but refused on quite different grounds, thus implying that the proposed action was a possible one. Yet Satan's words implied the power of our Lord to create instantly, out of inanimate materials, both the *matured* and the *cooked* products of animate life, of identical species with ordinary wheat. Suppose such a challenge accepted and the miracle effected—how could science deal with it? Apart from historic testimony as to the origin of the bread, all that science could do would be to affirm its exact resemblance to other bread.

You see how powerless science is in this matter of creation *versus* continuity. We know that creative acts do not normally occur; but we cannot say it is an admitted fact that "no one ever saw a special creation," for the book of Exodus declares that some people did witness a special creation. We may refuse to believe the testimony, but we cannot deny its existence.

Personally, I take the Bible very seriously indeed; and so I accept the testimony.* I am, therefore, very cautious in dealing with fossil forms. Such forms may or may not be *genetically* connected, but I know that I could never actually prove such a connection; and so I keep to the things that can

* "It is self-evident" said Tyndall, "that, if there is a God, He is Almighty, and, therefore, can perform miracles." Even Huxley admitted the same thing. "It seems to me" said he, "that 'creation' in the ordinary sense of the word is perfectly conceivable. . . . The so-called *à priori* arguments against Theism, and given a Deity, against creative acts, appear to me to be devoid of reasonable foundation" (*Life of Darwin*, vol. ii, p. 187). In other words, literal creation is possible so long as the existence of God Himself is possible. So, since science is powerless to testify against creative acts, we have nothing but human philosophy to oppose to the witness of Scripture.

be proved. I aim, that is, at "clear and demonstrative knowledge" *alone*; and I defy anyone to show that my practical geological work is hampered in any way whatever by my talking of the local successions of the forms I describe, instead of their lines of descent. In fact I sometimes draw up "trees" myself, in order to illustrate the successions and branching correspondences of the forms I study; but I decline to call these *genetic* trees. The "affiliations," etc., which they are meant to illustrate may, indeed, represent genetic connections in some cases, but it is quite possible that a number of them simply represent affiliations of ideas in the mind of a Creator. We can draw up exactly similar "trees" to illustrate the development of motor-bicycles from "bone-shakers," where genetic connections are out of the question and all "affiliations" lie in creative minds.

Let me remind you, therefore, that the fact of a succession of ever higher types being found in the rocks is no argument against creation. A hundred years ago, those whom we now call the "fathers of palæontology" were believers in creation almost to a man; yet, almost to a man, they believed in a succession of ever higher types, just as we do. What is more, they sometimes made just as shrewd guesses, as to what to expect in the rocks, as we do. Agassiz, we are told, was once asked to describe the sort of fish he would expect to find in beds of a particular horizon which had never, up to then, produced any fossil fish. He did so, and apparently outlined the very characters of a fossil which had—unknown to himself—just been found in those beds. One does not need to be an evolutionist in order to appreciate the idea of fossil successions from lower to higher types.*

This is all very hurried and sketchy, perhaps, but the subject is so vast that it is hard to choose what to mention and what to leave out. Geology is a fascinating subject; and to me it has become a matter of almost passionate interest to study and describe the forms I find in the rocks. At the same time, however, I am a Christian; and I most gravely suspect that doctrine of

* I also, the other day, was able to state the probable horizon to which a new and rather abnormal species of echinoid, found in the museum at Calcutta, belonged. It subsequently proved to have come from that horizon. In another case, some foraminiferal forms, found at a lower horizon than any at which the genus had yet been represented, fully bore out my anticipations regarding the probable character of such early forms.

interminable genetic connections which saturates the descriptive works of most other palæontologists to-day. I know it to be utterly unprovable; and feel compelled to say so, when asked to give my opinion.

Further, I believe the doctrine to be mischievous. Recently, for instance, I read the following:—

“THE SECOND COMING. ‘*No Hope of Physical Manifestation,*’ declares Dr. Major. *Evolution Faith.* ‘The hope that Christ will reappear in a physical manifestation is not held nowadays by educated people.’ So declared the Rev. H. D. A. Major, of Oxford, preaching the Advent sermon yesterday at St. George’s Church, Stuyvesant Square. Such people, he said, based their hopes of human progress on their conception of evolution.” (*The Daily Mirror* 1/12/1925, p. 2.)

Here, you see, we find a professing minister of the Gospel denying the literal Coming of our Lord, on the strength of his ideas about evolution. It is significant that, nearly 2,000 years ago, it was prophesied that:

“There shall come in the last days scoffers . . . saying, Where is the promise of His Coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, *all things continue as from the beginning of the creation*” (2 Pet. iii, 3, 4).

This is a most striking prophecy, for it puts the modern doctrine of continuity into the mouths of these latter-day scoffers. Our Lord’s Coming was to be denied by them upon the strength of a belief that present-day processes could be traced back, without a break, to the very beginning of the creation.* God’s interventions would thus be specifically ruled out, and creation itself be explained upon a basis of present-day processes.

In other words, St. Peter’s latter-day scoffers at the Second Advent were to be nothing more nor less than modern uniformitarian evolutionists.

It is impossible, as Dr. Major shows, for such people to believe in the literal return of our Lord. Their doctrine of continuity forbids their crediting any abnormal event. Their hopes for the

* There is no doubt about the accuracy of this rendering. The Greek word *arche*, meaning “beginning,” is there; so the scoffers are not simply talking of events since the creation, but are including creation itself in their scheme of uniformity. Their creed is thus identical with that of the modern evolutionist.

future, therefore, are ruled by their conception of the past; and they ridicule those, who take the Bible more seriously, as being less educated than themselves.

Thus we see that a prophecy which remained unfulfilled for eighteen centuries, is now being fulfilled before our eyes. It is rather a striking fact.

II.

The above is the paper that I originally prepared, for reading before you this evening. I have been told, however, that it is rather shorter than the papers usually read before the Victoria Institute, and I have been kindly invited to make it longer. I propose, therefore, to add a few remarks regarding some other deficiencies in palæontological evidence, when regarded as proof of descent, since I may have given the impression that the absence of historic testimony is the only serious defect—which is by no means the case.

I do not propose to dwell, here, upon the question of the "imperfection of the geological record," in the sense discussed by Darwin. I could easily quote reliable authorities to show how imperfect that record still is; what great deficiencies still remain in the matter of intermediate links between different types of structure;* but I prefer to pass such facts by, for the time being, in order to deal with more fundamental defects in palæontological evidence. I have no doubt that many more intermediate links are destined to be found than we have yet discovered; I myself always look for such links in the rocks, and see no reason why they should not have existed upon any theory of origins.† What

* Thus Depéret points out that "*the majority of the fundamental types of the animal kingdom come before us without any link between them from a palæontological point of view*" (*op. cit.*, p. 74; the italics are his own). "(We) have to confess" he adds later on, "that at the present day we are utterly unable to see and even to explain otherwise than by simple theoretical views the fundamental divergences which separate the orders, classes, and great ramifications of the animal kingdom" (p. 279).

† It is worth noting, however, that while the intermediate types which we find usually serve well enough to *fill gaps* they cannot so easily be fitted into *direct series*. Thus in the case of the echinoid succession referred to above, no actual species of a middle horizon could be placed in exact series between species belonging to the horizons above and below; for every species was, in some respects, individualistic, and specialized out of exact series. It was in the *general characters* of the species of each horizon

I would ask you more particularly to consider, therefore, in the short time left to us, is the matter of those deficiencies which are inherent in the very nature of palæontological study, and which are therefore less likely to be corrected in the course of time.

(a) In the first place, then, I would recall the fact that it is, in the very nature of things, only the harder parts of animals that are preserved in the rocks. Exceptions to this are so rare, and themselves so fragmentary in the information they give, that they can be disregarded for practical purposes. All that we can normally compare, in palæontology, is one skeleton (internal or external) with another. The softer parts of the animals concerned have to be judged of from the indications afforded by the harder parts; and those indications may be far too few for our purpose. Thus Professor Flower pointed out, in his book on *The Horse*, that if we had only known of horses, quaggas, zebras, and asses, from such parts as might be preserved in a fossil state, we would never have guessed how widely they differed in other respects. So we see that, if we could only study our fossil animals in the flesh, we would probably have to separate, as distinct species, a great many forms which we now regard as identical. But how this complicates matters for the palæontologist! For if practically identical bony structures can thus be

that I claimed to find a progressive change; and it was by examining the quality of those characters in the unknown species, that I determined the horizon to which it probably belonged. Similarly with some foraminifera on which I have lately been working: a recently described species from the upper Ranikot of India proves to be just what was required to fill a gap, in certain general respects, between the species locally found in the sediments above and below; but it is so strangely specialized out of series in some respects peculiar to itself, that it might almost be placed in a different sub-genus from all the others, and certainly could not represent a link in a genetic sequence. This is a very general phenomenon in palæontology; for it is notorious that while it is easy enough to fill many gaps after an approximate fashion, it is almost impossible anywhere to form what Wood-Jones calls a true "end-on" series. Thus when Cope, Adloff and others pointed out that man's evolutionary "pedigree" was being filled up with creatures which could not possibly be regarded as his actual ancestors, Professor G. Schwalbe could only defend the practice by saying that there was nothing else to fill it up with. He added that similar objections could be raised against every other creature's supposed genealogy; in other words, not a single one will bear close examination. (See Schwalbe's article on "The Descent of Man," in *Darwin and Modern Science*, pp. 131-134.)

possessed by creatures belonging to very distinct species, how can the palæontologist ever be sure that the skeleton he puts into a particular series belonged to a creature which was otherwise suitable to go into that series? It seems clear that he never can be sure; and so we find that a man like Professor Wood-Jones, when referring to those who glibly talk of finding true links between men and apes, insists that such people should first "become thoroughly acquainted with, in order fully to appreciate, the great differences which exist between anthropoids and man in those regions of the body which can never become the object of their study in fossil fragments" (*The Problem of Man's Ancestry*, p. 46). No matter how perfect a skeletal link we may find, to fit between other skeletons, we can never prove that it belonged to a creature whose softer parts were equally in series.

Nor is it only when studying fossil Vertebrates that such facts are brought home to us. The same thing is found when we deal with other branches of the animal kingdom. Thus, if we turn to the great phylum of the Mollusca, we find that while zoologists, dealing with the living creature, have proposed taking the structure of the gills as the soundest basis for classifying the Lamellibranchia, this plan has to be rejected by palæontologists, since it concerns fleshy characters which cannot be seen in fossilized forms. Similarly, in the case of the Gastropoda, we find that the features which zoologists have found to afford the best basis for a natural classification, are ones which leave no mark upon the shell, and so cannot be judged of when dealing with fossils. Thus we are apt to find, when we compare fossil structures with living ones, that not only is a very great deal of the evidence missing, but it is often the most important part of all that is missing.

(b) What, too, can we generally assert in regard to the ontogeny of our fossil types? Next to nothing in many respects. As with the adult forms, traces of embryonic phases are only preserved in the case of the harder structures concerned, such as the early whorls of foraminiferous or mulluscan shells, or the remains of animals that died when young, or that shed hard skins during the process of growth. What student of embryology would content himself with examining the bare skeleton or empty shell of a new type? Yet the facts in regard to living forms show us that seemingly quite small differences in the details of ontogeny may be correlated with complete physiological

separation of types. Thus it seems that the most important difference between the rabbit and the hare lies in the fact that the former brings forth its young in a blind and naked state, while the latter does not ; yet the most determined efforts to cross the types have completely failed to produce a hybrid race. Such minute details of embryology could never be preserved in a fossil state, however ; so we again see how the very resemblances in things that could be preserved in such a state would only prove a trap to the investigator who tried to draw up a phyletic series.

(c) We must constantly remember, in this connection, that the "species" of the palæontologist are purely morphological ones. They cannot, under the circumstances, be anything else. And so we are bound to admit that they are extremely artificial, as compared with the better-known species of the zoologist, since they can take no count of those more subtle and apparently more fundamental affinities which are revealed by the power of creatures to combine to produce perfect offspring. As we have seen above, we find that some living animals, which seem to us very similar, are physiologically quite distinct ; and yet it is equally true that others, which seem to us at least as distinct in form, are physiologically identical. Thus the great differences between the members of the dog tribe are notorious ; and Darwin himself remarked that if the various breeds of pigeons were judged of on the same lines as creatures found in the wild state, they would be placed by ornithologists not only in separate species, but even in separate genera. Similarly Professor Bateson tells us that : " We may even be certain that numbers of excellent species recognized by entomologists and ornithologists, for example, would, if subjected to breeding tests, be immediately proved to be *analytical varieties*, differing from each other merely in the presence or absence of definite factors" (*Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, p. 284). So we see how the increasingly more exact study of living types warns us against regarding fossil series as representing anything better than provisional guesses as to real affinities. Those forms which we place specifically, and even generically, apart, may be (in a physiological sense) identical. Those which we regard as members of one and the same species, may be physiologically quite distinct. The very means for forming a sound judgment, as to the real affinities of types, do not exist when we deal with fossils.

(d) Take, again, another fact. Darwin insisted (and I think rightly) that, in palæontology, positive evidence could alone be trusted, since negative evidence was "worthless." He pointed this out when defending his theory against those who objected that the links required by it had never been found. Darwin held that the links might yet be found; and his contention was quite legitimate. Negative evidence is, I believe, of little account in palæontology. But, if Darwin had been more consistent, he would have seen that this very fact was double-edged, since it must cut at the roots of all attempts to prove evolution by appealing to fossil series, for *all such series are essentially founded upon negative evidence in palæontology*. They all tacitly assume, that is, that "younger" types did not exist contemporaneously with "older" ones, simply because they have never yet been found at similar levels. So we see that no man who really regards negative evidence as "worthless" in palæontology, can ever consistently appeal to a fossil series as proving descent. He knows that he could never be sure that any given form was younger than its supposed ancestor.

