

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. LXII.

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

VOL. LXII.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1930

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

PREFACE.

AS will be evident to those who have followed the work of the Victoria Institute from year to year, the present Annual Volume—the 62nd in series—conveys a body of thought that is calculated to make a strong and eminently useful appeal to readers of reflecting mind.

Questions of Biblical import and connection, such as call for special consideration at the present time, are in some degree introduced in most of the papers. At the very outset there comes the essay, “The Garden Tomb at Jerusalem: A Possible Site of the Resurrection,” from the pen of the honoured President of the Institute, Sir Ambrose Fleming, and at the close of the volume, being the work of the same distinguished author, comes “Creation and Modern Cosmogony.” These two studies are of outstanding importance, and are commended to the close attention of those who follow the ever-changing thought of our day.

In between the papers already named will be found two valuable essays—“Christ and the Scriptures,” by Rev. F. W. Pitt, to whom was awarded a second prize in the Gunning Competition, and “Scientific Discoveries and their Bearing on the Biblical Account of the Noachian Deluge,” by Lieut.-Colonel L. M. Davies, whose essay secured the Langhorne-Orchard prize awarded by the Institute. These papers have an educational value which will assure them of sustained appreciation in the coming days.

If at the present time there is one subject of which we may say with confidence that it is specially under the public eye, that subject is *Palestine*. Hence, all who read will give a warm welcome to “Arabs and Jews in Palestine,” by Rev. Dr. Christie, and “The Jews under the Palestine Mandate,” by Mr. Israel Cohen. Coming

from pens that wield authority as regards Palestinian interests, these papers were subjected to discussion by acknowledged experts, and they are sure to exercise an enlightening influence.

As to "The Concept of Evolution in the New Psychology," by Rev. Dr. Morton, it may be declared, without fear of contradiction, to constitute a bold challenge to a philosophical theory which is widely employed to buttress the unbelief of our time. A theological issue of vital import was canvassed in the paper on "The Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord Jesus Christ," by Lieut.-Colonel T. C. Skinner, and points that are confessedly "knotty" in regard to New Testament chronology were discussed in "The Last Days of our Lord's Ministry," by Lieut.-Colonel A. H. C. Kenney-Herbert.

Themes that seem to be more on the circumference of modern thought, but involving important issues, were discussed by Brig.-General Harry Biddulph in "The Date of Ecclesiasticus"; by Rev. Charles Gardner, on "How Far do the Apologetics of Bacon, Butler and Paley hold good for Present Use?" and by Professor Garstang on "Joshua and the Higher Critics."

To all who have written papers, and equally to those who brought thought and suggestion into the various discussions, cordial thanks are rendered. On all hands the Session of 1929-30 was deemed to be one of great educational value, and it is hoped that, with such a high level of help and stimulus made available, the number of supporters of the Institute will be materially increased.

It was in order to the happy result thus expressed that a new class of adherents was established in April last, to be known as Student Associates; open to young people at the reduced fee of 10s. 6d. per annum. Friends of the Institute are urged to lose no time in bringing in Student Associates and in introducing new adherents of all grades, in order that the work of the Institute may expand and deepen, and so be enabled more efficiently to realize its aim in promoting "THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD."

JAMES W. THIRTLE,
Chairman of Council.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
REPORT OF COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1929	1
CASH STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR 1929... .. .	6
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 14TH, 1930	9
THE GARDEN TOMB AT JERUSALEM: A POSSIBLE SITE OF THE RESURRECTION. BY SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (<i>President</i>)	11
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Dr. E. W. G. Masterman, the Rev. A. W. Payne, Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., Major R. A. Marriott, Mr. William C. Edwards, Sir Charles Marston, J.P., and the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D.	28
CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES. THE OLD TESTAMENT: THE IMPLICA- TIONS. BY THE REV. F. W. PITT (BEING THE SECOND PRIZE GUNNING ESSAY, 1927)	38
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, and Mr. W. Hoste	55
SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES AND THEIR BEARING ON THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF THE NOACHIAN DELUGE. BY LIEUT.-COL. L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S. (BEING THE LANGHORNE ORCHARD PRIZE ESSAY, 1929)	62
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. William C. Edwards, Lieut.- Col. F. A. Molony, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. W. Hoste, Lieut.-Col. A. G. Shortt, and Dr. James Knight, F.R.A.S., F.G.S.	86
ARABS AND JEWS IN PALESTINE. BY THE REV. W. M. CHRISTIE, D.D.	96
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Mr. Israel Cohen, Secretary of the Zionist Organi- zation, Dr. Moses Gaster (the Haham), Mr. W. Hoste, and Mr. W. R. Rowlatt-Jones	106
THE DATE OF ECCLESIASTICUS. BY BRIG.-GENERAL HARRY BID- DULPH, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.	117
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. William C. Edwards, and Mr. Cyril Van Lennep	1 29

	PAGE
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES TO OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. BY LIEUT.-COL. T. C. SKINNER, R.E. (ret.) ...	134
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. G. Wilson Heath, the Rev. F. W. Pitt, Mr. W. N. Delevingne, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., Mr. W. Hoste, the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Mr. A. G. Secrett, and Mr. W. R. Rowlatt-Jones	
HOW FAR DO THE APOLOGETICS OF BACON, BUTLER AND PALEY HOLD GOOD FOR PRESENT USE ? BY THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A.	164
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., Mr. William C. Edwards, Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, and the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A. ...	
THE LAST DAYS OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY. BY LIEUT.-COL. A. H. C. KENNEY-HERBERT	180
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. G. Wilson Heath, Dr. Norman S. Denham, Mr. George Brewer, Lieut.-Col. A. G. Shortt, Mr. W. Hoste, Brig.-General Harry Biddulph, Mr. L. W. Kern, and Major R. B. Withers, R.A.	
THE CONCEPT OF EVOLUTION IN THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY. BY THE REV. HAROLD C. MORTON, B.A., Ph.D.	208
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. Charles Gardner, M.A., Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, Mr. G. Wilson Heath, and Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, R.A. ...	
JOSHUA AND THE HIGHER CRITICS. BY PROFESSOR J. GARSTANG, D.Sc., F.S.A.	234
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S.	
THE JEWS UNDER THE PALESTINE MANDATE. BY ISRAEL COHEN, ESQ.	241
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by Mr. E. R. P. Moon, M.A., the Rev. Dr. H. C. Morton, Mr. S. H. Wilkinson, Mr. W. N. Delevingne, and Mr. W. Hoste	
CREATION AND MODERN COSMOGONY. BY SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (<i>President</i>), BEING THE ANNUAL ADDRESS... ..	266
LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES, ETC.	283
OBJECTS, CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS	315

VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1929.

TO BE READ AT THE

ADJOURNED ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, APRIL 14TH, 1930.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council beg herewith, once more, to present to Members and Associates of the Institute the Annual Report of the Proceedings of the Society, with the customary Balance Sheet. They are glad to note a rise in the total number of the supporters of the Institute; this they hope will be continued, and, indeed, largely increased, by the carrying out of certain proposals, to be placed before Members, in the formation of a third class of adherents, consisting of Student Members—a class open to students within certain limits of age, and at a reduced subscription. By this measure it is hoped that the scope of the Society will be greatly enlarged.

The interest in the papers read before the Institute continues, and testimony received from distant Members proves that the work of the Society is both widely needed and highly appreciated. Special interest has been aroused and valuable discussions evoked, by such papers as that of the President, on "Matter, Energy, Radiation, Life and Mind," that of Dr. Rendle Short, on "Some Recent Books on Biological Subjects," and that of Sir Flinders Petrie, on "The Materialization of Old Testament History"—to cite only a few of the lectures delivered.

2. *Meetings.*

Twelve ordinary Meetings were held during the Session 1928-29. The papers published were:—

"Matter, Energy, Radiation, Life and Mind," by Sir AMBROSE FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*President.*)

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

“The Hebrew Calendar and Time Periods,” by Dr. W. BELL DAWSON, M.Inst.C.E.

The Rev. A. H. Finn in the Chair.

“Precious Stones of the Bible, with special reference to the High Priest’s Breastplate,” by the Rev. CHARLES W. COOPER, F.G.S.

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

“Scientific Proofs of a Universal Deluge,” by PHILIP J. LE RICHE, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

Alfred W. Oke, Esq., LL.M., F.G.S., in the Chair.

“The Ice Age: its Astronomical Cause and the bearing of Drayson’s discovery on the Biblical Account of the Deluge” (with Gyrostats and Lantern Illustrations), by Lieut.-Colonel T. C. SKINNER.

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

“Some Recent Books on Biological Subjects,” by ARTHUR RENDLE SHORT, Esq., M.D., M.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S.

Sir Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., in the Chair.

“Conjectural Emendations in the Psalms,” by the Rev. A. H. FINN.

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

“The Philosophic Basis of Modernism,” by Major LEWIS MERSON DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

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

“Humanity,” by ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

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

“Early Anti-Judaica—the Book of Testimonies,” by the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.

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

“Materialization of Old Testament History,” by Prof. Sir W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, LL.D, F.R.S.

Sir Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., in the Chair.

Annual Address: “Nature and the Supernatural,” by Sir AMBROSE FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*President*.)

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

3. Council and Officers.

The following is a list of the Council and Officers for the year 1929 :—

President.

Sir Ambrose Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

Vice-Presidents.

Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.
 Right Rev. Bishop J. E. C. Weldon, M.A., D.D.
 J. W. Thirtle, Esq., M.A., LL.D., M.R.A.S.; *Chairman of Council.*

Trustees.