Nor is this simply an academic point. The history of the subject shows how repeatedly we have had to antedate the first appearances of types in palæontology. Thus it was, for a long time, regarded as certain that the first fishes appeared in the upper Silurian. Yet fishes have now been found, and found in swarms, in certain Ordovician sediments; and it is regarded as extremely probable that they also existed in the Cambrian. That is only one general instance out of many that could be quoted of a similar nature. If we come down to particular genera or species, we find much the same thing happening on a smaller scale. Thus Depéret rejects the orthodox "genealogy" of the modern bear, on the grounds that what appear (so far as we can judge from fossil remains) to have been virtually true bears in all but size, are now known to have existed since the middle Miocene (*op. cit.*, p. 106). Similarly Sir Arthur Keith has devoted no less than three chapters of his book on the *Antiquity of Man* to proving that what seem to have been men of a perfectly "modern" type preceded, by two whole cultural stages, the Neanderthal remains associated with "Mousterian" implements. In short, there is no way known to science, whereby any given member of a fossil series can be definitely shown to be younger than its supposed ancestor. We may have reasons for regarding it as extremely probable that the youngest members of a series

covering a great geological range represent later species than the oldest members do, but there is not even a great probability when we deal with specimens taken from a limited range of horizons ;* and the antedating of a form even a short way, may mean a recasting of the whole previous series.

(e) The same sort of difficulty presents itself when we ask where a fossil species first appeared. Here, again, the palæontologist can only appeal to "negative" evidence if he tries to answer the question; for all he can positively say is, where the earliest known representatives of the species have hitherto been found. He cannot show that still earlier ones will never be found somewhere else.

I am afraid that some palæontologists here follow Darwin's example, and remember the limitations of geology only when it suits them to do so. Thus when the evolutionist finds a new and highly specialized type appearing abruptly in a given area (e.g. *Conchidium knighti*, at the base of the English Silurian), he at once assumes—and quite legitimately—that this "cryptogenetic" form may have been evolved elsewhere, and its sudden local appearance may be due simply to its migration from the scene of its earlier history. The possibility, however, is double-edged; for the form which the evolutionist (when all runs smoothly for his theory) claims as a member of a given sequence, may also have migrated from elsewhere, and so have nothing to do with those between which it is placed in a local series.† So

* Is *Nummulites lævigatus* younger or older than *Cerithium giganteum*? In France, *C. giganteum* and *Orbitolites complanatus* appear together, as characteristic fossils of the uppermost beds of the "Glauconie grossière," three zones above the level at which *N. lævigatus* first appears. In India, on the other hand, the same two species are found together in the "Alveolina Limestone" of Vredenburg, at a level three zones below that at which *N. lævigatus* first appears.

It is true that these three species belong to entirely different groups of forms; but the facts show, nevertheless, that a succession of types in one place may be entirely reversed in another. Local succession affords no criterion as to the relative dates of first appearances of species.

† Dr. Bather pointed this out when he remarked that if anyone, rightly guessing that the crown of England was normally hereditary, and finding evidence on coins that James the First succeeded Queen Elizabeth, concluded that James was therefore her son, he would be quite wrong. Yet that is just the sort of mistake, said Dr. Bather, which palæontologists are always making to-day, in regard to local successions of fossil forms. "Descent" he tells us, "is not a corollary of succession."

here again we find that the evidence cannot be secured, which is required in order to place our views as to descent upon a scientifically sound basis. It is obviously impossible to prove that one species was derived from another, when we cannot even prove that it was, at the time of its birth, in the same country as its supposed parent.

It would be easy to continue, but enough has perhaps been said to show the sort of questions which a palæontologist would like to ask of his fossil forms, but which he knows they could never answer. So, dealing as he does with the most fragmentary evidence, every attempt he may make to form a genetic series of bones must, as Haeckel said, be nothing but a "fabric of hypotheses." Not only is there a complete absence of historic testimony as to the actual mode of origin of his forms, but the forms themselves remain practically unknown as regards their softer parts. Most of the details of their embryonic development are equally unknown; and it is also utterly impossible to recognize the physiological limits of each type. The *date* of first appearance, in any particular case, can never be finally known, but must always be assumed upon the strength of that "negative evidence" which Darwin declared to be "worthless"; and all opinions as to the equally important question of the *locality* of the first appearance of a type must also rest for ever upon the same basis of "negative" evidence.

Realizing the fundamental inability of fossil series, therefore, to establish the fact of genetic connections, I flatly refuse to regard such series as scientific evidence of descent. They may be taken as representing possibilities, or as illustrating certain views regarding descent; but they are in no sense a *proof* of descent, since they carry no guarantee whatever of direct genetic connections. Remember, too, that the specimens composing the usual fossil series are not even supposed to be father and son, but mere occasional individuals separated from each other by untold myriads of intermediate generations which are not represented at all, and most of which must be regarded as lost for ever. In other words, it is never the whole chain that the evolutionist shows us, even when he produces his most perfect series, but only half a dozen links or so out of many millions, the vast majority of which have to be left entirely to the imagination. It is philosophy, philosophy alone, which knits these few and widely scattered facts together into a scheme of universal and uninterrupted

genetic connections. So what can we say ? Descent may or may not be a fact ; but there appear to be no scientific means of establishing it as a fact.

That belief in evolution has come to stay, nobody holds more firmly than I do. The same Book which so stikingly foretold its rise in the "last days," also foretold that it should be an increasingly popular belief, and prepare the way for certain definite events, most of which seem now to be taking actual shape.* I cannot think it probable that matters will be reversed when things have gone so far. That, however, is another story. What I wish to point out here is that, although the Bible foretold the rise of the modern doctrine of uniformity, it nowhere implied that the doctrine should be a true one. Quite the reverse.† And I have tried to show that, on examining the actual facts, there appears to be no reason why anyone who still likes to retain belief in literal creation, should feel debarred from doing so. Evolution is not science, and—on the testimony of Haeckel himself—it never will be science.

DISCUSSION.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said : Major Davies has given us a very valuable paper, evidently the result of a careful study of the subject. It is specially valuable because it points out the necessity of making

* It seems, by putting the prophecies regarding the "last days" together, that belief in uniformity is to lead to rejection of belief in the Flood, to rejection of belief in the Second Advent, and to rejection of belief in the future Judgment and everlasting perdition of sinners. In spite of the fact that uniformitarians are to be "ever learning," they are never to come to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. They are, on the contrary, deliberately to turn away their ears from that Truth, and be turned to fables. Evil men and seducers are to wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. And, finally, the deification of humanity, which is one of the corollaries of uniformitarianism, is to come to a head in the acceptance and worship of a transcendent genius, a veritable Superman, who will give himself out to be actually a god.

This last event is the only one which can fairly be said to be still altogether in the future ; and yet even it must now be allowed to be a reasonable prospect, logically following upon belief in uniformitarian postulates. Nothing could better lead up to the introduction of a Superman, than our present pseudo-scientific creed of evolution.

† It refers to it, indeed, as "the error of the wicked" and a "strong delusion" (A.V.).

sure of the ground before adopting views which, though they attract many minds, cannot be demonstrated as true. There are many who, desirous of hearing some new thing, need to be put on their guard before accepting a present-day theory simply because it is popular.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said : The chief aim, I take it, of the paper is to show that Evolution is not a scientific truth, but a philosophic theory for which no scientific evidence can be produced—a very valuable argument. I should like, however, to bring forward some other points.

Strictly speaking, Evolution should mean that whatever is evolved was already latent in whatever went before. "The world," says a convinced evolutionist, "and everything in it, including man, have come to be what they are in virtue of inherent powers and capacities, by processes that have been continuous and orderly through time." That would mean that the genius of Shakespeare and the intellect of Newton existed in embryo in protoplasm or even primeval slime.

Nowadays, however, many advocate a modification of the original theory called "emergent evolution," mentioned recently by Canon Storr in a paper read before the Institute. That appears to mean that while in general Evolution proceeded automatically, yet at certain crises some new factor was introduced. So Bishop Barnes has said : "When life emerged from non-living matter, or, again, when self-conscious mind grew in living things, God made something new. So, also, in creating the soul of man He made something new, definite, real, something different from any previous evolutionary product." That really amounts to a series of new creations, and is a serious departure from what is ordinarily meant by Evolution.

This is not the only instance of modern evolutionists departing from the original theory. On p. 216 allusion is made to Bishop Barnes' "declaration that man was certainly descended from an ape." Yet a few years ago he said, "Man . . . is the final product of a vast process by which all life has developed from primitive organisms. Biologically he is cousin, a hundred thousand or a million times removed, to the gorilla, and his ancestry goes back through amphibians to fishes," which is not quite the same as "descended from an ape."

Evolution, it is often confidently asserted, is found in the history of mankind, rising gradually from rudest savagery to the present high condition. Is that fully justified by the evidence? Suppose a terrific convulsion were to wipe out completely the present human race, while burying and preserving their works. Suppose some 3,000 or 4,000 years hence another race of intelligent beings were to set about exploring and excavating. In Europe they would find traces of splendid buildings, steam-engines, ironclad vessels, rifles, cannon, and the like. In other parts, such as the Andaman Isles, they would find rude huts, canoes, bows, and arrows with points only hardened in the fire. They might easily jump to the conclusion that this latter state belonged to a much earlier era than the former, a state when men had not learned the use of metals. Yet we know that both states are co-existing at the present day. Is it not possible, then, that the various so-called ages—Stone, Bronze, and Iron—may have been to some extent contemporaneous? It is really an assumption that these were world-wide stages and successive.

When, too, it is taken for granted that the original state of mankind was only that of savages little higher than animals, has sufficient allowance been made for the possibility of degeneration? Compare the marvellous achievements of Ancient Egypt with the conditions that prevailed there in quite recent times. To my mind, the boasted Evolution of the human race is by no means conclusively proved.

The Rev. MORRIS MORRIS, M.Sc., said: I congratulate the author on taking an interest in Geology. So do I. I not only took final honours in the subject, but have also published researches. I also congratulate him upon being a Christian. So am I. In my opinion, the Gospel has been verified by experience, as well as anything can be, and, therefore, I would query any interpretation of events which wars against it.

But that is as far as I can go in congratulating the author, for he has confused two things which should always be carefully distinguished, namely, Evolution and the Doctrine of Descent. Evolution implies the Doctrine of Descent, but the Doctrine of Descent does not imply Evolution; and, in assuming that it does, he has committed the very common fallacy known as "undistributed

middle." All Yorkshiremen are Englishmen, but not all Englishmen are Yorkshiremen.

The author has covered so much ground that I cannot, in the space of five minutes, cope with all that he has said. I will, therefore, confine myself to his main point. He set out to overthrow the theory of Evolution; and there I am one with him, for Evolution is a false version of the Doctrine of Descent. But, instead of opposing Evolution, he has attacked the Doctrine of Descent, showing clearly that he does not recognize the difference between them.

The crux of the matter is not Descent, as the author supposes, but *Variation*. We infer Descent from direct evidence, and the evidence is overwhelming and incontestable; but we infer Variation from Descent. For many years naturalists have been absolutely unanimous in accepting variation during descent; but, unanimous as they are about the *fact* of Variation, they are equally unanimous in admitting that we know nothing whatsoever about its nature and cause. The author has made remarks reflecting on the integrity of naturalists. I was sorry to hear him speak so, for, in my experience, they are the truest of the true. When they know, they say so; and when they do not know they are equally candid. There is not one of them who claims to know anything about the nature and cause of Variation. It remains as great a mystery as ever.

And if we do not know what it is, what right has anyone to call it Evolution, as if we *do* know? It may have consisted in creative power. Take, for example, the differentia of Man. What caused it to appear in the first man? That is the question. There are *two* possibilities: either it was *evolved*, that is, produced by natural processes, or else it was not evolved, in which case it must have been *created* in his developing body before birth, and added to the qualities which he inherited.

You all know that Christ descended from ancestors. The New Testament commences with the descent of the last Adam from the first. Therefore, He must have inherited most of His qualities. But He also has qualities which were not inherited. These were added in His Mother's womb; and we call that act or addition the Incarnation. Is it not conceivable to you that something similar took

place in the *first* Adam?—that, although he descended from an earlier species, something was created in him before birth and added to his inherited qualities?

Do you say this is contrary to the Scriptures? Nay, I have deprived you of the right to say that; for in *New Light on Genesis* and in *Man Created during Descent*, I have shown that this is the *Scriptural* standpoint; and I will challenge anyone to interpret Gen. i and ii from any other standpoint without violating the original and making it inconsistent with itself.

If the Doctrine of Descent offers two interpretations, according as Variation is considered to have been a natural process (Evolution during Descent) or a creative act (Creation during Descent), ought we not to distinguish them? Otherwise we must either accept them both, or reject them both. In the one case, we must accept the false as well as the true, and in the other we must reject the true as well as the false! Would it not be better to reject the false version (Evolution during Descent) and keep the true one (Creation during Descent)?

Instead of doing this, the author has tried to overthrow Descent! And, needless to say, he has failed miserably. If I had time, it would be easy to expose the falsity of his arguments and the irrelevancy of his quotations. From Huxley, Mitchell, Thomson and Geddes, for example, he has quoted passages which refer to one thing, and has applied them to something else. Naturalists do not rely on ontogeny alone for ascertaining stem-history, for it not only recapitulates stem-history, but contains secondary modifications as well. But although the law of recapitulation is not the *only* factor which determines the metamorphosis of embryos, yet it *is* a factor, and all naturalists, without exception, believe in it, including those mentioned by the author.

I cannot conclude without adverting to the author's extraordinary notion of what constitutes a scientific proof. It is absurd to sweep aside the testimony of the Geological record and say it has no bearing on Descent because no one was there to *see* any of those ancient forms giving birth to one another. The method of Science is *inductive*. It begins with a theory and then tests it by observation and experiment, to see whether it is true. The Geological record confirms the Doctrine of Descent in every particular.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : The paper is of peculiar interest, since it is a philosophical criticism of the nature of scientific inference, written by a disciple of one of the physical sciences.

I fear Major Davies is somewhat in the position of a man who, desiring to saw a branch off a tree, omitted to notice that he was sitting upon the branch ! His contention is that historical evidence for genetic sequences in Palæontology is absent. But how much historical evidence is there for his own science—Geology ? Surely, instead of condemning the theory of genetic Evolution on the ground that it is supported by philosophical arguments, we should say it is supported by fallacious philosophic arguments.

I have greatly enjoyed the author's masterly handling of the geological part of his subject.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E. : The note on p. 218, "There is a closer connection between social philosophies and evolutionary beliefs than most people realize," is worthy of considerable attention. If man and beast have a common origin, and progress is due to Evolution alone, then mankind is logically shut up to a strictly utilitarian philosophy, and can look forward merely to the goal of becoming ever more and more a highly specialized "scientific" animal—a truly appalling outlook ! The denial of man's origin as being created in the image of God leads logically (and in practice eventually will do so) to the most terrible conclusions. In this connection it is worth noting what Disraeli said at Oxford, in 1864, on "Evolution" :—

"What is the question now placed before society with a glib assurance the most astounding ? The question is this : Is man an ape or an angel ? I am on the side of the angels. I repudiate with indignation and abhorrence the contrary view. . . . The Church teaches us that man is made in the image of his Creator—a source of inspiration and of solace—a source from which only can flow every principle of morals and every Divine truth. . . . It is between these two contending interpretations of the nature of man and their consequences that Society will have to decide. Their rivalry is at the bottom of all human affairs. Upon our acceptance of that Divine interpretation . . . all sound and salutary

legislation depends. That truth is the only security for civilization, and the only guarantee of real progress." (*Life of Disraeli* (Buckle), vol. iv, p. 374.)

Professor A. RENDLE SHORT, M.D., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S. : As one who, like the author, has spent very many happy hours geologizing in the field, as well as studying the theory of the science, I would like to express my great interest in his paper, and especially in the second instalment, which the Victoria Institute was well advised to ask for. I desire to corroborate and enforce most of what he says. Evolution is much more a philosophy than a deduction from scientific facts. It is only in the dogmatics of text-books that Embryology (the Recapitulation Theory) is relied upon to prove the doctrine of Evolution : "The Recapitulation Theory of Fritz Müller and Haeckel is chiefly conspicuous now as a skeleton on which to hang innumerable exceptions. . . . The Recapitulation Theory is mostly wrong" (Professor Kellogg in *Darwinism To-day*). As a simple example of this, let us consider the stages of development of a butterfly : first the egg, then the caterpillar, then the pupa, and finally the imago or perfect insect. Now it might be reasonable, perhaps, to conclude that in past geological ages the ancestor of the butterfly was a grub, but we cannot believe that for the next few thousands of years it was represented by the pupa, motionless, not reproducing itself, its interior nothing but a mass of creamy cells in which no organs can be distinguished !

I would like to confirm Major Davies' remarks as to the limitations of the palæontological evidence. I know some of the older formations better ; he cites the newer ones, in the main, but the same lessons may be learned in the one and the other. What look like continuous series of fossils, as we pass from older strata to newer, are often met with, but there is usually something to show that they are not on the direct line. In the very great majority of fossils only the shell (in lamellibranchs, brachiopods, and gasteropods) is found, and the internal structure is lost to us ; sometimes a specimen turns up that reveals enough of some internal structure to show that the fossil belongs to another genus altogether, in spite of a superficial outward resemblance.

It is always a pleasure to read a contribution from one who has a competent practical and theoretical knowledge of those sciences

that run alongside of the Biblical record, who is not thereby stumbled in his belief in the Word of God, and yet does not ride off into fantastic theories that can convince no one but himself.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

The lecturer, in his reply, regretted that the chief opposition to his paper had taken so intangible a form. His principal critic, Mr. Morris, had apparently been so eager to tell us what he thought the paper should have discussed, that he took little notice of what it actually did discuss. The greater part of his five minutes' talk, therefore, calls for no remark. He had, however, made allegations which could not be passed over. Thus he accuses the author of confusing two things. The author did nothing of the sort. Mr. Morris himself, no doubt, uses the terms "Evolution" and "Descent" to express two different ideas; but the author does not. On the contrary, at the beginning of his paper, the author carefully defines what he means by "Evolution" and "Descent," and shows that he uses these two words as interchangeable terms, referring to the one question of "unbroken genetic connections." So far from confusing two things, therefore, the author uses *two words* to express *one thing*—and he kept to the subject of that one thing (the question of genetic connections) throughout his paper. Mr. Morris's talk about "Yorkshiremen" and "undistributed middles," therefore, is simply irrelevant.

It is worth remembering, in this connection, that one of our leading geologists, Dr. Watts, has remarked that "The essence of Evolution is unbroken sequence" (*Geol. Mag.*, 1924, vol. lxi, p. 532). Thus we see that Dr. Watts himself does not use the term "Evolution" to refer to the *method* of Descent, as Mr. Morris would like to insist upon every one doing, but to refer to the *fact* of Descent, just as the author does. This is, indeed, the general practice, Mr. Morris's methods being peculiar to himself. It is also significant that Dr. Watts regards "unbroken sequence" as being the very "Essence" of Evolution; just as the author—perhaps a little more precisely—defines "unbroken genetic connections" as being the crux of the matter. (The "sequence" to which Dr. Watts refers

is, of course, one of *genetic connections*; otherwise there would be no Evolution.) If Mr. Morris, therefore, would have liked the author to discuss other things, Dr. Watts obviously would not. The author chose, for his subject of discussion, what Dr. Watts regards as being "the essence of Evolution."

The gravest feature about Mr. Morris's remarks, however, lay in his assertions that the author makes imputations against the integrity of men of science, and misquotes and misrepresents them. This is entirely false. The author does not discuss the integrity of his fellow-students of science, but their differences of opinion upon this question of Descent; differences which are notorious, despite the denials of Mr. Morris.

It was unfortunate that circumstances did not permit the author to produce all the actual works referred to, in order to show that he had *not* misquoted his authorities. This being out of the question, all the author could do was to point out that he had, in his paper, given references to show where most of the passages he referred to could be found in the original treatises. If these were insufficient, he would be only too glad to give further references; and he concluded by inviting his hearers to verify his quotations for themselves, and judge for themselves whether or not the contexts suited the uses he made of them.

SUBSEQUENT COMMUNICATIONS.

From Mr. W. HOSTE, B.A.: As Mr. Morris Morris challenged the relevancy and genuineness of Major Davies' quotations from Huxley and P. C. Mitchell, as also from Messrs. Thomson and Geddes (without, however, giving any instance), and since Major Davies appealed to his audience to verify his quotations, I have done so; and I find them, by actual scrutiny, to be verbally accurate and quite applicable. I also find, where the lecturer only professes to give a *résumé* that in each case this fairly represents and utilizes the thought of the writer referred to.

On p. 219, the lecturer asserts that the testimony of "Rudiments" "has always been regarded as far too uncertain to be trusted by more able thinkers like Huxley and P. C. Mitchell." In his article on "Evolution" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (ed. xi), Dr. Mitchell

urges caution "in endeavouring to support the doctrine of Evolution by them (*i.e.* "Rudiments"). For it is almost impossible to prove that any structure, however rudimentary, is useless . . . and if it is in the slightest degree useful, there is no reason why, on the hypothesis of direct creation, it should not have been created." In what way, then, does Major Davies misrepresent P. C. Mitchell? For nowhere else in his lecture does he refer to Dr. Mitchell.

In the same way, Huxley warns us that the facts of "dysteleology" (*i.e.* the study of the alleged purposelessness of certain living organisms) "cut both ways. If we are to assume, as evolutionists in general do, that useless organs atrophy, such cases as the existence of lateral rudiments of toes in the foot of a horse place us in a dilemma. For either these rudiments are of no use to the animal, in which case, considering that the horse has existed in its present form since the Pliocene epoch, they surely ought to have disappeared; or they are of some use to the animal, in which case they are of no use as arguments against Teleology" (reprinted, in "Critiques and Addresses," from *The Academy*, 1869).

Certainly, if an argument can confessedly be used equally for or against a thesis, Major Davies was accurate in his reference to Huxley and Mitchell, and was perfectly justified in his use of their testimony. He is no less so on p. 218, as regards Messrs. Thomson and Geddes. His comments on this page (the only place where he refers to those authors) are exactly borne out by a reference to their book on "Evolution," p. xi, where they say: "Yet it was essentially in the very opposite way" (*i.e.* not from scientific facts to theory) "that modern evolution doctrines really originated; as a social theory, that of progress, and the *generally diffused spirit* of the later eighteenth century, and the earlier nineteenth, has both consciously and unconsciously stimulated naturalist and physicist towards their evolutionary inquiries and doctrines. . . . Each of these two great advances of thought" (*i.e.* Doctrine of Evolution and Natural Selection) "is thus *the philosophic epic of a great nation* at its epoch; and Lamarck and Darwin are their representative prophets respectively." I fail to see any irrelevancy or misapplication of the admissions of these writers. The references are both accurate and apposite.

I think the above will suffice to show that every confidence may be

placed in the fairness of the lecturer's quotations and references throughout his paper.

I might, however, test one more reference on p. 218 ; this time to Depéret, a leading French palæontologist, in his *Transformations of the Animal World*, p. 122. "The hypothesis," he says, "not very tenable from a philosophic point of view" (my italics) "of successive creations has been maintained with real talent by the disciples of the Cuvèrian school." Does not this bear out the lecturer's contention as to the part which philosophic thought, as distinguished from scientific fact, has played in the sphere of evolutionary theories ?

As for Major Davies' references to Depéret and Von Zittel, on p. 224, and the footnote for the former on p. 224, I have verified each one, and found them to correspond in their context with the use the lecturer makes of them.

From the lecturer, Major DAVIES : I am very grateful to Mr. Hoste for adopting my suggestion, and consulting my authorities for himself. I am still more grateful to him for his kindness in reporting the result. Such charges as Mr. Morris apparently does not hesitate to bring against those whose conclusions differ from his own, are peculiarly difficult to deal with on the spot ; they require direct investigation of a kind which is not immediately possible.

Mr. Morris declared that, "if he had time," it would be easy for him to expose the falsity of my arguments and the irrelevancy of my quotations. Well, he has had plenty of time to do these things since my lecture, and I have repeatedly urged him to make good his claim. For reasons best known to himself, however, he has completely ignored all such invitations upon my part, however plainly worded. I may point out that it is not at all normal for one scientific worker to make sweeping charges against another without offering at least some attempt to justify them by quoting actual data.

Mr. Morris, then, can hardly complain if I treat him somewhat rigorously ; and now that I have seen his statements on paper, over his signature, I propose to deal with them as he should have dealt with mine—*ad rem*.

As I remarked at the beginning of my lecture, there are many people who attempt to obfuscate all free discussion of the question of Descent ; and it is as well, perhaps, to note how they do so.

So I would point out that Mr. Morris does not, from start to finish of his remarks, bring a single tangible argument to bear upon the actual issue of my paper. I had limited that issue to the basal problem (quite apart from any question-begging discussion as to the supposed *causes* of Evolution) of proving the actual fact of genetic connections; and I had shown the many patent difficulties that lie in the way of obtaining any such proof. Mr. Morris does not attempt to show how a single one of these difficulties is to be overcome. He simply says that I "fail miserably." This method of disposing, by bald assertion, of everything that calls for proof, is typical of the class which he represents.

Mr. Morris asserts that: "We infer Descent from direct evidence, and the evidence is overwhelming and incontestable." Unfortunately for Mr. Morris, the evidence notoriously is *not* direct, but circumstantial and indirect.* That is just why Dr. Bather remarks that no one ever saw the actual birth of a fossil ancestor.† *Historic* evidence would be *direct*; while "Geology," as Hugh Miller pointed out long ago, "only shows us things lying on top of things." To say that the evidence is "overwhelming" is purely subjective; it merely describes the effect which the supposed evidence, viewed as Mr. Morris views it, has upon Mr. Morris. To call the evidence "incontestable" is to beg the whole question.

Mr. Morris talks largely of the method of science being *inductive*; but seems to know little enough about it, nevertheless. A scientific

* "By direct evidence is meant the statement of a person who saw, or otherwise observed with his senses, the fact in question. By indirect, or, as it is often called, circumstantial, evidence, is meant evidence of facts, from which the fact in question may be inferred or presumed" (*Man. Mil. Law*, p. 65).

Evolutionists often do (see pp. 218 and 219 of my lecture) refer to Palæontology as "direct" evidence *when compared with other* supposed lines of testimony to Descent. What they mean is, that it is more to the point than the others; and one can let it pass in that obviously loose sense. Mr. Morris, however, was not comparing lines of testimony, but claiming the evidence as direct in an absolute sense; which no one, realizing the circumstantial nature of *all* the evidence, could possibly have done.

† As Professor E. W. McBride told us the other day, in a paper at Oxford on "Evolution, a Vital Phenomenon," we "could never have direct evidence of Evolution, unless an angelic recorder had taken notes and those notes were available" (*Daily News*, August 27th, 1925).

“induction” does not, as he asserts, “begin with a theory.” It begins with a hypothesis. If fresh facts bear it out, the hypothesis *then* rises to the dignity of a “theory.” Even so, however, it remains far removed from Baconian *science*, or demonstrable fact.* Mr. Morris confuses hypotheses with theories, and theories with proved facts.