Alfred William Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M., F.G.S.
 Martin H. F. Sutton, Esq., J.P., F.L.S., F.R.G.S.

Council.

(*In Order of Original Election.*)

Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S.	Avary H. Forbes, Esq., M.A.
Alfred William Oke, Esq., B.A., LL.M., F.G.S.	Arthur Rendle Short, Esq., M.D., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S.
Sir Robert W. Dibdin, F.R.G.S.	The Rev. Harold C. Morton, B.A., Ph.D.
H. Lance-Gray, Esq.	William C. Edwards, Esq.
John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A.	Robert Duncan, Esq., M.B.E., I.S.O.
W. Hoste, Esq., B.A.	Louis E. Wood, Esq., M.B., D.P.H.
Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.	The Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A.
Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.	Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, F.R.Met.Soc.

Honorary Treasurer.

William C. Edwards, Esq.

Honorary Editor of the Journal.

Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S.

Honorary Secretary, Papers Committee.

Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.

Honorary Secretary.

William Hoste, Esq., B.A.

Auditor.

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

Secretary.

Mr. A. E. Montague.

4. *Election of Officers.*

In accordance with the Rules, the following Members of Council retire by rotation: Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.R.A.S., H. Lance-Gray, Esq., John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A., William C. Edwards, Esq., the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., Dr. Louis E. Wood and R. Duncan, Esq., M.B.E., I.S.O., who offer themselves for re-election. The last six are renominated by the Council, who also nominate Sir Charles Marston, J.P., as a Member of Council.

5. *Obituary.*

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

The Rev. S. S. Farrow, Ph.D.; the Rev. C. A. R. Janvier, M.A.; Miss M. A. Laurence, the Rev. H. N. Moore, M.A.; The Archbishop of Melbourne (Dr. Harrington C. Lees); Prof. A. S. Peake, D.D.; Finch Perrott, Esq.; the Rev. J. W. Pratt, M.A.; and the Rev. Ambrose J. Wilson, D.D.

6. *New Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Members and Associates elected up to the end of 1929:—

LIFE MEMBER.—The Rev. William Davey.

MEMBERS.—The Rev. Alfred A. Aldridge; Dr. Norman S. Denham; the Rev. W. M. Evans; George H. Johnson, Esq.; the Rev. Thomas Nicklin, M.A.; Martin H. F. Sutton, Esq., J.P., F.L.S.; Dudley B. Toye, Esq., O.B.E., LL.D.; Cyril C. O. Van Lennep, Esq.; Clair A. Wontersz, Esq.; the Rev. Geoffrey B. Withers; and Major R. B. Withers, R.A., D.S.O.

ASSOCIATES.—Colonel W. G. S. Benson; George Brewer, Esq.; R. Arthur Button, Esq.; the Rev. R. W. Colquhoun, M.A.; the Rev. Charles W. Cooper, F.G.S.; Eliot C. Curwen, Esq., M.B., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.; the Rev. H. S. Curr, B.D., B.Litt.; A. Cowper Field, Esq.; Thomas H. H. Foster, Esq.; Charles H. R. Grant, Esq., L.D.S.; Rev. L. F. Gruber, D.D., LL.D.; the Rev. D. E. Hart-Davies, M.A., D.D.; John Hern, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S.; Major R. A. Marriott, D.S.O.; the Rev. F. E. Marsh, D.D.; George P. H. Maynard, Esq.; the Rev. W. M. H. Milner; James J. Mills, Esq.; Alfred Phibbs, Esq.; W. B. Sommers, Esq., M.B., F.R.C.S.; Alfred G. Secrett, Esq.; Mrs. T. Wilson-Smith; J. V. Stevenson, Esq., C.B.E., M.V.O.; the Rev. Carment Urquhart; Mrs. E. Wieland; Howard W. Wright, Esq.; Andrew Williamson, Esq.; Commander W. H. N. Yonge (R.N. ret.).

7. *Number of Members and Associates.*

The following statement shows the number of supporters of the Institute at the end of 1929 :—

Life Members	13
Annual Members	115
Life Associates	49
Associates	300
Missionary Associates	11
Library Associates	30
				518
				518

8. *Donations.*

Anonymous, 10s. ; Archibald Greenlees, Esq., £2 2s. ; W. R. Rowlatt Jones, Esq., £1 1s. ; Sydney T. Klein, Esq., £5 ; W. E. Leslie, Esq., £5 5s. ; Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., £1.

9. *Finance.*

The question of Finance is naturally a pressing one, but it is hoped that, if the proposals already alluded to are adopted by Members, this problem may be largely solved; especially if the Members and Associates fall in with another proposal to be laid before them, and undertake to furnish names from their friends who might come forward as suitable candidates, for incorporation in the Institute.

Conclusion.

The Council are more than ever persuaded of the importance of the work which the Victoria Institute seeks to perform, in providing a platform on which important questions—such as those touching the relations of Faith and Science, and matters akin to both—can be discussed in a dispassionate spirit, and from a conservative point of view.

The Council thank very heartily those who have contributed to the usefulness of the Society's work by reading papers, or by taking part in the discussions. They hope that adherents will continue to do their best to attend upon the reading of papers, and likewise will join in the discussion of subjects falling within the scope of their own special studies.

JAMES W. THIRTLE,
Chairman of Council.

BALANCE SHEET, 31st DECEMBER, 1929.

LIABILITIES.				ASSETS.								
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.			
SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID IN ADVANCE			9	9	0	CASH AT BANK:—					
SUNDRY CREDITORS for:—							Current Account					
Printing and Stationery	268	17	4				41	6	3		
Audit Fee	3	3	0				107	7	4		
				272	0	4	“Gunning Prize” Account					
LIFE SUBSCRIPTIONS:—							“Langhorne Orchard Prize” Account					
Balance at 1st January, 1929	128	2	0				9	0	9		
Additions	34	10	0				STAMPS IN HAND				
				162	12	0				1	6	4
Less Amount carried to Income and Expenditure Account	10	10	0	152	2	0	SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ARREARS:—				
										Estimated to produce		
“GUNNING PRIZE” FUND (<i>per contra</i>)										23	2	0
Balance at 1st January, 1929	83	16	4				INVESTMENTS:—				
Add Dividends received	23	11	0				£500 2½ per cent. Consolidated Stock				
				107	7	4				at 52½		
“LANGHORNE ORCHARD PRIZE” FUND (<i>per contra</i>)										“Gunning” Fund:—		
Balance at 1st January, 1929	28	7	7				£673 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock at cost				
Add Dividends received	9	1	2				“Langhorne Orchard” Fund:—				
				37	8	9				£258 18s. 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock at cost		
										200	0	0
										INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT:—		
										Balance at 1st January, 1929		
										193	13	0
										Add Excess of Expenditure over Income for the year 1929		
										197	18	9
										391	11	9

<i>Deduct :</i>			
Prize awarded to Lt.-			
Col. L. M. Davies....	£20	0	0
Expenses	8	8	0
	<hr/>		28 8 0
			<hr/>
			9 0 9
RESERVE ACCOUNT			<hr/>
			262 10 0
			<hr/>
			£1,520 9 5
			<hr/> <hr/>

<i>Deduct :—</i>			
Donations received	£16	18	0
Balance of Tract Fund	6	17	0
	<hr/>		23 15 0
			<hr/>
			367 16 9
			<hr/>
			£1,520 9 5
			<hr/> <hr/>

I report to the Members of the Victoria Institute that I have audited the foregoing Balance Sheet, dated 31st December, 1929, and have obtained all the information and explanations I have required.

I have verified the Cash Balances and Investments. In accordance with a Resolution of the Council £500 Consolidated Stock 2½ per cent. has been valued at £262 10s., and a Reserve Account created of a corresponding amount. Printing Account includes £52 10s., cost of printing Tracts numbered 12 and 13. No valuation of the Library, Furniture or Tracts in hand has been taken, subject to which in my opinion the Balance Sheet is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the affairs of the Institute according to the best of my information and the explanations given me, and as shown by the books of the Institute.

21, Old Queen Street, Westminster,
London, S.W.1.

24th March, 1930.

E. LUFF-SMITH,
Incorporated Accountant.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1929.

EXPENDITURE.				INCOME.							
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.		
To Rent, Light, Cleaning and Hire of		£	s. d.	£	s.	d.					
Lecture Room	75	17	10					
„ Salary	200	0	0					
„ National Insurance	3	13	8					
„ Printing and Stationery....	395	14	0					
„ Expenses of Meetings	4	0	0					
„ Library Purchases	0	15	6					
„ Postages	34	17	2					
„ Audit Fee	3	3	0					
„ Fire Insurance	0	12	0					
„ Bank Charges and Sundries	5	17	1					
				724	10	3					
				£724	10	3					
							By SUBSCRIPTIONS :—	£	s.	d.	
							91 Members at £2 2s.	
							1 Member at £1 1s.	
							241 Associates at £1 1s.	
							Proportion of Life Subscriptions	
							455	14	0		
							„ DIVIDENDS received, less Tax
							„ SALE OF PUBLICATIONS
							„ “LANGHORNE ORCHARD PRIZE” FUND
							526	11	6		
							„ BALANCE, being excess of Expenditure over Income for the year 1929
							£724	10	3		

THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING

OF THE

VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 14TH, 1930,
AT 4 O'CLOCK.

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

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Honorary Secretary to read the notice convening the Meeting.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed that the Report, which was printed and in the hands of the Members, be taken as read.