Because the facts of the geological record can—with some manipulation—be squared with Descent, Mr. Morris thinks that they prove it. But they can equally well—and with no more manipulation—be squared with belief in progressive creations.† They can, in fact, be squared with all sorts of different ideas—with a little manipulation. Palæontologists know this: their very disagreements show it. Hence Dr. Bather, when discussing the reasons for such disagreements, points out that “Descent is not a corollary of succession.” Mr. Morris, however, brushes all such considerations aside.

Mr. Morris asserts that “The Geological Record confirms the Doctrine of Descent in every particular.” This is simply misleading. The actual facts, as they stand, often do not suit Evolution at all. Pteropods appear long before the Opisthobranchiate Molluscs from which they are supposed to have taken their origin; the earliest Graptolites are more complex than their successors; the modern Monotremata are regarded as “representing” the ancestors of the ancient Marsupials; and so forth. The earliest forms of all the great types are far too high to satisfy the evolutionist; and the latter is also continually having to postulate fresh ancestries to account for the fresh forms which he finds—forms which, even when they serve to fill gaps, seldom go directly into series. Many, too, are the things which we are asked to believe in the cause of Descent. Thus

* Thus Dr. Watts tells us, in the paper already referred to, that the “key-note” of the earth’s history “is Evolution, the dream of philosophers from the earliest times, now passed from the realm of hypotheses into that of established theory.” Note the successive stages: Philosophic dream—hypothesis—theory. And there the matter ends. Dr. Watts is too familiar with the realities of the subject to call Evolution an established *fact*.

† Whatever the palæontological facts might be, I would guarantee to raise suppositions to square them *either* with Evolution or with Creation. Both ideas are philosophies, and—in the nature of things—incapable of exact proof.

we are invited to agree that the pre-Cambrian rocks are too old and metamorphosed for us to expect them to contain any trace of those interminable ancestries which are required in order to explain the appearance of relatively high and well-differentiated forms in the early Cambrian. Yet, since we have actually found remains of fossil *jellyfish* in the Cambrian itself, it is hard to see why the record opens so suddenly. Discoveries of pre-Cambrian fossils are extremely rare* ; yet, if a *jellyfish* could be preserved from the Cambrian onwards, it is hard to see why (if the required ancestries existed) the palæontological record should not go back at least as far beyond the Cambrian as the Cambrian is removed from ourselves. Sometimes, too, as in the case of the huge Cuddapah series of India, the pre-Cambrian beds (20,000 feet in thickness) are perfectly undisturbed, unaltered, and just of the sort to have preserved traces of life had any existed. Yet they are entirely barren, although the immediately succeeding formations contain abundant representatives of by no means the lowest types of life.† Such facts are notorious. The truth is that, so far from the Record confirming the Theory in every particular, we are always having to pull the

* And among these earliest remains are Pteropods! The extremely early appearance of this type has been a sore trial to evolutionists; some of whom, like the eminent palæontologists Neumayer and Pelseneer, have strongly urged that, in spite of the structure of their shells, such pristine forms could not possibly have belonged to so highly specialized a family. Unfortunately for this idea, the more recent discovery of very perfect specimens, with distinct impressions of the Pteropoda, seems to put the matter beyond question. Fresh fossil evidence is not always of a sort to please the evolutionist.

† As Mr. Wadia, of the Geological Survey of India, remarks: "The entire series of Cuddapah rocks are totally unfossiliferous, no sign of life being met with in these vast piles of marine sediments. This looks quite inexplicable since not only are the rocks very well fitted to contain and preserve some relics of the seas in which they were formed, but also all mechanical disturbances, which usually obliterate such relics, are absent from them. . . . (In) formations immediately subsequent to the Cuddapahs . . . we find evidence of fossil organisms, which, though the earliest animals to be discovered, are by no means the simplest or the most primitive. The geological record is in many respects imperfect, but in none more imperfect than this—its failure to register the first beginnings of life" (*Geology of India*, pp. 72-3).

Theory this way and that in order to keep it fitted to the Record.*

Fortunately for the evolutionist, the Theory is so adaptable that an ingenious man can always raise suppositions to square it with any set of facts. Thus, when it became apparent that the great majority of the data of ontogeny are directly opposed to Recapitulation, the resourceful Haeckel, unwilling to give up the occasional coincidences as well, informed us that the embryo is subject to two influences—namely, *Palingenesis* which makes it repeat its ancestral history, and *Cænogenesis* which makes it alter that history. So every happy coincidence is now credited, by people like Mr. Morris, to *Palingenesis*, and hailed as evidence for Evolution; while every discrepancy, however glaring, is waved aside as being caused by the wicked *Cænogenesis*.†

The *naïveté* of this is delightful, and reminds one of how the small American boys, in *Tom Sawyer*, “proved” both the value of incantations and the devastating influence of witches. When they got what they wanted, after repeating an appropriate incantation, it showed the value of the incantation; and they had quite a list of such successes to enforce the point. When they failed, as they too often did, they could see how busy the witches were! Without in the least impugning the *integrity* of the more confident evolutionists, one can hardly help doubting the scientific value of their methods, which have so distinctly juvenile a flavour about them.‡

* Thus, in the case of the early Pteropods, those malacologists who accept the facts (for a few still resist the evidence) surrender the orthodox derivation of Pteropods from Opisthobranchs, and postulate a common origin for both groups in those far pre-Cambrian days which have never yet produced any forms of life whatever. And yet some people claim that a single fossil found out of place would have destroyed the credit of Evolution! The history of the subject shows that, given a little practice, the follower of Darwin can always reconcile the facts to his creed, whether they stand on their heads or their heels.

† *Alias* “secondary modifications.”

‡ These people seem to forget that, by admitting *Cænogenesis*, they make it exceedingly difficult to prove that *Palingenesis* exists at all. But some evolutionists do see the difficulty. “Man,” says Prof. Gamble, “is at no time a fish, an amphibian, or a reptile, as it is somewhat crudely put. . . . (The) older history like a papyrus has received alterations of a later date, and we

It is not true, as Mr. Morris asserts, that the authorities I quoted as attacking belief in Recapitulation themselves believed in Recapitulation. Sedgwick declares that Recapitulation and Evolution *cannot both be true*; Ballantyne concludes that ontogeny is *not* an epitomized phylogeny; and so forth. But even if such men did believe in Recapitulation, their sweeping admissions as to its falseness would reduce such continued belief to the level of a mere unreasoning vote, of no significance to any independent reasoner, and impressive only to counters of noses.

Too many people, however, think more about votes than reasons. It distresses them to admit that any votes whatever go in the wrong direction. They are therefore reduced to the strangest tactics when they find that some modern men of science do not even accept belief in Evolution itself. Time and again we see how the more extreme evolutionists first ignore, or decri, the testimony of experts like Fleischmann,* Reinke,† Meunier,‡ Wasmann,§ etc., and then talk as if scientific opponents of Evolution did not exist at all. Such tactics are more understandable than laudable. Mr. Morris himself coolly ignored the fact that, at the very meeting at which he spoke, both the author and the Chairman were Fellows of the Geological Society, and yet disbelieved in Evolution.

The remarks of Professor Rendle Short are in pleasing contrast to those of the critic last considered; and show how frankly one of the more serious students of science can admit the plain facts which less responsible people attempt to obscure. The ex-Hunterian Professor obviously does not see eye to eye with me in all things; but I am glad to find that he agrees with my main contention that belief in Evolution is much more a matter of philosophy than anything else.

Mr. Leslie's criticism is interesting. It is true, as he implies, that geologists do not usually, nowadays, analyse the potentialities of

know not how much of the altered development to attribute to that added matter" (*The Animal World*, p. 232). The wicked *Cænogenesis*, that is, may be faking the very coincidences.

* Zoologist and comparative anatomist.

† Botanist.

‡ Geologist.

§ Entomologist.

their evidence. The older geologists, like De la Beche, used to do such things ; some of the more senior thinkers, like Dr. Bather, still occasionally do so ; but the younger ones seldom follow their example. It is generally taken for granted that things can be proved which are not strictly capable of proof. The fact of Descent, as Haeckel himself felt forced at times to admit, is one of them.

I cannot quite understand, however, why Mr. Leslie compares me to a man cutting off a branch upon which he is sitting ; what he means by my " own science " of Geology, in this connection ; and why he would have me talk of fallacious philosophies. My *own science* is Palæontology, which is a definite *subhead* of Geology. I was discussing that subhead alone, and showing its limitations. Mr. Leslie will also appreciate that, since I define a " philosophy " as a " method of explaining and co-ordinating facts, which suits a certain type of mind," I cannot decry Evolution so long as it continues to suit anybody at all ; for it thereby fulfils its function. Mr. Leslie, obviously, does not use the term " philosophy " in quite the same sense as I do* ; but he has a distinctly analytic brain, and I expect he will agree that, *under my own definitions of terms*, I can only talk of Evolution being a philosophy as opposed to science.† This is exactly what the clearer thinkers, among those who believe in Evolution, themselves admit it to be.

* He would probably refer to things as " philosophic," which I would call " analytic."

† I do not wish to be misunderstood. While pointing out that my definitions of terms themselves prohibited my talking of inferior philosophies, I wish to keep it clear that I do *not* regard Evolution as an inferior philosophy in any sense of the words. I have no quarrel with those who accept it simply as a philosophy. My quarrel, from start to finish, is with the nonsense talked by those who would have us treat it not as a piece of philosophy but as science.

691ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JUNE 14TH, 1926,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Proceedings opened with an announcement by the CHAIRMAN of the decease of Dr. D. Anderson-Berry, LL.D., F.R.S. Edin., Member of Council, and one who had read papers before the Society. A vote of condolence was passed unanimously, Members standing as a mark of respect to the deceased.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election, as Associate, of Miss Marion Hilda Cooper.

The CHAIRMAN then explained that, owing to the unusual brevity of Dr. Howard Kelly's paper on "The Silence of God: How is it to be Explained?" Dr. David M'Intyre, of Glasgow, had also kindly prepared a paper on the same subject. He then called on Mr. Avary H. Forbes to read Dr. Kelly's paper, and the Hon. Secretary to read Dr. M'Intyre's paper.

*THE SILENCE OF GOD: HOW IS IT TO BE
EXPLAINED?*

By PROFESSOR HOWARD A. KELLY, M.D., LL.D.

"How rare it is to find the soul quiet enough to hear God speak."—*Archbishop Fenelon.*

"Silence is the nutriment of devotion."—*Thomas à Kempis.*

"Silence is in truth the attribute of God, and those who seek Him from that side invariably learn that meditation is not a dream but the reality of life, and not its illusion but its truth, not its weakness but its strength."—*James Martineau.*

MY theme of ten words is highly paradoxical, and as such I treat it. The first four words assume :

- (1) That we know there is a God generally recognized ;
- (2) That He has spoken to men in times past and was understood ;
- (3) That we cherish a reliable record of His speech of old ;
- (4) But that God no longer speaks as of yore ;
- (5) And yet that men to-day are longing to hear His voice, and hence the enquiry ;
- (6) That if He would but speak again, men would hear and heed His message.

The first three declarative propositions form the common ground basic to my thesis. I address myself, therefore, to the concluding six words. How is the silence of God to-day explained ?

That God has ceased to speak to the Jew as of old is recognized by the orthodox Jewish rabbi, who curtails discussion by declaring to the earnest enquirer that God is angry with His people, and has scattered them in all parts of the world as He forewarned them in Deuteronomy ; and for this reason they no longer hear His voice, and must, therefore, rest in the merits of their fathers and await His favour.

The first step in our enquiry must needs be, In what way might I expect God to speak ?

Without attempting to define the ways in which God may address us, I do not hesitate to aver that we dare not confine God's speech to language as used by man. An answer in part at least must obviously be suggested by God's previous methods of communication, referred to above in (2) and (3) ; to this end I search the scriptures of the world, only to find none worthy (although I do not deny some glimmer of light in all) or of serious consideration but the Hebrew Scriptures justly and *par excellence* named THE BIBLE. I assume, therefore, that this Book contains the mind of God expressly stated in human language.

If, on the other hand, natural man were left to dictate the manner of God's speech, he would inevitably, like the Jews of

old appealing to Christ on several occasions, ask for a sign from Heaven ; to whom Christ's answer was, " A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign," and again, " If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

And herein lies a crux. Men at large, through some basic inherent fault, invariably demand a form of speech God cannot grant, inasmuch as it merely contemplates an intellectual assent ; while God's methods in the past, although intimately associated with mighty works and miracles, have never in any instance used the miraculous solely for its dramatic effect. In brief, a mere dramatic sign is a futility or worse.

Our next enquiry is whether by the silence of God we refer to the absence of speech addressed to multitudes at once, or may we here include speech addressed to individuals as to His recognized prophets of old, who by one sign or another are sure God has spoken to them, and are then able as sent-forth-ones to convey their conviction to others ? Briefly, are there no longer any prophets of God in our midst ?

God's plan has ever been a quiet message lodged in the heart with the purpose of a complete transformation of the nature, best expressed by being " born again." In the Old Testament it was the still small voice, and in the New, One spake who was meek and lowly and gentle, who would not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax.

May it not then be that God does still speak unmistakably to those who, in a chattering self-seeking age which dreads silence as a plague, step aside from the world to meditate before Him ? Are there not those among us even now whose faces image a peace not of this world, and who seem to mirror the light of the Throne of God out upon the world ? Is not, perhaps, the " Silence of God " but the absence of any loud speech striking the outer ear, while an inner ear attuned ever hears His Spirit's voice ?

Again, I say, God's message is ever a heart message. I boldly assert, therefore, that God does not speak to-day because of the supreme character of His revelation of Himself made once for all in His Christ, the culmination of all the prophecies of old and the transcendent revelation of the New Testament ; that this matchless message is a continuing one, while God waits for the answer of each individual of each generation since the advent of His Messenger of Peace upon the earth.

Just as we daily clearly recognize and guide our conduct by the voices of men long since passed from our midst yet continued in their written words, so, if we are not to be judged as merely captious in enquiring why does not God speak to-day, we must also equally recognize His voice in his final written Word, for this Word is of such a character that it is impossible that He should ever speak again more clearly, more positively, or more directly to the heart of man. So marvellous is this message and of such a character that it can be strengthened by no reaffirmation, that there can be no subtraction from nor addition to it, except as it ever reveals itself anew in the hearts of men through the ages in their varying circumstances and need. Thus it becomes clear that further speech would be detraction from the infinite dignity of the message.

I ask further, How can God give a new message when He has made a supreme revelation of Himself equally clear to each generation, a revelation which remains largely unheeded, in which God risked all for humanity in identifying His Son for ever with our race ?

Any complaint that God fails to speak to this generation must seem but an excuse, a gesture to hide the indifference of the world and its unwillingness to abandon its own ways.

I do affirm with every assurance and emphasis that God's message in His living Word, identified with His Son, is a continuing one, and that He does to-day speak indubitably to the hearts of men in each succeeding generation as He never spake of old.

The declaration that God, who spake of old by the prophets, "hath spoken unto us in these last days in a Son," refers not to any moment of time but to a dispensation succeeding the advent of His Son in our midst until His coming again.

I further aver that God speaks as never before to an age in which He has poured out His Spirit upon all flesh, the earnest of our inheritance and our unction from on high, of whom He has said, "Ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you."

The silence of God is not a period of darkness, but of such light as the world has never seen. And the light is life to him who will have it. And faith is the key which gives voice to the Word and to Nature, and which causes man's heart to become receptive, making life a great pilgrimage, a wonderful adventure. And faith ever cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. And

prayer is not a monologue, but a voice of the Spirit brooding over the soul's formless waters, and bringing articulate expression out of the voiceless waste of our needs.

It is almost invariably the fate of the words of men to live for a generation and then to die, while succeeding generations vainly try to perpetuate the dead word.

In the writings of men, great moral ideas do not perish, but lodge in men's hearts and do their work generation after generation. God's living Word, throbbing from Gen. i to Rev. xxii with the great moral purpose of the exposure of the true nature and final outcome of sin, and revealing His righteousness and judgment of sin, and developing a plan for the salvation of man, remains eternally sweet and fresh, providing daily instruction, strength, nourishment for the spirit, and solace to him who comes to it to be taught with the spirit of a child. This Word daily repeats its living drama through the ages, as efficacious to-day as when first uttered. This we may believe, in the language of our most modern science, is due to the timelessness of God Himself who is identified with it.

Illuminated by God's Word and His gifts to men, Nature was never before so vocal in His praises and in her appeals. Is it not pathetic to be made sceptic by the perfection of God's work and His gracious self-effacement that we may search Him out even in His handiwork ?

I believe, therefore, in view of this collocation of simple obvious facts, that our paradox is solved, and that the years of the silence of God are even the years of His plainest and most effective speech, during which He is gathering among the nations His *ἐκκληται*, His Church, destined to be the unique and living testimony to His grace, to the principalities and powers in the heavenlies, through the ages to come.

*THE SILENCE OF GOD: HOW IS IT TO BE
EXPLAINED?*

By the Rev. D. M. M'INTYRE, D.D.

IN tracing the analogy between natural and revealed religion, Bishop Butler has emphasized the fact that difficulties similar to those which confront us in our study of the Christian faith are built up into the fabric of creation.* In Nature we have the summer sunshine, the springing of flowers, the song of birds, the winsomeness and glee of all young creatures. We have also the pitiless storm, the hungry desert, the struggle for existence, with outbreakings of sudden cruelty. Pascal maintains that the course of the world confounds both the dogmatist and the pyrrhonist—Nature vindicates our belief that God is, it also permits us to deny that the universe is ruled by love. Modern thinkers as well as ancient theorists, have found refuge in the belief that creation has somehow been marred in the making, that a malign influence has mingled with the Divine working. St. Paul has been cited as one who supports this view, as when he declares that the earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revealing of the sons of God, and goes on to prophesy that creation itself, which now groans and travails

* “Origen has with singular sagacity observed, that ‘he who believes the Scripture to have proceeded from Him who is the Author of Nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found in the constitution of Nature.’”—*Analogy of Religion* : Introduction.

in pain with us, shall in due time be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God, whereas others, with the same prospect in view, argue that the severities of Nature are a bitter but wholesome discipline leading to higher things. Nature is not one with rapine ; to assert that the fair scene on which we gaze with so much pleasure is an Aceldama, a field of blood, is not all the truth. And if one should say to us,

“ Sit you down,
And let me wring your heart : for so I shall,
If it be made of penetrable stuff,”

we may reply that Nature is full of remedial activities, and that love is even now antagonizing, not without success, pain and fear and death. The calm words of the late Professor Flint, in this connection, are worthy of attention :—

“ The character of pain itself is such as to indicate that its author must be a benevolent being—one who does not afflict for his own pleasure, but for his creatures’ profit. . . . Pain tends to the perfection of the animals. It has, that is to say, a good end ; an end which justifies its use ; one which would do so even if perfection should not be conducive to happiness. . . . Perhaps susceptibility to pain is a necessary condition of susceptibility to pleasure ; perhaps the bodily organism could not be capable of pleasure and insensible to pain ; but whether this be the case or not, it is a plain and certain matter of fact that the activities which pain originates are the chief sources of enjoyment throughout the animal creation. . . . If there had been less death there must have been also less life, and what life there was must have been poorer and meaner.”—*Theism*, pp. 247-51.

Without attempting to follow out the analogy between the processes of Nature and the reign of grace, I simply offer three remarks :—

(a) The course of Nature teaches us to expect that the All-wise Ruler of the universe shall often veil His throne in darkness. We ought not then to esteem it a strange thing should occasions arise when, like the great French thinker, we are constrained to

re-echo the plaint of Isaiah: *Vere Tu es Deus absconditus*--
 "Verily, Thou art a God that hidest Thyself." It was by bringing this consideration with power to the mind of Job that the Almighty met the reproaches of His tried servant. Speaking out of the whirlwind, the Maker of All dazzled His interrogator with a galaxy of Nature's wonders, until the conscience-stricken patriarch humbled himself to receive instruction:—

"Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge?
 Therefore have I uttered that which I understood not,
 Things too wonderful for me, that I knew not."

(b) Nature teaches us that the silence of God which from time to time invades the continuity of His revelation to men is apparently part of His ordered procedure: it is in accordance with the counsel of His will, and is determined by the wisdom of His love. This reflection came with strong encouragement to the later Jews. To their fathers God had spoken by the prophets; now, however, repeated calamities were falling on the discouraged remnant, who struggled to maintain their footing in a corner of the land which had once been all their own: they cried to God, but only "the silence that is in the starry sky" responded to their entreaty. Yet in their affliction, they remembered the Covenant and reposed upon the Divine election:—

"He has weighed the age in the balance,
 And with measure has measured the times,
 And by number has numbered the seasons:
 Neither will He move nor stir things,
 Till the measure appointed be fulfilled."

—IV Ezra iv, 36, 37.

(c) The end will explain the process. The confusions of time will resolve themselves into an ordered sequence under the sceptre of the Most High. With resistless majesty God moves through the most disquieting scenes. Each one of His purposes must come to accomplishment, for who hath resisted His will? All the progressions in Nature are evidence of the "one increasing purpose," which runs through the ages, and which, though still unfulfilled, is beginning to take form to the gaze of those who look with practised eyes through the prospect-glass of faith.

The City of God is builded in the heavens, but it comes down to earth.

I.

But we must define more exactly what we mean when we ask, "The Silence of God : How is it to be Explained ?"

Sir Robert Anderson finds a proof of the silence of God in the supposed cessation of physical miracle. But God has many voices, and if He is silent in one mode He may speak as with the sound of a trumpet in another. Physical miracle is not the only witness to the immanence of God in His creation. The direct intervention of God in the moral and spiritual spheres is constant. Not only is God calling to us out of the great deliverances of the past, and, in the remembrance of these, challenging our faith in His present power ; He is even now speaking to us in our dusty trudge along life's level ways as loudly as He spoke to the Hebrew fathers who were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Are not the new birth, forgiveness of sins, answers vouchsafed to prayer, the grace of sanctification, the witness of the Spirit in our hearts, communion with our Heavenly Father, miracles as real as any that were wrought by the faith of Elijah or Daniel or Paul ? To His own people God is not silent.

"Miracles as real," one may reply ; "but in another sphere. Why have *physical* miracles ceased ?" They have probably ceased to be spectacular, but is it certain that they have ceased to be ? Does not prayer, for example, often project itself into the physical sphere ? If I pray for the restoration to health of one whose life has been despaired of, and the patient recovers, who shall say that my prayer had no power with God ? Indeed, it may very well be that miracles are being wrought for us daily, even in the physical sphere, but the Great Worker sounds no trumpet before Him : "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing." Our standing orders with regard to prayer are probably intended to assure us of this, "When ye pray, say, Our Father, which art in Heaven."

Passing from this, however, we may ask, Why are miracles such as those recorded in Scripture not common among us now ? A counter-question may be put, Why should they be common ? They broke forth in Israel's history only at critical points, and long periods in which no miraculous events seem to have happened

followed. Miracles are only signs attendant on the progress of the Messiah to His Birth, and Cross, and Crown. And their chief value appears to have been to open our eyes to the action of the supernatural in spiritual realms. In such events as the raising of the son of the Shunammite, the cleansing of Naaman, the feeding of the thousands on the scanty store provided by a boy, the resurrection of Lazarus, etc., we have it vividly brought home to us that God does not hold Himself apart from His creation. His interpenetration of natural law establishes our belief that Nature is not a closed circle, which shuts us in as in a prison; but that the world-order, rigid as it may seem, is as free as the air, as open as the heavens, as near as God is near. And this assurance, even though events such as we have been describing are rare, is surely the voice, and not the silence, of God.

Or, the silence which we are asked to consider may be observed in another sphere. In olden times "men spake from God, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Why should the canon of Scripture be looked upon as closed? Are there not to be in the future, as in the ancient days, lawgivers, and psalmists, and prophets? So, many writers ask.

What can even Infinite Wisdom say more than He has said? "What could I do to my vineyard," asks the Great Husbandman, "that I have not already done?"

"God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the worlds; who being the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High."—Heb. i, 1-3.

If God at times appears to be silent, it is because He has already spoken.

Scripture itself teaches us that the revelation of God in His Son is final, supreme, absolute. It remains to us now to apprehend, with all saints, the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, to possess ourselves of those unsearchable riches which are openly displayed before us. We do not require a new Bible; we have

only begun to discover the wealth which is contained in the Bible that we have. Age after age, God is still bringing forth new light from His Word, and His Holy Spirit is guiding the saints into all truth.

It is only in a very partial sense, therefore, that we are able to speak of the continuing silence of God in the history of men. What has really to be explained (if that is possible) is His seeming inaction in the course of events, His apparent indifference to the necessities of His creatures.

II.

We all know how the thought of the Purple East stung the sensitive brain of an English poet to madness. The Armenian massacres, when savage men plunged with avidity into incredible atrocities and covered an innocent land with blood, spread horror and amazement over the civilized earth. Even believing men were tempted to exclaim with Asaph, "Doth God know? and is there knowledge in the Most High?" Two partial explanations occur to us. The first is, that God expected the watching nations to arise and rid the wrong by might of arms. Did not Cromwell terminate the Piedmontese massacres by the mere threat to stretch a punitive arm across the Alps? The second mitigation of our difficulty is that God *is* working through the silence. The aphorism of Schiller that "the history of the world is the judgment of the world" is endlessly true. God stands back among the shadows and gives no sign; but He still wields the sceptre of universal dominion and executes His sovereign will.

But as I have said, these explanations do not carry us all the way. The true solution of this vast difficulty seems to be that it is necessary, in order to the vindication of the moral government of God before all ranks of created intelligences, that sin should be allowed to reveal itself in its hideous deformity and its unrelenting hatred to good. Sin must prove itself in the amplest measure to be "exceeding sinful." No created being shall ever be able to charge the Almighty with injustice. He is working through the ages of time for an irreversible verdict on behalf of righteousness. The long-suffering of a God of love is the Divine theodicy: *Patiens quia æternus*—"He is long-suffering, because He inhabiteth eternity."

(a) The light of truth has shone slowly upon earth; it was only in the fullness of the times that the Lord Jesus came.

On this fact St. Paul builds an imposing argument :—

“ Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith, by His blood, to shew His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.”—Rom. iii, 25.

During thousands of years the authority of the Almighty was defied, His laws trampled underfoot, His overtures of mercy spurned ; yet He made no movement of wrath. But from of old His throne was pillared on righteousness, and all things were naked and open before Him. Yet the silence was unbroken—till in the fullness of the times the Word became flesh : “ God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.” On the Place of a Skull, in the sufferings and death of the Sin-bearer, the sins of the ages were judged.

(b) The Messiah came to Israel, and was rejected. Jesus, the Son of the Blessed, went out of this world wearing a crown of thorns and bearing a slandered name. But as He went He said that He would return in the power of the Highest. The early Church believed that His advent was near. When Christians met in the street, they offered and received the mystic salutation—“ Maran-atha.” They said : “ He will come soon ; even now He is on His way : our eyes may be gladdened by the spectacle of the rending clouds as they brighten and break at the touch of His feet.” But, contrary to expectation, He tarried, till hope became faint, and scoffers said : “ Where is the promise of His coming ? for from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.” The reply of the apostle to these sceptical questionings is : “ The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness ; but is longsuffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance ” (2 Pet. iii, 9).