Dr. THIRTLE proposed that the following retiring Members of Council be re-elected:—H. Lance-Gray, Esq., John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A., William C. Edwards, Esq., the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., Dr. Louis E. Wood, and R. Duncan, Esq., M.B.E., I.S.O. and that Sir Charles Marston, J.P., be elected a Member of Council; also that Ernest Luff-Smith, Esq., be re-appointed as Auditor at a fee of three guineas.

Mr. HOSTE seconded this, which was carried.

The REV. F. W. PITT proposed the *second Resolution*:—

“ That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1929, presented by the Council, be received and adopted, and that the thanks of the Meeting be given to the Council, Officers and Auditors for their efficient conduct of the business of the Victoria Institute during the year.”

This was seconded by Mr. CYRIL VAN LENNEP and carried unanimously.

Mr. E. LUFF-SMITH gave explanations of the Balance Sheet, and answered various questions from Members.

Dr. THIRTLE then proposed the *third Resolution* :—

“That a third class of adherents to the Society be initiated, to be known as Student Associates, open to all Members or Students of Universities, Colleges, etc., between the ages of 18 and 25, at a reduced fee of 10s. 6*d.*, to be subsequently eligible for election to the ordinary grades of Membership and Associateship, and also that present Members and Associates of the Society be urged to introduce the names of friends suitable for nomination as Members and Associates.”

This was seconded by Mr. W. HOSTE.

Resolution No. 4, moved by Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS :—

“That the cordial thanks of this Meeting be passed to Dr. Thirtle for presiding on this occasion,”

was seconded by Mr. HOSTE, and carried unanimously.

727TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 2ND, 1929,

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 following elections since our last meeting:—As Members: Cyril C. O. Van Lennep, Esq., the Rev. G. B. Withers, George H. Johnson, Esq., Major R. B. Withers, R.A., D.S.O., the Rev. W. M. Evans, and the Rev. Alfred Aldridge, B.A. As Associates: Col. W. G. S. Benson, C.B., John Hern, Esq., M.D., C. H. R. Grant, Esq., L.D.S., the Rev. L. F. Gruber, D.D., LL.D., and Major R. A. Marriott, D.S.O., F.R.G.A.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S., President, to read his paper on "The Garden Tomb at Jerusalem: a Possible Site of the Resurrection."

THE GARDEN TOMB AT JERUSALEM: A POSSIBLE SITE OF THE RESURRECTION.

By SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, F.R.S. (*President*).

I.

IT is always interesting to visit the localities where great historical events have taken place, and to recall to our minds on the spot the incidents which have made them famous. Some of us may have seen the undulating fields in Belgium on which the decisive Battle of Waterloo was fought in 1815. There Napoleon's war-worn veterans hurled themselves in vain on the shattered but indomitable British squares and thus brought to an end his military domination of Europe. Others, like myself, may have stood on the heights of Abraham above Quebec, where General Wolfe's daring strategy in 1759 gained Canada for the British Empire; and not a few have walked over the meadows of Runnymede, near Egham, where King John

in A.D. 1215 was compelled by the Barons to agree to that Magna Charta which gave us our fundamental British liberties. But of all the sites and places which are of supreme permanent interest the most attractive to students of sacred history are those in Palestine where the events described in the Old and New Testaments occurred which have been familiar to us all in story from our earliest years. Chief amongst these are the localities in and around Jerusalem which are inseparably connected with the earthly life and footsteps of our Redeemer.

The consideration of the question as to the exact sites of the Crucifixion, Entombment, and Resurrection of our Lord has been the subject of countless investigations, writings, and disputes. As historical events they must certainly have had a place and time. Personally I have not the very smallest claim to be considered as competent to decide any issue on this subject, but, having endeavoured to gather some information on the spot during one visit to Jerusalem last winter, I was informed by our Council it might interest the Members of this Institute if the evidence for and against certain conclusions were presented to you, assisted by some lantern slides illustrating places mentioned.

The first thing to note is that we stand in point of time almost exactly 1,900 years after the events we shall discuss, and that the city of Jerusalem in which they took place has been of all cities in the world the most frequently besieged and destroyed. Hence it is no easy matter to determine now the exact site of any event.

There is no need to occupy time with any detailed description of these destructions of Jerusalem. In A.D. 70 the Roman armies under Titus captured the city and laid it waste after a siege, the horrors of which are described in terrible words by Josephus. Sixty years later the Jews had so far recovered that they revolted again, under a leader called Bar-cochba, against the Roman power, and the Emperor Hadrian thereon destroyed it afresh, made the whole country of Palestine a desolation, built a Roman city on the site of Jerusalem, and called it *Ælia Capitolina*, and forbade any Jew even to approach it under penalty of death. He afterwards built a temple to Jupiter on the site of Herod's temple in Jerusalem. Thus were all the predictions of the Messiah, whom the Jews had rejected and crucified, literally fulfilled as regards that city and people to whom He came.

We pass then over a span of 174 years to the date A.D. 306, when the son of the Roman Emperor Constantius, called Constantine the Great, was acclaimed Augustus at York by the Roman legions encamped in Britain. At that time the headship of the Roman Empire was unsettled, and the four or more claimants to it fought each other for supremacy. Finally the struggle was reduced to a contest between Constantine and Maxentius, and the victory of the former at the Battle of Milvain Bridge, near Rome, made him undisputed master of that city and of the Empire of the West.

II.

A tradition recorded in the life of Constantine, written by Eusebius the historian and Bishop of Cæsarea, states that Constantine was encouraged to advance against Maxentius by a dream or vision of a cross in the sky, with the legend under it, "By this conquer." Be this as it may, Constantine was unquestionably influenced in favour of Christianity, which up to that time had been a proscribed or persecuted religion in the Roman Empire. In A.D. 313 he issued an edict of toleration towards it, and in A.D. 336, shortly before his death, he received Christian baptism at the hands of Eusebius.

When, sometime after the Edict of Toleration, Christianity had freedom to extend, and baptisms and perhaps nominal conversions became general, and interest began to be taken in the localities of its cardinal events, the Empress Helena, wife of Constantius and mother of Constantine, undertook at an advanced age a pilgrimage to Palestine. Her name became connected with a supposed discovery of three crosses in a cave in Jerusalem which were assumed or declared to be those of Christ and the two thieves. There was not the slightest veritable basis for this legend, but it seems to have determined Constantine to erect two Christian churches on the spot, one called Martyrion to commemorate the Crucifixion, and the other called Anastasis to the memory of the Resurrection, to which further reference is made later on.

Before mentioning the reasons which render doubtful, to say the least, the validity of this selection of site, it will be convenient to remind you of some points in the geography of Palestine and Jerusalem.

Whatever it may have been in former times, a pilgrimage to

Palestine presents no particular difficulty now, since the construction of the standard-gauge railway between Kantara in Egypt and Haifa in Palestine, with branch line to Jerusalem starting from Ludd or Lydda. The journey from Cairo or Alexandria in Egypt to Jerusalem is performed in about nine hours by express train, along the line laid down through the north part of the peninsula of Sinai during the Great War for transport of troops to Palestine.

A very usual route to Jerusalem from England is to travel via Paris to Marseilles in the South of France, and then take one of the large steamers of the Messageries Maritimes line across the Mediterranean Sea, a four days' voyage, to Alexandria or Port Said. From those places railways run to Kantara on the Suez Canal, and thence a nine hours' night journey brings you to Jerusalem. The last two hours from Ludd or Lydda, the burial-place of St. George of England, are very interesting. The train winds its way up the steep, tortuous valleys from the sea-level to the railway station of Jerusalem, which is situated about a mile or more outside the city, and at a height of about 2,400 feet above the sea-level.

Palestine is a small country not much larger than Wales, about 250 miles long north to south, and about 100 miles wide east to west. Down the centre, like a spinal column, from north to south there is a chain of mountains tailing away from the snow-clad summit of Mount Hermon in the north to low hills on the margin of the Dead Sea in the south: about two-thirds of the way down on this central elevation lies Jerusalem, at a height of 2,400 feet above the Mediterranean Sea and 3,700 feet above the Dead Sea. The River Jordan winds its way in an irregular course down the deep valley which lies to the east of this chain of hills, and empties itself into the salt waters of the Dead Sea which lies 1,300 feet below Jerusalem and at a distance of about 20 miles.

Jerusalem, therefore, occupies a commanding position from the point of view of military defence, and the site has been inhabited for fully 4,000 years. One of the earliest mentions of it is in Gen. xiv, which describes the recovery of Lot by Abraham when the former had been captured by the three kings or heads of tribes which attacked Sodom and Gomorrah on the Dead Sea. On returning from his expedition, Abraham was met by Melchizedek, King of Salem or Jerusalem, to whom he gave tithes of his spoil. Later the place became known as

Jebusi (Joshua xviii, 28), and was a fort or citadel of the Jebusites at the time when Palestine was invaded by the Israelites under Joshua. Owing to its strong position it remained in possession of the Jebusites until David captured it about 1000 B.C., as described in 2 Sam. v, 6. He then renamed this Jebusite fort "the City of David," and he subsequently reigned there for thirty-three years over Israel.

The city afterwards extended itself over an area which included three or more hill-summits. There was to the east a hill called Mount Moriah, the summit of which has been considered likely to be the place on which Abraham offered up Isaac, for we are told (Gen. xxii, 2) that God said to him, "Get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." Then to the west was a summit called Zion, and to the south a lower hill called Ophel. On the south-east side lies the lower Mount of Olives. The hills were separated originally by deep ravines, but these have now been more or less filled up with the rubbish of centuries due to the many destructions of the city. On the east side there was a deep valley called the Kidron, continuing on the south under the name of Jehoshaphat; on the south-west the valley called Hinnom, which separates Mount Zion from the so-called Mount of Evil Counsel; whilst other valleys, called the Asmonean and Tyropœon, separated the hills of Zion and Moriah from the northern land or promontory.

Hence Jerusalem was only easily accessible from the northern side, from which its invaders generally came, as on the east, south, and west it was defended by deep valleys and steep cliffs, and was moreover protected by high walls, which on the northern side at least have varied in position from age to age. As some questions to be presently considered depend upon the position of this north wall at the time of Christ, it will be well to exhibit a plan of Jerusalem showing the position of these walls.

III.

Jerusalem is, and from the time of David and Solomon has been, a walled city. In order to prepare a site for the Temple, Solomon built walls around the top of Mount Moriah, and a platform was formed called the Temple Area, now termed the Haram-es-Sherif (the noble sanctuary). Through this area

projects the rocky summit of Mount Moriah, which probably was the site of the Altar of Burnt Offering in Solomon's Temple.

At the present time the city wall is roughly quadrilateral in shape, being in all about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles in length and some 40 feet in height. The walls now existing were built in the sixteenth century by the Sultan Suleiman, and are only in part in the position of the three previous ancient walls. In each wall are one or more gates, numbering eight in all. In the north wall the Damascus gate is the most picturesque and opens on to the Damascus road. On the west side is the Jaffa gate, but close to it the wall was taken down to afford a theatrical entrance for the ex-German Emperor in 1898. It was by this gate that Lord Allenby entered the city in 1917. In the south side is the Zion gate, and on the east St. Stephen's gate. The Herod gate is on the north side, half-way between the Damascus gate and the north-east corner.

Inside the present walls the city is now divided into four portions called, respectively, the Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Armenian quarters: Across from west to east, leading from the Jaffa gate up to the Temple area, is a narrow street called David Street continued into one called Temple Street. It may be added that there is at the present time a very large extension of the city outside of the present walls, and chiefly in the north-west direction, where there are colonies of various nationalities.

It is hardly necessary to add that since the British Protectorate was established, there has been a great improvement in the sanitation of the city. A new water supply was laid on from reservoirs in the hills, and the main streets are kept clean. There are several fairly good hotels, but outside of a limited area the interior of the city is a maze of squalid and dirty alleys.

Whilst there is in this chief and ancient city of the world a vast amount to interest the student and antiquarian, the interest of most visitors is concentrated on the sight of the so-called holy places. Prominent amongst these is the Mosque of Omar, more correctly called the Dome of the Rock, which stands in the centre of the stone-paved platform on the east side of Jerusalem on the summit of Mount Moriah, on which place once stood the Temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Herod. This platform has a length of about 1,500 feet and width of 1,000 feet, or an area of nearly 35 acres. The mosque was built in the seventh century by Abd-el-Melik, the tenth Caliph after the capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens. Its great dome

covers the summit of Mount Moriah, which projects through the floor and is surrounded by a marble wall. When you look over that palisade at the few dozen square yards of hard, brown rock, you are gazing at one of the most ancient and sacred spots in human history.

Here on this rock Melchizedek, king and priest of Salem, may have offered sacrifices ; here also Abraham possibly prepared to offer Isaac. It was the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, and bought from him by David as a place of sacrifice after the plague. On it most probably stood the Altars of Burnt Offering in the three successive Jewish Temples. The site is supposed also to be that of a Temple of Jupiter built by Hadrian after his desolation of Jerusalem.

The Crusaders, who held the city for about 100 years, converted the mosque into a Christian church called *Templum Domini*, but on the recovery of the city by the Mohammedans it was restored, and has remained for 700 years a mosque or Mohammedan place of worship. As we look at its wonderful marbles, beautiful stained glass windows, Persian carpets, and glass chandeliers, we cannot help wondering whether it will ever be replaced by a fourth Jewish Temple, or, better still, a Christian cathedral, standing on the area which has been consecrated to various religious worship for at least 4,000 years.

IV.

Retracing our steps again from the Temple area, we return to the centre of the Christian quarter to visit there a building far older in parts than the Dome of the Rock, called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which for 1,500 years has by tradition been revered as the site of the Crucifixion and Entombment of our Lord. The history of it, as far as it is definitely known, can be told in a few words. When Hadrian had desolated Jerusalem in A.D. 135, he partly rebuilt it as a city called *Ælia Capitolina*. It is said he erected on one spot a Temple to the pagan deity Aphrodite. The Christians who were in Jerusalem at the time when Titus began its circumvallation in A.D. 70, bearing in mind their Lord's warning in His great prophecy in Matt. xxiv, 15-20, and Luke xxi, 20-21, fled from the city, before its complete enclosure, to Pella on the other side of the Jordan. They were allowed later to return to *Ælia Capitolina* by Hadrian. It is not at all certain, however, that they had retained, in the sixty-five years that had elapsed since the

destruction by Titus, any clear memory of the locality of the sacred places, or that they would have been able to identify them, in view of the vast destructions that had taken place under Titus and Hadrian. Neither is it certain whether the Temple to Aphrodite was erected at a place chosen by chance, or whether it was deliberately erected on the site known to be that of the Crucifixion, to annoy and insult the Christians.

Nevertheless, when, after his conversion, as already mentioned, Constantine had determined to build two churches in Jerusalem, the task of searching for the true site of the Tomb and the Cross was entrusted to Bishop Macarius. The bishop decided that the true locality was probably under the above-mentioned Temple of Aphrodite supposed to have been built by Hadrian. Constantine ordered this Temple to be pulled down, and a Jewish tomb which was found cut in the rock below was somewhat too confidently identified as the sepulchre of the Lord.

It is worthy of notice that some historians doubt whether any Temple to Aphrodite or Venus was ever erected by Hadrian on this place. Thus Dean Milman, in his book *The History of the Jews*, vol. ii, p. 327, says in a footnote: "The only indication, the Temple of Venus said to have been built by Hadrian in contempt of the Christians, I am confident is utterly unhistoric, out of character with Hadrian and his times, and perhaps the fiction which has perplexed the question for ever." This is important, in view of the much later find, as mentioned below, of a relic at the site of the Garden Tomb connected with the worship of Venus. On the other hand, Mr. C. C. Dobson, in his little book *The Empty Tomb and Risen Lord*, says, without quoting his authority, that Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) saw as a boy the clearing away of the Temple of Venus and the subsequent erection of the Church of Anastasis on the same place.

There is no valid proof, however, that these places selected by Macarius were the true sites of the great events of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.

Some might ask, how was it that the locality of these supreme events was not more carefully determined and recorded? The answer to this seems to be, that the attention of the early Christians was far more closely riveted on the fact of the Resurrection of Christ than on the mere question of locality where it occurred.

We do not even know whether the interment of the body of the Lord, after being taken from the Cross and its laying in the private tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, was a temporary expedient intended merely to tide over the Sabbath-day and Passover Feast, until a suitable permanent place could be found, or whether it was intended as the final resting-place. The whole behaviour of the disciples at the time shows that they never anticipated the Resurrection would take place at all.

V.

As far as localities were concerned, the early Christians seemed to attach more importance to the site of the Ascension than that of the entombment of Christ.

The result, however, of Macarius' decision, made more than three hundred years after the events in question, and on very slight evidence, such as the apocryphal story of the discovery of the three crosses, was that the Emperor Constantine ordered the construction of two churches on the site of this said Temple of Aphrodite.

Eusebius, commonly called the father of ecclesiastical history, in his *Life of Constantine*, gives a vague description of them, but there still exists in the Church of Santa Pudentiana, one of the oldest churches in Rome, a mosaic of the fourth or fifth century showing the general appearance of Constantine's churches. The Church of the Anastasis or Resurrection was a round church with a domed roof, and the Church of the Martyrion, 100 yards or so away, was a polygonal building also with a domed roof. Between the two was a slight rocky elevation of the ground, which was called *Mount Golgotha* or *Calvary*, though the gospel records say nothing about any *mount* or hill. It is said that there exists another mosaic in a church of Madeba, east of Jordan, in which these two churches are shown.

There are other descriptions, such as that of the Bordeaux Pilgrim who visited Jerusalem in A.D. 333, during the construction of these churches, which agree with the above statements. Eusebius took part in the services of consecration in A.D. 336. The buildings seem to have remained intact for about 300 years.

These churches were damaged in A.D. 614 by the Persians when Jerusalem was captured by them under Chosroes II, but

when the Saracen Caliph Omar took the city in A.D. 636, he treated the Christians with leniency and left these churches in their possession. In A.D. 1010 the Caliph Hakim destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and from that date the Church of the Cross seems to have disappeared.

In 1099, the Crusaders, after they gained possession of Jerusalem, rebuilt and enlarged the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to which other buildings were added from time to time. The part added by the Crusaders is known as the Catholicon or sometimes the Greek cathedral, and was formerly called the *Chorus Dominorum*. It now forms, as it were, the nave of the rotunda, and at the other end opens into the Chapel of St. Helena which is the oldest part of the whole. The Crusaders also built a large Romanesque church which served as the choir or chancel of the Holy Sepulchre Church.

In 1808, the latter part, and a great portion of the Crusaders' basilica or nave, was destroyed by fire. In 1868, Russia, Turkey, and France undertook the replacement of the old wooden dome by an iron one, and under this dome is now a quite modern marble structure or chapel called particularly the Holy Tomb. It is only about 6 or 8 feet square, and one-half is occupied by a raised marble slab or shelf.

It will be seen then that at the present day the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a conglomeration of many buildings of various ages, some parts dating back to about the seventh century and some not yet sixty years old. The complicated arrangement of the thirty to forty "holy places" within it can be best judged from a modern plan.