The Apocalypse shows us Satan, as a furious red dragon (red, the colour of blood) tempesting through earth and air and sea. He scatters wrath and anguish over the face of the world, and drags the very stars down from heaven. Wars and famines and pestilences succeed one another, and earth is drunk with her own blood. But God is silent. The slow years pass, while the souls under the altar urge their plaintive remonstrance : “ How

long, O Master, the holy and true ! ” At last sin has displayed itself in all the debasing forms of its deep-seated malignity, and He who sits upon the eternal throne arises in power. One is almost abashed to see the ease with which He makes an end of sin and finishes the transgression :—

“ I saw an angel coming down out of Heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that original serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it.”—Rev. xx, 1-3.

III.

Within this all-embracing consideration—that the delays and silences of God are designed, in order that the Divine government may be fully vindicated to a watching universe—we have a further explanation of the seeming abstention on the part of God from interference with the courses of this world, when we remember that man is a moral agent, with freedom of choice, and with a delegated authority on the earth. This argument may be summarized in the words of the Psalmist : “ The heavens are the heavens of the Lord ; but the earth hath He given to the children of men ” (Ps. cxv, 16). The Creator respects the freedom of our manhood, and waits patiently for the fulfilment of the task assigned to us. Thus character is matured, and our moral nature is disciplined.

In the dawn of history God said to His creature, man : “ Repopulate the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion.” This mandate has never been withdrawn. Through all the eras man has been engaged in the endeavour to realize his sovereignty, to possess his possessions. He looked up to the stars, and after a time discovered the law of their motion, thinking the thoughts of God after Him. He mined the earth, laying bare its strata, and retracing the story of its birth. He questioned Nature, determining the elements, and setting free the viewless forces which God had hidden in the secret place. He peered into the darkest recesses of his self-consciousness, and so laid the foundations of mental science. He measured anew the line of this world’s progress, garnering lessons of wisdom from the seed-field of time. Who shall say that God was not with him, directing his search and irradiating the path of his progress ? Yet the

discoveries made were his own. The attainment was his; his, too, the failure to attain.

The quest for God is different from scientific research or the investigation of ancient records, for He has revealed Himself to men in a gracious covenant. But it may be said that before the light of the glory of God shone from the face of Jesus Christ, and still among those who have not the lamp of the Word to guide them, there has been, and there is, something of Divine aloofness. God has seemed to withdraw Himself, that men might seek after Him, and, finding Him, count Him the more their own.

Agur, the son of Jakeh, pours out his complaint: "O God, O God, I have wearied myself, and am become faint. . . . I have not learned wisdom, neither have I the knowledge of the Holy One. . . . What is His name, and what is His Son's name, if thou canst tell" (Prov. xxx, 1-4).

Asaph saw a rich oppressor clothed in purple and fine linen, sunning himself before the admiring gaze of his fellows, while a godly widow hears her children clamouring round her for bread, without being able to supply their need. In that vision Asaph's conventional theology fell from him, as the sheath drops from the bursting flower. He saw in the infinite distances a revelation so wonderful that, in the hour in which he thought he had lost his God, he discovered the Divine beauty and grace as he had never imagined them in his happiest dreams (Ps. lxxiii).

Jeremiah had learned to know God through vivid personal intercourse, but the pressure of the Almighty Will stirred him to a dull anger: he reproached Jehovah with harsh treatment of one who was constitutionally weak; why should He drive His servant with such pitiless persistence? And the prophet of tears vowed in his hot heart: "I will never speak in His name again" (Jer. xx, 9). Then there was given to the prophet a vision that streamed in light through the mirk centuries, and was undimmed even in the advent of the Christ:

"This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord. I will put My law in their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people: and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more."—Jer. xxxi, 33, 34.

Qoheleth went out to look for God, but he went where God was not. He traversed miry ways, and descended valleys as of the deathshade ; he stumbled among the dark mountains ; he wandered in the deserts until his eyes grew dim. At length a revelation startled and shamed him, such a disclosure as came to King Arthur's knight ; a revelation as of despair :—

“ Then every evil word I had spoken once,
 And every evil thought I had thought of old,
 And every evil deed I ever did,
 Awoke and cried, ‘ This Quest is not for thee.’
 And lifting up mine eyes, I found myself
 Alone, and in a land of sand and thorns,
 And I was thirsty even unto death ;
 And I, too, cried, ‘ This Quest is not for thee.’ ”

Finally, in the dreary round of his wanderings there came to him—by what alchemy of grace, who shall say ?—the conviction that God is, and that He is the Rewarder of those who diligently seek Him. And Qoheleth, kneeling before the throne of the Eternal, found the Object of his search : “ This is the end of the matter ; all hath been heard : Fear God, and keep His commandments ; for this is the whole of man ”—*this is everything for man.*

All the saints have made the silence vocal with their plaint, as they have called upon God : “ Lord, why castest Thou off my soul ? Why hidest Thou Thy face from me ? ” “ How long wilt Thou forget me, O Lord ? for ever ? ” “ Awake, why sleepest Thou, O Lord ? wherefore forgettest Thou our affliction ? ” “ Reproach hath broken my heart ; and I am full of heaviness.” “ Hear me, O Lord, hide not Thy face from Thy servant ; for I am in trouble.” “ Forsake me not, O Lord : O my God, be not far from me.” “ My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ? ” (Pss. lxxxviii, 14 ; xiii, 1 ; xlv, 24 ; lxix, 16–20 ; xxii, 1). But the supreme example in the Old Testament of one who searched for God among the waste places of life, who would have stormed Heaven, and descended into Sheol in search of Him, is Job, the afflicted man of Uz : “ Oh that I knew where I might find Him, that I might come even to His seat.” This man, athirst for God, roamed through all of life's experiences that were open to him ; at last, he broke open the gates of the eternal world, and called upon the Living Word to be his Vindicator. He knocked at the doors of the underworld, saying : “ All

the days of the days of my appointed time, will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer Thee." He stood before the Throne of Judgment, and challenged Him who sat thereon: "Behold, my desire is that the Almighty would answer me, and that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written." At last God spoke out of the whirlwind. What He said may not seem to us to be particularly satisfying: for Job it was sufficient. Jehovah recalls His creature to humility, presents to him some of the mysteries of the lower creation, bringing him to the place of blessing, where inspiration is given to those who are lowly in heart. "Now mine eye seeth Thee," exclaims the sufferer in the calm rapture of discovery. And, as Vinet says, "To see is to live."

IV.

Within the Christian Family questions relating to the silence of God are sometimes raised by the devout soul as it passes through unwonted, and it may be, painful, experiences. "Be not silent unto me," cries the believer who is ringed round with besetments: "Be not silent unto me, lest I go down to the pit." The silence of God may be designed to perfect our manhood, to discipline our will, to anneal our character. Faith is a warrior grace.

In the first place, there is what the mystics call "The dark night of the soul," in the ascent to God. The ascetic theologians describe it as "aridity." There are hours when God seems far away and the comfort of His presence is withdrawn. This experience may result from various causes. It is often temperamental. Perhaps we have an instance of this in the refrain of Pss. xlii and xliii: "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted in me?" Dark moods descend upon us, a grey mist from the sea creeps over the land, the sunshine pales, and the day grows chill. In its severer forms this trial is very distressing; and when it reaches mental derangement we are reminded of the German proverb: "He whom God deceives is well deceived."*

In all such cases the remedy is faith: let him who walks in darkness and has no light trust in the name of the Lord and stay

* Probably temperamental troubles have their seat in our physical system. And changes in our corporeal nature often register themselves in spiritual gloom.

upon his God. Faith exists that it may be tried. Sometimes, as our Lord taught, a germ of faith, insignificant as a mustard seed, dares to challenge a mountain, pluck it up by the roots, and hurl it into the depths of the sea. Charles Wesley triumphantly sings :

“ Faith, mighty faith, the promise sees,
And looks to that alone ;
Laughs at impossibilities,
And cries, It shall be done.”

But faith does not always have the comfort of its own victory. One of the mediæval saints, having passed through a time of fierce conflict, and having at length overcome, said to the Lord : “ Where wast Thou, Lord, when I was being tempted ? ” The Lord (it is reported) made reply : “ My child, I was in thy heart.” He was in the midst of the battle as “ the Lord God Omnipotent,” but the believer had not the intimate and tender assurance of His presence. An incident in English history may illustrate this experience. Edward the Third, when his son was hotly engaged at Cressy “ in a hard passage of arms,” refused to send him succour, saying, “ Let the boy win his spurs.” In such ways our Lord frequently honours His servants while He strengthens their faith. Said an English Puritan, “ God often reserves Himself for a dead lift.” And many a time it is when we have come to the last point of our endurance that Captain Credence sees the onset of the soldiers of Immanuel. Then they come so quickly that their feet seem scarcely to touch the ground.

Silence in regard to our prayers is another test which the saint must undergo.

The assurance that an answer will be granted to the prayer of faith, prayer offered in the name of Jesus, prayer according to the will of God, is full and absolute. The promise of Mark xi, 22-24, is as definite as words can make it—“ whosoever,” “ whensoever,” “ whatsoever.” And St. John, speaking for himself and his associates, seems to take it for granted that all his and their prayers shall be answered : “ Whatsoever we ask, we receive of Him, because we keep His commandments, and do the things that are pleasing in His sight ” (1 John iii, 22). Yet how often our experience is similar to that of the priests of Baal : “ There was no voice, nor any that answered.” We have as an instance St. Paul’s request that the stake in the flesh should

be removed : " Concerning this thing I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me." Apparently, at the first appeal, and also at the second, there was no response. Afterwards, recalling perhaps the thrice-repeated petition of Christ in the Olive Garden, Paul seeks the face of the Lord a third time, and prays that the messenger of Satan may be taken away. Then the Lord replies in words so gracious that the heroic soul chants a song of victory, though his flesh still thrills with pain : " Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me."

In looking for answers to our prayers we must remember that prayer is not merely a request that such and such things should be done for us. Prayer is a spiritual exercise, informed by knowledge of God's will, directed by faith, and energized by the Spirit. It is impossible that God should cease to be the Sovereign Disposer of events : His glory He will not give to another.

Nor does it follow that prayer shall always receive an answer without trial to faith. In Gethsemane our Lord was heard for His godly fear (Heb. v, 7), yet His prayer was offered " with strong crying and tears," and the cup did not pass from Him. Our prayer-life is part of the discipline which fits us for the eternal service.

In two parables—that of the Friend at midnight, and of the Unjust Judge—our Lord teaches that prolonged delays, which threaten to wreck our faith, must sometimes be encountered in our prayer-life.

The former of these parables is concerned with prayer for the Bread of God which the believer may dispense to the wayfarer who is belated and has missed his way. The wanderer has stumbled upon a hamlet in which all the lights are quenched but one. The master of the house to whom he makes appeal receives him graciously, granting him welcome, shelter, rest. But there is no bread to offer to the unexpected guest ; this must be won from another. The householder proceeds to a neighbour's dwelling ; this friend is asleep—his children are with him in bed, and he refuses for any call of hospitality to turn night into day. But the petitioner becomes obdurate in his turn : he will not accept repulse ; he *asks, seeks, knocks*. At length he prevails, his discourteous neighbour relents, and the necessity of the famished guest is met. The Bread of God, wherewith we may feed a hungry soul, must be won from God Himself. And God does not always respond to the first appeal. We have to become

even "shameless" (Luke xi, 8) in our entreaty. The reasons for the seeming refusal of our Father may lie deeply hidden in His inscrutable wisdom, though some considerations are obvious to our understanding. The greatest honour that the God of all grace can confer upon a man is to give him words of truth whereby his fellow-men may be saved. He will not bestow this priceless gift on any one who asks for it lightly, having only a tepid desire towards an endowment which comes to us out of the heart of Christ. Therefore, as often happens, our prayers receive no answer till we come to "the breaking-point," and cry with Whitefield, "Lord, give me souls—or I die."

The second parable represents a woman, a widow, whose orphaned children have been defrauded of their inheritance by a rich neighbour, or, it may be, a powerful and unscrupulous kinsman. She carries her appeal to a local justiciary, but he (we may presume) has been heavily bribed, and will not decree her right. She cannot endure the thought that her children should be deprived of their patrimony. Morning after morning she is the first appellant at the judgment seat, until her pertinacity begins to wear out the dishonest judge—she "gets on his nerves." Then he blusters: "Though I fear not God, nor regard man," he says, "yet because this widow troubleth me, I will right her wrong." This is more than half pretence: he is not so callous as he would have us believe. The shame of injustice has come home even to his seared conscience. He returns the bribe and dispenses righteousness. In our Lord's view this woman represents the Church, anguished and desolate on her children's account. Day and night His own elect cry unto Him. But He delays, because He is long-suffering (Luke xviii, 7). He thinks of others: He has compassion on the rebellious and the evil; He would that they also were enclosed in His merciful kindness—He willeth not the death of any. Judgment is His strange work. Then the searchlight sweeps on, and rests on the day of the Saviour's Advent: "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" He seems to shade His eyes, as He looks down the long vistas, and speaks in questioning tones. He does not say that He will not find faith on the earth in His return in power. What He does imply is, that till then, and even in that hour, faith will be difficult to come by. It is the long silence that makes it so hard for faith to continue to clasp and cling.

The late Bishop Westcott has told us that once, after long absence, he met his former teacher, Dr. Prince Lee. For a time

they talked of old friends and remembered incidents, until presently the chill mystery and darkness of human life crept in between them. They sat silent for a time; then the older man ejaculated, "Ah, Westcott, μή φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε.—*Fear not: only believe.*"

There is another reason for the Divine silence. God speaks, but our ears are not always attuned to hear His voice.* There is possibly an allusion to such an experience in the record of the vision of Isaiah, when he beheld in the heavenly temple the Lord, high and lifted up. His penitent cry was a three-fold confession of sin—on account of his personal sinfulness, his unworthiness in his prophetic service, and the turpitude of the nation of which he was part. It was answered by the flight of the seraph, the touch of the flaming coal, and the words of grace, "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged." After this, the prophet relates, "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Had not God been speaking before? Had not the summons to serve been falling, year after year, on closed ears? Now, when lips and heart have been cleansed, the call of God sounds out in strength and clearness.