The impression produced upon a visitor who sees this building for the first time is that it seems a purely artificial structure, resembling a collection of Roman Catholic churches or chapels, with numerous lamps, altars, and pictures of a highly ornate modern character, and with nothing at all which is in accord with the simplicity and unadorned nature of the localities described in the gospel narratives.

VI.

All that can be said is, that this complicated church occupies the site of Constantine's buildings, and perhaps of a former Temple of Aphrodite. In spite of the fact that tradition for 1,500 years has held it to be the locality of the Crucifixion and

Resurrection, there is one great, and perhaps fatal, objection to this identification. It is beyond doubt that the Crucifixion took place outside the then walls of Jerusalem and that the tomb was close to that place.

The evidence of the New Testament writers is unquestionable on this point. St. Mark says (xv, 20, 21), "and they led Him *out* to crucify Him. And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming *out* of the country." St. Matthew says (xxvii, 32), "And as they came *out*, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name": and also (xxviii, 11), "some of the watch came *into* the city." St. John says (xix, 17-20), "He bearing His Cross *went forth* into a place . . . *nigh* to the city": also (xix, 41), "in the place where He was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre." Also, in Heb. xiii, 12, "Jesus . . . suffered *without* the gate."

These expressions, and the fact that two thieves were crucified at the same time and place, show that the place of crucifixion must have been a place of common execution outside the then wall of Jerusalem and near to some high road. It is not in the least likely that the Roman authorities, who alone could at that date inflict capital punishment, would have selected a site for it inside the city, which site would be deemed ceremonially unclean and abhorrent to the Jews.

The question of authenticity of site, therefore, all turns upon the position of the north wall of Jerusalem at the date A.D. 28-31.

The walls south, east, and west of Jerusalem all remain in substantially the same position as in the time of the Kings of Israel and Judah, and could not be otherwise on account of the position of the adjacent valleys. The north wall, however, has been changed in position at least three times.

At the time of the Kings and of Nehemiah the north wall was built due west to east from the point now the Jaffa gate to the middle point of the Temple area; this is now called the "old" wall. It ran along the present David Street. At some time between the Maccabean revolt against the Greeks in 168 B.C. and the time of Herod the Great a second or outer north wall was built, but it is not possible to fix an accurate date or position for it. Herod Agrippa built a third north wall later on, which probably coincided very nearly with the present north wall. The completion of this third wall was

stopped by the Romans, and it was not completed at the time of the siege of Titus in A.D. 70. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands nearly in the centre of the Christian quarter of Jerusalem and well inside this third and present north wall.

Comparatively recently the remains or bottom courses of a length of about 120 feet of wall, it is said, have been found running just south of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This, it is contended, would place that site outside the city wall in A.D. 29-31. Even if this were the case, it would only place the church just against, but outside, the wall, and this location would have necessitated an irregular change of direction in this second wall, which is not very probable. Colonel Conder has also shown the grave disadvantages, from a military point of view, of such a disposition of the wall. It must be remembered also that this second north wall was built 400 or 500 years before the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. If, then, there was a great irregularity of direction in that wall, the reason for it must be sought in the nature of the ground or otherwise, and not in any desire to locate the church outside the wall.

Dean Milman, in vol. ii, p. 328, of *The History of the Jews*, gives some details of the course of this second wall. He quotes Josephus as having said that the whole circuit of the city (he seems to mean by that the walls) was 33 stadia, or rather more than 4 miles, at the time of the siege of Titus. If this was in fact the circuit of the walls, then it is difficult to see how the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre could have been outside the walls of the city in any sense in which it could have been called "nigh to the city."

The consideration of these arguments has, however, led a number of writers, including some leading authorities, to reject the view that this Church of the Holy Sepulchre is on the true site of the Cross or Tomb. The important question then arises, if this is not the true site, where was that site?

VII.

For the last eighty years, or since 1849, attention has been directed to another site which has gained many strong and learned advocates. Just outside the present north wall, close to the Damascus road and not more than a few minutes' walk from the Damascus gate of Jerusalem, is a low hill, part of which is now occupied by a Mohammedan cemetery. On one side this hill

has a vertical rocky face, and a recess or shallow cave in it has been for long known as "Jeremiah's Grotto." At the foot of this cliff, and on the side towards the city, is at present a garden with an area of perhaps an acre, more or less. Now there are three remarkable things which seem to indicate this place as a very probable site of the Crucifixion. In the first place, part of this cliff when seen from the front has a most remarkable resemblance to a human skull; there are the holes forming the eye-sockets, and a broken nose and slit which resembles a mouth. When once it has been pointed out it cannot possibly be overlooked. This skull-formation is certainly not an artificial construction and not of very recent date, and *if* it has existed for 1,900 years there is nothing more likely than that a place showing such a curious characteristic would come to be called "*skull hill*," or "the place of a skull," by persons familiar with it.

It will be remembered that all four gospel writers say that the place of Crucifixion was called Golgotha or Calvary, which is by interpretation the place of a skull. St. Matthew says (xxvii, 33), "And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull . . . they crucified Him." St. Mark says (xv, 22), "And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a skull." St. Luke says (xxiii, 33), "And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary" (in Greek, *Kranion* = a skull). St. John says (xix, 17), "He bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha." There must have been, therefore, some very well-known place familiar to all inhabitants of Jerusalem by the name Golgotha. There is nothing whatever about the traditional site which in the least degree would make it deserve the name Golgotha.

Then, secondly, this "skull hill" must have been a place of common execution. There is an ancient tradition that it was called also "the place of stoning."

Early in 1882 the ruins of a monastery and church dedicated to St. Stephen were found close to this hill, and are held to be those of the church erected by Eudoxia, wife of the Emperor Theodosius, to the memory of the first Christian martyr. If this is so, then that supports the view that this hill was a place of execution. St. Stephen was stoned outside of the city (Acts vii, 58).

It has been stated that this low hill and vertical cliff is identical

with the Beth-ha-Sekelah, or House of Stoning, mentioned in the Mischna. The summit of this low hill commands a view of Jerusalem, and any crucifixions on it would be seen by all passing along the Damascus road.

Then, in third place, a rock tomb has been discovered cut into part of the vertical cliff above mentioned which opens into the garden, and is now called "The Garden Tomb." This tomb complies in a very remarkable way with the conditions mentioned in the gospels. First, this sepulchre is "nigh at hand" to the "place where He was crucified," and there is, and no doubt was, a garden adjacent (*see* John xix, 41).

If the present garden, bounded on one side by Golgotha, is over the garden of Joseph of Arimathæa, that would meet the conditions, because then nothing would be more likely than that Joseph would cut his "own new tomb" (*see* Matt. xxvii, 60) into this cliff. The Jewish tombs round Jerusalem were not dug down into the earth as a pit like our graves, but cut horizontally into a vertical cliff like a cave, and closed by placing a large stone at the entrance.

This Garden Tomb was not known to exist until 1867, when it was accidentally discovered and exposed, and it at once attracted attention from eminent authorities on Jerusalem topography, such as Colonel Conder, General Gordon, and many others. So great was the general interest that later on an influential committee was formed, and the site of the tomb and garden purchased in 1894 for £2,000, after some difficulties with the Turkish authorities. That property has been confirmed to the Trust Committee since the British occupation of Jerusalem.

The tomb is a cave cut into the limestone cliff on the north side of the garden at a distance of about 70 yards from the summit of the low hill Golgotha. It is about 7 feet 6 inches high, 14 feet 6 inches long, and 11 feet 6 inches deep. It is clearly (1) the tomb of "a rich man"; (2) it was "hewn out in the rock" (*see* Matt. xxvii, 57, 60); (3) it was "his own new tomb," prepared for the proprietor and his family, for it contains three loculi, or places for bodies, but only one has been completed and used; (4) there is provision for "a great stone" to be rolled against the entrance in the form of a mill-stone rolled in a stone trough. Those who have the necessary knowledge assert that it is a Jewish tomb of Herodian character and date, and a number are strongly of opinion it was the actual tomb in which the body of the Lord was laid.

VIII.

It is only proper to add that the identifications of Golgotha and of this tomb are not necessarily connected. Some who agree that the most probable locality of the Crucifixion was this low hill, now partly occupied by a Mohammedan cemetery, do not agree with the identification of the Garden Tomb. Colonel Conder, R.E., who is in favour of the new Golgotha, has publicly repudiated all belief in the Garden Tomb.

There is evidence that this site in the time of the Crusaders was occupied by some buildings, probably stables. One curious fact was brought to light in 1923 by excavations near the tomb made by Miss Hussey, a member of the Committee. She cleared away a quantity of rubbish, and found evidence of the above-mentioned Crusaders' buildings, but about 10 feet underground came on a carved stone shaped to represent a columbarium or dove-cot. Now, the dove was sacred in pagan mythology to Venus, otherwise Astarte or Cybele. A German professor who saw it remarked on its possible nature as part of a shrine to Cybele, and, on cleaning it, marks indicating the pillar and tree sacred to Adonis were found. It is therefore possible that this is a fragmentary remains of the true shrine of Venus, said to have been erected in the time of Hadrian over the place of the Crucifixion, and that the Temple to Aphrodite found by Bishop Macarius, which fixed the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, was another shrine, but not the one erected in the time of Hadrian.

It is however, only fair and proper to add that several authorities question the identity of this Garden Tomb with that of Christ. It has been declared by some, such as Dr. Merrill and Colonel Conder, to be a Christian tomb of much later date than the Crucifixion. The late Dr. Schick pronounced it to be a rock-cut Jewish tomb, but used subsequently for Christian burials. The arguments for and against these views are given at length in the books mentioned at the end of this paper: they are too long to repeat here in detail.

At the present time this Garden Tomb is visited annually by a large number of visitors to Jerusalem. The entrance to it is a little way up a lane turning out of the Damascus road. There is a house in the garden for the caretaker. The tomb itself is now closed with an iron door kept locked, but visitors are admitted by the caretaker. There is also a small window

closed by a wire network. On entering the tomb we find it divided into an antechamber separated by a low wall from the actual loculi. The one at the extreme left, or next the back wall, is completed, and is marked by having a recess cut out for the head. This loculus is separated from the other incompleting places by a low ridge or wall. Then outside the door there is evidence of a stone-groove in which a stone could be rolled. It was the custom of the Jews to close these rock-cut tombs by a circular stone, like a large mill-stone, which was rolled down a groove so as to block up the entrance.

The whole of the arrangements can best be understood from photographic views shown by lantern slides, some of which are my own photographs taken on the spot, and some are borrowed from a pamphlet on the Garden Tomb which is sold to visitors by the curator of the garden. (*Slides exhibited.*)

With regard to the stone closing the tomb, the expressions used by the writers in the gospel narratives, viz., "he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre" (Matt. xxvii, 60, 66) (*also* Mark xv, 46); "the angel of the Lord . . . rolled back the stone" (Matt. xxviii, 2); and the query of the women, "Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" (Mark xvi, 3, 4), are only consistent with the fact of a large circular stone being rolled down in a groove in front of the entrance. This groove was laid on the slant, so that it would be easy to roll the stone down but very difficult to roll it up again. By thongs or cords sealed to the rock-wall and to the stone, it would be readily seen if the stone had been moved at any time subsequent to the sealing.

One other fact may be mentioned, and that is that the Garden Tomb is at no greater distance from the accepted site of Pilate's Judgment Hall, which was near the Tower of Antonia, close to the Temple area, than is the traditional Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

IX.

Time will not permit us to follow out in detail the manner in which the characteristics of this Garden Tomb fit in consistently with the narration of events, as stated in the gospels, concerning the Entombment and Resurrection of the Lord and the visits of the women and disciples to it, as well as the actions of Joseph and Nicodemus at the tomb. I can only

refer you to several excellent books in which the whole of this subject has been treated with deep insight and reverent knowledge.

The first of these is a work by the Rev. Henry Latham, Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, called *The Risen Master*. He deals especially with the evidence of the grave clothes (as recorded by St. John, an eye-witness) to a supernatural Resurrection. Then there is an admirable series of lectures by the Rev. Dr. Henry Wace, a former Dean of Canterbury (and former President of this Institute), called *The Story of the Resurrection*. Next, a small but excellent book by Rev. C. C. Dobson, Vicar of St. Mary-in-the-Castle, Hastings, called *The Empty Tomb and the Risen Lord*; and finally a chapter in a book, by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, called *The Morning Lands of History*. A small pamphlet by A. W. Crawley-Boevey, revised and enlarged by Mrs. Theodore Bent and Miss Hussey, is published by the Committee of the Garden Tomb in Jerusalem, and gives full details of the site.

If these books are carefully read in connection with the statements of the Evangelists, they produce a very strong conviction that whatever may be the true site of the Crucifixion and Entombment, they are not located in the traditional Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but that the site of the Garden Tomb agrees far more nearly with the narratives of the New Testament. In addition, the ornate, rather tawdry, decorations of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, with its very numerous candles, altars and pictures, and the attempt to give a false realism by such exhibits as the silver sockets in the assumed holes in the ground for the three crosses, the stone of unction, a very modern slab of marble, the pillar of scourging, and the Chapel of the Apparition, also the artificial and modern character of the Holy Tomb itself, offends all well-informed and critical taste, and generates a sense of unreality or make-believe in the entire collection of them.

On the other hand, the quiet, natural, untouched surroundings of the Garden Tomb appeal extremely strongly to those who approach the locality with a proper sense of the reality of the incidents connected with the redemption of the world. In this quiet garden, General Gordon, when on his visits to Jerusalem, was accustomed often to rest and meditate, and countless others have found it bring home to them a keener realization of the facts and events of the Passion in a way that is quite impossible

in the fictitious atmosphere and crowds of the traditional church.

Nevertheless, prudence forbids any confident dogmatism as to the claims of any particular site to be certainly ascertained. The vast gap of time, and the immense destructions that have taken place in the interval between then and now, make it necessary to be very cautious in drawing conclusions.

Archæological research still proceeds, and at any moment may reveal things which will upset all previous theories. A visit to Jerusalem is, however, to the serious-minded traveller a most stimulating experience, and any one who wishes to profit fully by it must pay at least one unhurried visit to the Garden Tomb.

This paper was illustrated at its reading by about 30 lantern slides, most of them from photographs taken by the author.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Thirtle): I am sure we have listened with profound interest to the paper read by the honoured President of the Institute—a paper which not only records the impressions of past observers, but likewise sets forth the views and judgments of the President himself, as they grew out of a personal visit to Jerusalem, with special attention bestowed upon the Garden Tomb. There are doubtless among those who have listened some who have personally examined the site and its surroundings; and likewise others who, without such individual examination, have notwithstanding gathered opinions more or less definite from a perusal of some or all of the works which the President has mentioned. From beginning to end the paper has, I doubt not, been helpful to such as, up to the present, have been of uncertain mind in regard to the particular issue dealt with by Sir Ambrose Fleming.

Apart from that special issue, topical in its allusion, who can fail to be thankful for the study, patient and reverent, of the subject of our Lord's Resurrection, as a sublime occurrence altogether vital in its bearing upon the Christian faith, in its every element and its every aspect. There may be a type of thought which

passes by the fact that our Lord "rose again, the third day, from the dead," also a type that is indifferent to the warning which suggested the well-known words of the Apostle Paul: "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." But the mind that is in any degree submissive to Holy Scripture, and occupied with thoughts of God's movements among men, can hardly fail to have been thrilled in presence of the strong and unanswerable case for the living Christ, the risen Lord of life, as we have been privileged to gather it from Sir Ambrose's paper.

While thanking the lecturer for the study he has read in our hearing, it gives me great pleasure to move that the thanks of the meeting be accorded him for an utterance, at once cogent and valuable, and calculated greatly to enrich the body of instruction given to the world in the Transactions of the Institute.

The motion was carried with applause.

Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN, Hon. Sec. of the Palestine Exploration Fund, said: There is one fortunate thing about the subject of this paper, and that is, whatever view we take about the position of the tomb of our Lord, it has no bearing on the great fact on which we are all agreed, namely, that He did actually rise from the tomb in which His body had been laid. In the closing words of the lecturer's able and interesting paper there was a reference to what I may call the *sentiment* about the tomb. There is no question but that, to most of us here, the present surroundings of the Garden Tomb—"the quiet, natural, untouched surroundings"—appeal to us as far more in accord with the incidents of that first Easter morn than the "rather tawdry" surroundings of the traditional "Holy Sepulchre." From that point of view doubtless the tomb—now purchased through the generosity of friends—has a real use. It conveys to the visitor a setting for his imaginative reconstruction of the Bible Story. At the same time, when we mention sentiment we must think of the other side of the question.

With regard to the site of Golgotha and the tomb, no one disputes that they must have been outside the city walls of that time. Yet it is difficult to make a mental picture of the traditional site as outside the walls, because, on account of the sacredness of the

site, the Christian quarter of the city has grown around it. But archæological students—some of them also students of military history—have agreed that it is possible that the site was outside the second wall. If not, one may ask how do Jewish tombs come to lie within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? The course of the second wall is described by Josephus as running from the Gate Gennath and ending near to Antonia, *i.e.*, at the north-west corner of the Temple enclosure. Unfortunately, we do not know the site of this gate, and, that being so, we cannot say how much was enclosed within its circuit. It must, however, be admitted that the recent discovery, further north than the present northern wall, of remains of a powerful wall, which appears to be the "Third Wall" of Herod Agrippa II, raises a new difficulty.

With regard to the so-called "Skull Hill," I must mention a few points. Firstly, as to the supposed skull-like appearance of the face of the rock, it can be said with considerable certainty that this condition cannot be as ancient as is claimed. No early or even mediæval writer ever suggested that the "Place of a Skull" was a place shaped like a skull. That is quite a modern theory. The term "Place of a Skull" probably has reference to a tradition that at Golgotha the "Skull of Adam" had been found—a tradition which survives in the "Skull of Adam" which is still shown in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. There is archæological evidence that small private tombs were not provided with "rolling stones." In the vast majority of the thousands of private tombs which have been examined, the entrance was closed by a rough rock rolled against the entrance, the inner part being sometimes shaped to fit the entrance, like a cork in a bottle.