In *Le Trésor des Humbles*, Maurice Maeterlinck describes the pilgrimage of a company of devout men to a holy temple in which, so it was reported, the voice of God might be heard. They came to the place of blessing; they sat before the gates of the temple, but did not enter; they waited. At length, after long tarrying, they turned away saying, "We have not heard His voice; the Lord has not spoken." But all the while, the voice of God echoed and reverberated within the sanctuary, and those who had passed in, and were kneeling before the shrine, were blessed.

If I do not hear the voice of the Lord God, I dare not say that He has not spoken, unless I am certain that my ears have not become heavy because of sin indulged, unless I am satisfied that I have drawn near to the place where His voice resounds.

Herod of Galilee had long desired to see Jesus, and when an opportunity of a personal meeting with our Saviour came to him, he was "exceeding glad." He asked Jesus many questions, but received no answer. Think of the tragedy of it! Herod, steeped to the lips in all manner of soul-destroying sin, is pressing

* The apparent lack of response to our prayers is often due to this.

swiftly down to Hell, and the compassionate Saviour, who came to seek and to save the lost, meets him, for the first and only time on earth, and has no word to utter : “ He answered him nothing.” Was it not because there was nothing to say ? And yet, perhaps, that awful silence may have rung in heart and conscience like a peal of doom, startling the drugged soul to a sense of bitter need, until—in the Divine mercy (it is at least possible)—he broke into an agony of prayer, that he might be delivered from the eternal silence, where God’s absence strikes more heavily than even His word of doom.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN : I am sure we have listened with deep interest to the papers that have been read. The voices are two, but the utterance is substantially one. In both instances we are assured that, in an absolute sense, God is not silent : He speaks, but we do not hear—certainly not all of us, and assuredly not all the time. That is a truth which, for the most part, we shall readily allow. Moreover, it has been made clear that God’s speaking is not after the manner of men. Whether He speaks or whether He is silent, God is God, and if we would understand His ways we must bear in mind, in the first place, His essential nature, and, in the second place, the conditions of His self-revealing dealings with the creatures of His hand. For, if God is *God*, so also man is *man* ; and of the ways of God we learn in the pages of Holy Writ that they are high above man’s ways : His ways are not our ways, nor are His thoughts our thoughts.

I think I shall carry most of you with me when I say that the paper by Dr. M’Intyre brings the problem before us in a manner that is specially welcome. I do not disparage the utterance of Dr. Kelly, but his treatment has been too brief to give the full mind of its writer. Dr. M’Intyre, on the other hand, has succeeded in bringing the facts of life and experience—positive and negative—into relation with the truths of Holy Scripture, and the demands of a philosophy worthy of the Christian name. God is not silent to the extent that many men seem to think ; and yet, as God, He appears to stand aside from things, though all the time He may in reality intervene. And may He not speak in a subjective sense and thus make no appeal to objective faculties ? If we neither hear His words nor see His

acts to-day, yet we may find proofs that He is neither silent nor inactive when we survey the generations and centuries of human history. In the nature of things God is saying and doing all the time, and in the consummation of things this will be realized in a degree that is not possible at present. Now we know in part, but there will come a time when the whole—of times and of things—

Like a parchèd scroll
Shall before our amazèd sight uproll,
And without a screen
At one burst be seen
The Presence wherein we have ever been.

Yes, assuredly, we are ever in the presence of God, and we may be within sound of His voice, though we hear it not.

All the same, there is silence, and a silence that is of the essence of the ways of God, and this may be explained by two self-evident facts:—

First, by *the patience of God*. He is a God that waits to consummate salvation—that waits to visit vengeance. Though sin may call for judgment, nevertheless God is long-suffering. Though servants of God may be assured of eternal salvation, yet He leaves them to struggle with trials from which by a word He might afford them release. If we could conceive of the Infinite intervening in either event—for momentary release or for momentary judgment—we should be compelled to conceive Him as abdicating His part as the Eternal and Infinite, who in perfect wisdom has laid bounds for the accomplishing of His will, not only in relation to His people, but also to all that belongs to the ripening of His providential purposes.

Secondly, *the transcendence of God* demands that His attitude toward His creatures should not partake of the momentary, the hourly, the daily, the weekly, the monthly, or even the yearly character that dominates human action. As men, we have no time but *now*, and we speak and act accordingly; and it is only by grave misunderstanding that we look for God to speak and to act after the manner of men—in momentary, hourly, weekly, monthly, and yearly measures. We on our part hasten to achieve deliverance or visit vengeance. God's day of vengeance is in the future; His hour of deliverance likewise has not yet come. *He has all the time*: and a time to be silent as well as a time to speak. His transcendence

supplies reason for His attitude as God. If we only knew, we should recognize in His silence an attitude which speaks of mercy and grace, even as it affords opportunity for sinners to repent and for the children of folly to learn wisdom.

Two other considerations may be advanced. First, God is a *God of judgment*. Men follow their daily courses, and act as though there were no God. This was as clear to Qoheleth, "the Preacher who was king in Jerusalem," as it should be to discerning men to-day. And what was the Preacher's word to men of his time when he witnessed their bondage to the ways of their own hearts and eyes? It was this—"For all these things God will bring thee into judgment." With this agrees a later writer in the sacred volume—"It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment." So we gather that it is because God maintains an attitude consistent with His place as Judge—one and supreme—that men have spoken of Him as aloof, and as being silent in regard to the things of righteousness. But in due time, when delay shall be no longer, as is made clear in Holy Scripture, God will speak, and when His voice shall resound throughout the spheres, it will be realized that what we have come to know in the disciplinary experience of life has been little indeed. In a word, we have seen the mere outskirts of His ways—in the words of Job of old: "How small a whisper do we hear of Him! But the thunder of His mighty deeds who can understand?"

Second, we must note that in Holy Scripture *life is spoken of as a walk, a pilgrimage*. From this it follows that were God to declare Himself in relation to each and all of our affairs, and to do it now—as hours and days and years pass—there would be an end of providential order, and the life of faith would be divested of all reality. There would be no place for trial and discipline. This was clear to the Jewish mind, even as it is part of Christian experience. Listen to Rabbi Tarphon, in a saying that takes us back to the second century:—"The day is short and the work is great, and the labourers are sluggish: the reward is much, and the Master of the house is urgent. He used to say: It may not be for thee to complete the work, but neither art thou free to desist from it. . . . Faithful is the Master of thy work, who will pay thee the wages of thy toil; and know that the grant of the reward to the righteous will be in the time to come" (*Pirkē Aboth*, ii, 20, 21).

There is reality in the silence ; and in the meantime the servant must apply himself to duties that are well defined, and must not expect the Master, Employer, Rewarder—Rabbinical designations of the Eternal—to give now that which He holds in reserve for the time to come. In the language of the New Testament the same thought is emphasized. We are told to “ occupy,” or get about the work ; and we are warned that “ we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ.” In these circumstances, it is evident that if at every turn we were confronted by tokens of God’s reproof of sin, and of His good pleasure for those who work righteousness, there would be an end of the walk of faith which is characteristic of this dispensation. It is for us to pass our time “ as seeing Him who is invisible,” and to render obedience to instruction already delivered by Divine inspiration rather than to wait upon words momentarily addressed to the outward ear. In the words of Dr. M’Intyre (pp. 262 and 263), “ Scripture itself teaches us that the revelation of God in His Son is final, supreme, absolute. It remains to us now to apprehend with all saints, the excellency of the knowledge of Christ. . . . We do not require a new Bible ; we have only begun to discover the wealth which is contained in the Bible that we have. Age after age, God is still bringing forth new light from His Word, and His Holy Spirit is guiding the saints into all truth.” In other words, the present dispensation is *our* day of opportunity. By-and-by the Infinite and the Eternal will break the prevailing silence, and His words and deeds will command universal attention : He will consummate salvation and execute judgment, and so give glorious effect to the expectation of those who await “ the age to come ”—the Day of Christ.

In conclusion, the Chairman moved a hearty vote of thanks to the authors of the two papers.

Mr. C. E. LEWIS HEATH said : The few remarks I desire to make are not intended as a comment or criticism of the papers just read, with which I am generally in agreement ; though I cannot endorse Dr. Kelly’s view, that God has spoken once and for all in the Holy Scriptures, and has nothing further to say. But my reason for speaking is, that recently this expression, “ The Silence of God, what does it mean ? ” and other similar phrases, have frequently come to my notice ; and there seems to be an assumption that God is silent in these days, whatever the cause may be. With this

I cannot agree. I remind you that in the Book of the Revelation at the close of each of the Seven Epistles, the exhortation is given : "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches." And if, as is generally agreed, the Epistles have an application beyond those seven cities in Asia, and extend to the Church in all ages, then it follows that the Holy Spirit still speaks, still has something to say to the Churches. No ! God is not silent ; but it may be that His people cannot hear.

Let me illustrate the matter by a reference to the wireless broadcasting with which we are all familiar. Though I know nothing of the scientific aspect, I understand that the air is now full of wavelengths of sound, sent out from all directions. But I am told that unless your receiver is tuned to a particular length, you will get nothing at all, though your next-door neighbour may be hearing perfectly. Now, if we translate these things to the heavenly regions, I believe that the spiritual atmosphere is full of sounds, messages, and warnings from God, and loving and comforting words of the Holy Spirit. But whether we hear these words of warning and comfort, depends entirely on the tuning of our spiritual receiver. And if any should ask how this tuning is to be accomplished, there may be various methods ; but I prefer that suggested by the Apostle John, when he said, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, and I heard a voice as of a trumpet talking with me." God was not silent to him, and He may be speaking now. At any rate, before any man decides that God is silent, and that there is nothing to hear, let him look first to the condition of his spiritual receiver, and make sure that it is rightly tuned ; for it may be that the fault is there.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES : To my mind both these papers are most interesting. They grapple with a great mystery, and give the human heart assurance and consolation of the best kind. But, dealing with one of God's spiritual enigmas, they cannot do more. Dr. M'Intyre's opening sentence sets the matter very plainly before us. He cites Bishop Butler and Origen to show that we must expect in the Christian faith difficulties similar to those which we find in the physical world. He then proceeds to handle the matter in a very able way. I notice—both in the writer's original remarks and in his quotations—many a "perhaps," a "probably," a "possibly," "it may be," etc. This is only what one would expect,

for the subject is a *mystery*, and a mystery cannot be solved—or it would cease to be a mystery. Dr. M'Intyre reaches the right—and indeed, the only feasible—conclusion when he says, “In all such cases the remedy is faith” (p. 268).

With regard to the two sets of difficulties—the spiritual and the physical—there seems to me to be a great difference. The former remain, as they were from the beginning, insoluble mysteries; while the latter, all along the line of history, have been solved, or are still in process of being solved. The great spiritual problems—such as the origin of evil, the nature of Satan, the prosperity of the wicked, the failure of the righteous, election and reprobation, necessity and free-will, a personal devil, unanswered prayers, infinite punishment for finite sin, God's government of the world—yet “nature red in tooth and claw”—these are mysteries just as insoluble now as they were when Job grappled with them thousands of years ago. Not a single ray of light has been thrown on them by all the philosophizing and disputing of theologians since the world began. In early life I spent a whole year in reading psychology, ethics, and metaphysics, and almost nothing else; and at the end I found myself just as much in the dark as at the beginning.

The secrets of the physical world, on the contrary—the laws of Nature and their operations—have been unsealed and solved from the earliest times; and the process is still going on. The laws of light, of sound, of heat, of motion, of electricity, of gravitation, of cohesion, of chemical action, etc., have been opened up and brought to light in a very marvellous way; and especially, perhaps, during the last hundred years—though some of the nations of antiquity knew a good deal about the sciences, as the wonderful remains of many of them attest. All this seems to me to be in exact accordance with the Eden story of Genesis. There, we are told, man deliberately chose the forbidden tree of knowledge—that is, the earthly, the secular, the physical, and deliberately rejected the unforbidden tree of life:—the Divine, the Heavenly, the Spiritual. The latter was then taken from him, but the fruits of the other were left; and ever since, man's secular, earthly appetite has been gratified by fresh discoveries; while his spiritual aspirations have been left unenlightened.

Many revelations have been granted to him by God, it is true; otherwise he could never have found a way to escape the consequences

of disobeying his Maker. But none of those revelations have solved, or were they intended to solve, those great spiritual problems which still confront him in their entirety, and will baffle him to the end of this dispensation.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : The papers to which we have listened seem to take a double view of the meaning of their thesis—(1) That, in the face of many current events, God is silent ; (2) that He no longer speaks as by the prophets in Holy Scripture and verbal Revelation.

(1) On p. 264, Dr. M'Intyre says, " He made no movement of wrath." I can hardly agree with that. The Deluge and the overthrow of the Cities of the Plains, as well as the repeated destructions of Jerusalem, are certainly " movements of wrath." Outside of Holy Scripture there are many judgments, *e.g.* Vesuvius of old and Martinique in our own times. *But God is never in a hurry*—He is long-suffering. The prophet Habakkuk speaks of Chaldea (read chap. i, 13) : " Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on iniquity : wherefore lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he ? " The story of Chaldea shows that, notwithstanding the long-suffering of God, at last the punishment overtook the guilty city to its utter destruction (Isa. x, 5, 12).