The Garden Tomb is one of a whole series of similar tombs which lie just over the circling wall, in the property of the Dominicans, and archæological authorities—Col. Conder among them—agree that, like the tombs in the adjoining property, it is a Christian, and not a Jewish, tomb at all. When first found it was not unstained by decay as some have claimed, but full of bones. Personally, I fear we shall never have a certainty about this or any other site. Possibly it is as well. With regard to the Garden Tomb, I view the arguments in its favour as so open to objection that its claim to be the "actual tomb" should be abandoned; yet, as it assists our imagination to picture the great scene of the

Passion, it must always have value to the earnest Protestant pilgrim who visits the Holy Land to realize more fully the events that occurred there.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE, from Jerusalem, thanked the lecturer for his noble defence of the truth of the literal Resurrection of Christ; he also thanked Dr. Masterman for his remarks. He agreed that Calvary and the adjoining Garden Tomb are a most strikingly suitable site for realizing the whole Gospel story of the Crucifixion, Burial, and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Some 38 years ago, on a Palm Sunday morning, he was taking a walk alone around the walls of Jerusalem, and saw the Place of a Skull; and at that time it looked more impressive even than at the present, as changes in the surroundings have taken place. He well remembered how, on the Easter Sunday afternoon, Mr. D. L. Moody, of Chicago, preached to a large gathering of Evangelical Christians on Gordon's Golgotha. Since then he had visited both the so-called Holy Sepulchre and the Garden Tomb many times, and realized how much more the latter appealed to one than the former.

It has been stated that, in the neighbourhood of the Garden Tomb, grave-stones had been found with the inscription "Buried near his Lord": these stones had been deliberately broken up by the Dominican monks, as they bore such strong evidence against the site within the city walls. A lady formerly in charge, Miss Lomax, a relative of Lord Salisbury, also said that her old Arab servant had declared that, many years ago, in excavating the very ancient cisterns, skulls had been found.

It was a great joy on Easter Sunday to attend a Resurrection service at the Garden Tomb, to take Jew and Moslem there, and tell them the story of the Risen Redeemer, also to sing the hymn beginning "Up from the grave He arose."

Lieut.-Col. HOPE BIDDULPH said: It is recorded in the Gospel by St. Matthew that the angel "rolled back the stone, and sat upon it." This would seem to cast some doubt as to the stone being one that rolled in a groove, like a large grinding-stone, but rather appears to indicate a solid block which sealed the entrance, and was rolled away outwards.

Major R. A. MARRIOTT said: I gathered that Dr. Masterman was not in favour of the Garden Tomb being the place of burial of our Lord. But in the derivation of the word Calvary, which is unknown generally, we have a striking proof, of what was claimed in the address, that the scarp of the cliff still shows its skull-like features; and that being "nigh at hand," the Garden Tomb, with all the evidences found in it, *must* be the true site of the Holy Sepulchre.

Metathesis, meaning a change in the order of the syllables of a word, is common to all languages alike, when they adopt foreign words, but the Hebrews carried this peculiarity into words of their own language. For example, the French change "*mosquito*" into "*moustique*"; the Portuguese, "*crocodile*" into "*cocodrillo*"; and with our Tommies, the "*ricochet*" in musketry becomes "*rackoshee*." Now there is a word still used in parts of Greece, *kephalári*, which is applied to the top of a hill, or a hill with a rounded top, from *kephalé* (head). The Hellenists, who came in great numbers to the Feast, brought this word with them, which the Jews turned into *kelphari*, and thus, perhaps because Golgotha involved the idea of defilement, the word Calvary was generally adopted.

This word Calvary is not to be found in the Greek Testament, but I think it was originated by Jerome, when he translated the Scriptures at Bethlehem, finding it called locally *kelphari*, Latinized it into *Calvarius*.

The recent find of an ancient wall seems to preclude the possibility of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre being the true one.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: May we not approach the question from a new angle? Let us inquire how this *intermural* place came to be regarded as a sacred church. I suggest that this church possibly occupies the site of the "large upper room." Tradition tells us that this place escaped the general destruction, in A.D. 70. Let us turn to Acts i, 12, 13, "Then returned they . . . and when they were come in, they went into the upper chamber where they were abiding" (R.V.). I doubt not that this "large upper room" became the church—the Mother Church, the scene of the wondrous Pentecost. To-day a large *lower* room is shown in another part of the city—the Cænaculum, but let us consider *this* as an alternative site.

Turn to Mark xiv, 12-16. Our Lord said: "Go into the city and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him." Let us do so in imagination. We go down the slopes of Olivet and enter the ancient gate called St. Stephen's, really the only gate on *that* side leading into the city. There has been a gate here for thousands of years, and therefore a street, so we may be sure that we are on the right road and following the two disciples (Peter and John) and the water carrier. On our left we pass the pool of water called to-day "Birket Israel," and here are entrances to the Temple. Out of the side comes our man with the pitcher of water; he may have gone to get water out of the pool, but I suggest that he has drawn water from the well in the Temple area. Remember, perhaps this is the very water later to be used to wash the disciples' feet. I may remind you that it was customary for the worshippers to enter the Temple area by going over the Tyropœon Bridge at the S.W. corner, then to cross the Court of the Gentiles, and go out by an exit at the N.W. corner. This would agree with the theory which I am now advancing. We follow the water carrier into the city—whither does this road lead? It bends round to the quarter of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

With a map before you, see how this site fits in with regard to the story of the Resurrection. The streets from the Damascus gate converge also to this place. Please turn to Acts xii. The Apostle Peter is in a prison in the citadel and Palace of Herod, which is on the other side of the city. An angel guides him out *into the city*; he passes on through one street (? the Jaffa gate street) and the angel leaves him; he has but to turn to the left and again he is at this famous site. He went to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark—some of the Church have gathered here and are having an all-night prayer-meeting in her house. The "upper room" was probably close by, if not the very same.

I therefore, and for these reasons, beg to suggest that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands really on the site of the "upper room."

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

From Sir CHARLES MARSTON: I have read with interest Sir Ambrose Fleming's paper. I have twice been to Jerusalem and

studied the claims of the Holy Sepulchre. In my opinion, Skull Hill, that is to say the site by Jeremiah's Grotto, is the probable scene of the Crucifixion.

But if it was a place of common execution and stoning, it seems unlikely that a rich man like Joseph of Arimathea would have his tomb located there. Nor would the place of common execution be also a garden. I suggest that the immediate proximity of the Tomb to the scene of the Crucifixion is an argument both against the site of the Holy Sepulchre where Golgotha is also shown, and also against the Garden Tomb.

My understanding of the narrative contained in the Gospels is that our Lord's Tomb may have been as much as 250 yards away from the actual scene of the Crucifixion; it is a matter of relativity. The late Director of Antiquities for the Palestine Government (Professor Garstang), after a long discussion on the subject of the site of the Holy Sepulchre, enables me to sum up as follows: If the present Damascus gate existed in our Lord's time, the Holy Sepulchre cannot have been outside the Wall. The Damascus gate contains Roman architecture. What is the date of it? If it is Herodian, then the site of the Holy Sepulchre cannot be genuine. But if the Roman work in the gate belongs to the time of Hadrian, then the Holy Sepulchre may be the genuine site.

Members are doubtless aware that Hadrian, about A.D. 130, infuriated at the fresh rebellion of the Jews, razed Jerusalem to the ground and rebuilt it as a Roman city under another name. I understand that the so-called "Ecce Homo" arch is a relic of the time of Hadrian.

It is thought that it would not be difficult to determine the date of the Roman work embedded in the Damascus gate, but it might involve a temporary obstruction of that thoroughfare. Until such examination has been made, my conclusions are as above.

From Rev. HAROLD C. MORTON, Ph.D.: The most interesting paper from our President commands my full agreement with respect to the Garden Tomb. I spent some time in Jerusalem last year, and gave such special attention as I could to the Garden Tomb, as also to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the more I studied the position the more convinced did I feel that the Garden Tomb satisfies all the requirements of the Gospel narratives.

One of the supreme needs, if the issue is to be finally settled, is that excavation should be carried out to discover the line of the Second Wall, the wall of our Lord's day, and the rumour that properties are being bought up in the neighbourhood of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre with the object of preventing excavation, should be indignantly negated by facilitating excavation at the earliest possible moment.

What so many regard as the almost certain site of Calvary, viz., the low hill, evidently an ancient quarry, backing the Garden toward the north, still remains a Mohammedan cemetery! I was warned not to try to enter, because the presence of a Christian upon Calvary, *after eleven years of British rule*, would quite possibly lead to riot, or at all events to violence. I commend such a position to those who never tire of talking about our "overbearing imperialism." For my own part I believe no small part of our present lamentable troubles in Palestine is due to the incomprehensible weakness of leaving the great sacred Christian and Jewish sites in Mohammedan hands when the Great War plainly destined them for restoration to their rightful guardians.

There are two things which I rather think call for reconsideration in the paper. The first is the continued identification of the high western hill of modern Jerusalem with Zion. This cannot be sustained. Zion was Mount Ophel, the Jebusite fortress between the southern end of the Tyropœon Valley and the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It seems to have been thoroughly established by excavation that the little ridge of Ophel, about 1,200 feet north to south and 150 feet east to west, was Zion.

The second point is on p. 21, viz., the statement that "the walls south, east, and west of Jerusalem all remain in substantially the same position as in the time of the Kings of Israel and Judah." But the present wall of Jerusalem runs far to the north of the wall of the time of the Kings. The ancient wall ran along the depth of the Valley of Hinnom, and is in one place standing to-day to the height of 40 feet. Excavation has revealed the old wall right along the valley. The modern wall is roughly 400 feet above the depth of the valley and runs along the edge of the height, before the tongue of land upon which the modern city stands falls away to the valley on the south.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

I should like, in the first place, to thank the Members of the Institute and the various speakers in the discussion, and especially our Chairman, for the kind reception they have given to the paper. As I said in it, I make no pretence to be able to speak with authority on the difficult archæological and topographical questions involved, and I avoided as far as possible dogmatic statements.

The contributions made, however, to the discussion have shown that the subject is one of immense interest to thoughtful minds. We are here concerned with matters of historical fact, although the power of reaching certainty as to localities may be denied to us.