(2) As regards the completion of the canon, let us remember that the Holy Spirit is now indwelling in each believer and not, as in olden times, in a comparatively few prophets. We cannot expect that God shall come down upon Sinai in glory and awful grandeur every day to pronounce with thundering voice His will and laws ; but He still speaks as in the still small voice to Elijah (1 Kings xix, 12), or as the inward voice of Jeremiah concerning Hanameel (Jer. xxxii, 7). There are times when no other way of comfort or direction can reach us, and then God speaks in a voice, *e.g.* Jeremiah in the dungeon (Lam. iii, 55), or Paul on the sinking ship (Acts xxvii, 23, 24), saying " Fear not." There is an " economy " in voices. The Gospels give us only three such voices, *viz.* :—*The Baptism* (Matt. iii, 17 ; Mark i, 11 ; Luke iii, 22) ; *The Transfiguration* (Matt. xvii, 5 ; Mark ix, 7 ; Luke ix, 35) ; *The Greeks in the Temple* (John xii, 20).

Consider the question in another way. Through the media of voice and hearing my spirit is in touch with your spirit. Cannot God get at our spirits directly and apart from such media? These may be generally necessary for the intercourse of men, but they are not at all necessary for God, who is a Spirit. With me, thought originates in the soul or mind, and passes through to the organs of speech into sound, and when I address another the process is reversed, and my thought passes through his organ of hearing, and through the brain reaches his soul. It is not really the eye that sees or the ear that hears, any more than it is the telescope that sees or the hearing-trumpet that hears; it is the mind that does both and *all*. To me these thoughts make it clear how God can never be silent but is always "speaking" or influencing minds, and His will is always operating. He can speak in a voice if He will; but He is not confined to that or any other form of communication. To those who walk with God, as Enoch did, God is ever speaking. There can be unbroken Communion, for "in Him we live, and move, and have our being."

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: An analysis of Dr. M'Intyre's paper reveals an argument which, in its cumulative force, is of considerable weight, and throws light on some dark problems. Nevertheless, the lecturer has candidly admitted that "it is only in a very partial sense that we are able to speak of the continuing silence of God in the history of men. What has really to be explained (if that is possible) is His seeming inaction in the course of events, His apparent indifference to the necessities of His creatures." After everything has been said that can be said, and arguments gathered from history, from philosophy, from experience, and from the Holy Scriptures, we are still face to face with many mysteries, the adequate solution of which seem impossible with our present knowledge. The infinite glory of God and His purposes transcend our power of search, and go beyond our understanding.

There are, within a stone's throw of this building, men and women whose hearts are crying out on account of unspeakable wrongs, and God appears to be silent. But the revelation of the character of God, and the vindication of His ways as unveiled in the Apocalypse, make an adjustment certain at some time. Cowper, in perhaps the

best hymn of its kind in the language, with incomparable insight, wrote :—

“God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform ;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

“Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never-failing skill
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign Will.

“Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take ;
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

“Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust Him for His grace ;
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face.”

It is to these problems that Dr. M'Intyre has directed our attention, and he has done so with an eloquence, a thoroughness, and reverence which can only command admiration.

Rev. Dr. H. C. MORTON said : I think one of the truest things said was that of Dr. Kelly—that in the Bible God is always speaking. He is certainly not silent, for in the Bible all problems are both foreseen and solved. We have endless things yet to learn from the Bible, and the way to get our instrument tuned in to hear His voice is earnest study of the Word.

It was not the silence, but the inactivity of God that so often baffled us. Sometimes there was no problem. In Ps. xviii, for instance, David said (in verse 6) that he called and God heard, and then there came “the thunder of God's mighty deeds” : “He bowed the heavens, and came down.” But (in verse 41), speaking of the enemies of God, he says : “They cried, but there was none to save them : even unto the Lord, but He answered them not.” That is no “small whisper” we have heard from Him, but a plain teaching, and one that solves many problems of His inactivity.

But Dr. M'Intyre's illustration—the ghastly problem of Armenia—moved me deeply. I do not believe there is anything to be added to the Canon. I love the reply Dr. Parker once gave to an eminent divine who said that he himself was as certainly inspired as Isaiah. Dr. Parker said: “Yes, yes: let him give us a specimen.” But if anything ever could have a shadow of a claim, it would be such poetry as William Watson's: those flaming Armenian sonnets, burning with the very fire of the Seraphim. Yet they had no solution of the problem: nor had anyone, spite of all the helpful personal things which had been said, given any solution of that awful national problem. I have listened with very great interest to the keen address of the Chairman. He said “the patience of God.” Yes: but patience with the Turk at the expense of the Armenian? He said “God's transcendence: He moves not on the human scale of hours and years.” No: but He does move on the scale of the generations and the centuries, and that is the scale of Armenia's agony.

I do not see how to “justify the ways of God to man” in such a tragedy. There is no explanation: but is it not the Bible principle that practice precedes philosophy? Perhaps we should understand, if Britain fulfilled her duty and saved Armenia. Watson said he saw on high “the gathering blackness of the frown of God.” In the distress which settles down upon our country, do not we too see that gathering blackness? Oh! if Britain would but listen to the voice which calls so loudly, it would not only be more tolerable for her in the Day of Judgment, but it would take an aching load out of many hearts.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. F. C. WOOD: To answer the question on which the two papers are based, it seems necessary first to define what is meant by “The Silence of God.” Personally, I take it to mean that God has not, since the days of the Apostles, spoken to us as He did to the Jewish people, from the time of Abraham to Christ and His Apostles; neither, perhaps, by miracle as He did during the same period. If this be the correct way of stating the matter, may we not answer by asking another question, viz. “Why should we desire or expect a definite communication, or a manifest sign as in the days of old?” Would it be to satisfy our curiosity, to strengthen

our faith, or to tell us something not already known ? We do well to remember that there were but few divine communications from Abraham to Moses, a period of 430 years, when the Pentateuch was given with its many special revelations ; or from Moses to Samuel, about 370 years ; then, some time after the kingdom was established, came the period of the Prophets whose writings we have, which began with Jonah and ended with Malachi, about 320 years. Then followed nearly four centuries of silence.

I take no account of present-day theories concerning certain Old-Testament writers living later than Malachi. There were, of course, some intervening communications, but not many, so far as we understand God to be definitely speaking. But what was the sum and substance of nearly all the communications ? Was it not to give Israel divine laws and statutes ; to rebuke them for national declension ; to establish a kingdom for God in the midst of the nations ; to reveal how the whole earth should be blessed through Israel ; and, more than all, to foretell in much detail the coming of Messiah with His life, sufferings, death, resurrection, intercession and coming again ? In a word, providing the world since then with everything it needed to know. The Old Testament, for special reasons, did not clearly indicate the long period of the present dispensation. When Israel completely failed, and crucified their King, and also as a nation failed to accept the offer of forgiveness as revealed in the Acts of the Apostles, then God turned to the Gentiles, and began to take out a people for Himself, both from Jew and Gentile, thus forming the Church.

Divine Revelation in the form of God, speaking to men, was almost entirely to Jews, though for our learning, and miracle was chiefly connected with the same people, until the Apostolic times when, for a short period, it was granted to confirm and bear witness to the truth of the Gospel of Christ. Another great question, therefore, arises, viz. Has God given a complete and sufficient revelation concerning Himself, and the Believers standing before Him, also instruction about his everyday life ? If He has, why should He now break His silence ? He will certainly break this silence when His Church is removed, and things become essentially Jewish again, as we read in Ps. l, and, in my way of looking at it, especially in the Book of The Revelation. God does now speak clearly to individual believers through His written Word, illuminated by the Holy Spirit,

and He works what are practically miracles, *i.e.* things out of the ordinary course, to those who pray in faith and really trust in Him ; but He has not promised to work miraculously to an ungodly world in general, or for unbelievers in particular, like to what He frequently did with His people Israel of old.

A great miracle, though not noticed by the world, is being performed, to-day, in Israel restored to Palestine according to Scripture. It seems, therefore, to me, so far as the believer is specially concerned, that, with a complete and perfect Old and New Testament—with an indwelling Holy Spirit, and with many promises and proofs that prayer will be (and is) answered—we are not taught to expect definite communciations or special miracles as of old, but rather to take heed to the reiterated word, “The just shall live by faith,” and to “walk by faith, not by sight.” Craving for anything beyond this is probably due to lack of satisfaction with what the Lord has provided, and might lead to spiritual troubles.

MR. SYDNEY T. KLEIN : The title of Dr. M'Intyre's paper takes for granted as a fact “The Silence of God,” and then asks “How is it to be explained ?”

From the paper itself, I glean that in using the word *Silence*, the writer means that God does not speak to us direct in finite physical words, so that we may hear Him by means of our auditory sense organ.

Surely God is ever speaking to us, but as He is a Spirit, and we are His spiritual offspring, He naturally speaks as Spirit to spirit. It was thus He spoke to the Hebrew seers of old, and has continued ever since to speak to all those who are God-loving, that they may clothe His messages in finite physical language and deliver them to mankind.

After more than half a century of reverent study of our surroundings in this life, I have come to the conclusion that God does not interfere with the working of the wonderful laws of Nature which, in His wisdom, He has ordained for carrying out His great Purpose. He does not, therefore, interfere with the doings of man, but speaks and acts through all those who have found the Kingdom of Heaven *within*, and have realized their oneness with the All-loving.

His voice is heard within, not objectively but subjectively, and

the only explanation required is not why He doesn't speak to us in audible language, but whether His messages have been truly transmitted by those who have been ordained to speak and act as His representatives on the physical plane. If we take the converse to this, we cannot help noting that many of us seem to address our prayers to God objectively, as though He were an outside Being, which we do when petitioning our earthly father, but spiritual prayer does not depend on or require finite words for utterance ; it is the *thought* within which must precede those outward symbols if prayer is to have power : " All things whatsoever ye ask in prayer, *believing*, ye shall receive," namely, the inner spiritual thought must come before the outward physical words.

We have a naïve account of the experiences of one of the mediæval mystics which expresses well the attitude necessary for true prayer. He describes how, in his early days, he first learnt the futility of praying objectively. For a long time he had been wrestling daily in prayer without getting any response, and at last desperately demanded of God why He didn't answer him ; he then received the reply : " I am only waiting until you have done shouting."

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS : I should like to say that I very much appreciate Dr. M'Intyre's paper, and particularly his reason for the silence of God being because He has spoken finally to men in His Son. This comprises not only the three years of our Lord's public ministry, but that ministry which immediately followed through the Holy Spirit sent down from Heaven to dwell on this earth at Pentecost.

It is apparent, especially from the Johannine scriptures, that all that was spoken through the inspired writers had its origin in our Lord's own life, for, as the wise man said, " What can the man do that cometh after the King ? " (Eccles. ii, 12), and none could really speak after the Son of God in the way of a greater or different revelation. Therefore the Apostle Paul could say, in his last doctrinal epistle, that it was given to him to " fulfil (complete) the Word of God " (Col. i, 25). The inspired men who wrote after him based everything on what they had seen and heard of the living Christ. Nothing is more marked than the immense gap which separates the books of the New Testament from all subsequent Christian literature.

Miracles seem to have ceased much sooner than Christian apologists

are usually prepared to admit, being apparently intended only to accredit Christianity to an unbelieving world. The Apostle Paul remained in prison four years, and was unable to heal Epaphroditus (Phil. ii, 27) and Trophimus (2 Tim. iv, 20), though he had earlier done miracles of healing, and had been delivered from prison by a miracle. Just as there was no inspired Word for several centuries before the First Coming of Christ, and no miracles for a longer period, so I believe the present silence of God will continue until the Second Advent, for it is one of God's ways with men to present a testimony for faith's acceptance before it is fulfilled by His intervention.

Mr. W. HOSTE : There is an aspect of "the Silence of God" (if we may understand by the phrase that, for all-wise reasons, He does not at once interfere to punish wrongdoing) which has not, I think, been referred to, and that is the danger of misinterpreting that "silence" into acquiescence in evil. This supports the general thesis of Dr. M'Intyre's paper, that God is allowing sin to manifest itself fully in all its hideousness, before taking open measures to deal with it finally in judgment. The same thought is exemplified by God's words to Abraham, "The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Ps. l illustrates the danger referred to above. It is addressed to two classes, God's people and the wicked, especially the religious wicked, as the context shows. The man addressed in the latter part of the psalm, if not an active religious *worker*, is an active religious *talker*. He "declares God's statutes"; he "takes God's covenant in his mouth," but his conduct belies his profession. He "casts God's words behind him"; is morally unscrupulous; speaks evil; tells lies; slanders his "brethren"; and God's only reply is beyond his ken, because outside his own use, *silence*. Thus he argues, if God disapproved, He would say so; therefore He approves! But the reverse is true, and when God's time comes the silence will be terribly broken. "These things hast thou done, and *I kept silence*, and thou thoughtest I was altogether such an one as thyself; but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes."

The "silence of God" is in reality only a relative term. Though normally silent as far as miraculous display is concerned, He is speaking through His Providences and His Word. But even His

“silences” are eloquent and effective. That “still small voice” had accomplished infinitely more than Elijah, armed though he was with the power of temporal judgments. He had to confess he was “left alone,” while Jehovah could point to “seven thousand men, whom He had reserved to Himself, who had not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.” “The Incarnation,” as Gregory Nazianzen, I think it was, has said, “was carried out in one of the great silences of Eternity.” There was a dead silence too at Calvary from the sixth to the ninth hour, while “the great transaction” was taking place ; and the closing panorama of the Great White Throne passes before us in the Scripture without a sound. Men seem to *read* their record and their fate. As has been well said, “There is more in the silences of God than in all the shoutings of men.”

The AUTHOR’S reply : The references to my paper in the preceding discussion are even too generous, and little occasion can be found for remark.

Mr. Edwards has rightly taken exception to a phrase of mine on p. 264—“He made no movement of wrath.” I was trying to paraphrase St. Paul’s statement in Rom. iii, 25, but I ought to have selected an exacter form of words.

With, I think, all the speakers, I agree that, in one sense, God is never silent. He speaks through Nature and history, in the Scriptures, and by the Holy Spirit. But there are many things which we desire to know that are still unrevealed. Nor, when He has spoken, does He always find attentive and understanding hearers.