The question of the identification (or possible identification) of the sites of the greatest events in the history of the world is not merely a matter of sentiment or useful imaginative setting, as some of Dr. Masterman's remarks seem to indicate, but is a call for careful weighing of the evidence for or against certain conclusions. It does not produce the same effect on the minds of serious believers in the truth of the historical statements in the Gospels when they are told that a certain place is the traditional site of one of these events, but that there is no particularly good evidence for that identification, as when forceful evidence is presented showing the high probability and consistency with facts of some other locality.

For instance, one can now visit the ruined village Bethany, and guides always show to visitors a tomb-like place asserted to be the grave from which Lazarus was called back to life. There is no evidence of any value that this is the site, whereas our feelings in viewing it would be very different if there were valid evidence for it.

It is perfectly clear that absolute certainty on the sites of the Crucifixion and Entombment of our Lord cannot be reached. Perhaps it was not intended that it should be; but at any rate this discussion has shown that those who have visited Jerusalem, such as Rev. A. W. Payne, Sir Charles Marston, and Rev. Dr. Morton, and carefully examined on the spot the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Garden Tomb and Skull Hill, incline to

the belief that the evidence for the latter is stronger than that for the traditional site.

I may say that, in all questions of ascertained topography, I willingly submit myself to the opinions of speakers such as Dr. Masterman and Dr. Morton, who have studied the questions at issue in Jerusalem itself. For most of us, however, the questions raised can only be viewed in the light of a conflict of evidence. Unquestionably the statements of the Gospel writers, who were, as St. Peter says, "eye-witnesses" of the facts, should have the proper value given to them in any discussion, as this eye-evidence is of far more weight than any traditions or mere sentiments.*

* Members of the Institute may be interested to learn that there is a Fund called "The Garden Tomb (Jerusalem) Maintenance Fund," for the preservation of the Garden Tomb—and of the "Garden of Joseph of Arimathea"—within which the rock-hewn tomb is situate, close under the hill of Calvary, or Golgotha. The Committee welcome subscriptions for the maintenance of what is believed to be the most sacred spot on earth. Communications to Lieut.-Col. C. C. Robertson, D.S.O., Hon. Secretary of The Garden Tomb Association, Benholme, Fleet, Hants.

728TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 6TH, 1930,
AT 4.30 P.M.

BENJAMIN I. GREENWOOD, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the following:— Miss Katharine R. Oke, as a Life Member; David Willoughby Lambert, Esq., M.A., as a Life Associate; and James Bruce Norris, Esq., and the Rev. George Houghton Thorne, as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. F. W. Pitt to read his paper entitled "Christ and the Scriptures. The Old Testament: The Implications" (being the Second Prize Essay, Gunning Competition, 1927).

GUNNING PRIZE.—SECOND PRIZE ESSAY, 1927.

CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES.

THE OLD TESTAMENT: THE IMPLICATIONS.

By THE REV. F. W. PITT.

IN the days of the Cæsars, before the destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jews, there existed in Palestine a Book, Jewish in its origin and scope; read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day; peculiar to the nation of Israel; believed to have come down out of Heaven from God; older than any other sacred book, and surpassing all in sublimity.

So jealous were the Jews of this Book, that to preserve the text from corruption, the letters, words, and verses were carefully counted, peculiar expressions and combinations were noted, and the very accents pointed, to ensure integrity to the meaning. There were officials specially trained to copy, teach and interpret the writings, and to guarantee safe custody.

The writing of the Book was begun by Moses about 1,500 years before our era. King David, and over a dozen prophets, priests, and unknown authors, continued the work. A most curious fact is that one author would write his portion, and nothing would be added for many years, when another would come forward and add a few chapters. Isaiah wrote sixty-six chapters, but Obadiah added only one page.

By what influence these various parts became compacted is a mystery. If the Book were only a code of laws it could be understood, but while there is in it a code of laws, and a very good code too, there is much more.

History and prophecy, poetry and philosophy were, during more than a thousand years, woven into one harmonious whole. Heroes whose fame never dims, criminals whose crimes never die, are pictured here. It is a Book of tears and laughter; a Book of God and man, of angels and devils; a stirring romance, and a register of genealogies; a Book of penal laws, and a Book of sacred songs; a Book for the learned and devout, and a Book for the wayfaring man and the fool; a Book of worship, and a Book of judgment; as marvellous in diversity as it is in unity. Sometimes it rolls like a cataract, and sometimes it sleeps like a lake. It is sweeter than honey or the honeycomb, yet "brackish with the salt of human tears." For a thousand years the story ran on, and then it suddenly stopped; no man dared to add another line.

Four hundred long and troubled years passed, and the nation became vassals to Imperial Rome. All that was left to them of the spacious days of David and Solomon was an unfulfilled promise that David's son, a greater than Solomon, would yet appear. The Jews, clinging to their Book, and, like many of ourselves, reading and believing only the parts they wished would come true, were ready to listen to anyone who brought forward a workable scheme to restore the kingdom to Israel. If it had not been for the sacred writings it is probable that the nation would have been exterminated or absorbed.

Herod the Idumæan usurped the throne of David; but if the Jews lost hope in themselves, they still had the Book. True, in many respects it had become a dead letter, strangled by commentators, made void by tradition, yet out of the jungle of confusion there gleamed the fiery eyes of promise; and "hope springs eternal in the human breast."

Great events, when they begin to come to pass, have a way

of moving rapidly. After four centuries in the slough of despond, the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali by the way of the sea beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw great light, and to them that sat in the region and shadow of death light sprang up. At least, if it was not light, it was something unprecedented. A man of Nazareth, Jesus the son of Joseph the carpenter, came forward after living unknown for thirty years. In a thousand days He achieved a fame which increases after two thousand years. Augustus and Tiberius are but moths in the candle of the Lord.

This Man, though meek and lowly in heart, was certainly not wanting in the courage of His convictions. The Jews would have been satisfied if He had rallied them to the standard of the Lion of the tribe of Judah; but He went far beyond that, and took up the whole burden of the predicted "sufferings of Christ and the Glory that should follow" as revealed in the wonderful Book.

Without hesitation, Jesus said that Moses wrote of Him (John v, 46); that a cameo of the Christ in the prophecy of Isaiah represented the day when "He went into the synagogue at Nazareth and stood up for to read" (Luke iv); David, by the Holy Ghost, "called Him Lord" (Ps. cx); Abraham rejoiced that he should see His day; the manna in the Wilderness was a type of His flesh which He gave for the life of the world (John vi); as the serpent was lifted up by Moses, so must He, the Son of Man, be lifted up (John iii); He came "not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil" (Matt. v). He focussed the Book upon Himself, so that it appeared to refer wholly to His Person and work. The Scriptures testified of Him (John v).

None of this would the Jews acknowledge, and till to-day they shut their eyes to the fact that if it had not been for Jesus their name would be but a ghost of the past, and their Book a literary curiosity, a monument of unfulfilled prediction.

It must have required a stainless sincerity to confidently stand alone in the converging beams of a thousand years of prophecy. If "the fierce light that beats upon a throne blackens every blot," how much more shall the blaze of divine revelation scorch and shrivel meditated falsehood. Every false Christ that ever appeared stood away from the glare of Holy Writ; Jesus stood, with open breast and uncovered head, in its directest rays.

No false Christ ever said anything which showed that he knew and loved the Book, but its incidents are threaded into the

discourse of Jesus like pearls upon a string of gold. He takes us into Paradise and makes us witnesses of the first wedding; we hear the blood of Abel crying for vengeance; we see Noah building his Ark, and we sail away with him while the Flood breaks loose, as it will at the coming of the Son of Man. Like Moses, we take off our shoes at the burning bush, and tremble with joy as we listen to the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." The God of the Bible of Jesus "is not the God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto Him"!

We become silent, but reverent, spectators in the Upper Room where Jesus ate the Passover that pointed back to the Exodus from Egypt. We sit at the feet of the prophets; sing the songs of Zion, weep with Jeremiah, run with Elijah to Jezreel, mount up to Heaven in the chariots of imagination, and live through the whole story of the elders who obtained a good report through faith.

It was certainly not because Jesus was unaware of the nation's cherished and unparalleled past, that He took up the challenge of history. By His words we see that He knew the Book from cover to cover, and so vividly do the pages shine that we have no difficulty in recognizing the Bible of Jesus as our Old Testament.

This Book He interpreted. Sweeping aside narrow and bigoted interpretations, Jesus breathed the spirit of life into the law, which tradition had embalmed as if it were a corpse. Except to a few pious individuals, the Bible had for centuries been an impregnable but antiquated lighthouse; Jesus installed a new light. The interpretations of the Lord Jesus would fill a volume, for they cover the whole realm of Scripture. His manner must be gleaned from "the corners of the field."

"Whatsoever ye will that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets" (Matt. vii, 12). The Jews had never dreamt of such luxury of love; they thought the law was meant to bind on the people a burden too grievous to be borne.

Twice the Lord quoted from Micah "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." The first time (Matt. ix, 13) He said it meant that He had not "come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." The second time (Matt. xii, 7), He said that if the Pharisees had known what the verse meant, they "would not have condemned the guiltless." The elicitation of this double meaning shows that Christ had a careful and penetrating view of

Scripture not obtainable by a brief glance or a passing word. "Well hath Esaias prophesied, saying 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me'" (Mark vii, 6), an interpretation of Scripture that must have stung like a whip of small cords. The Lord interpreted Isa. liii as predicting his own sufferings. After his Resurrection He reproached His disciples for not believing the Scriptures, and then interpreted the Word of God.

Christ's method of interpretation would not have been adopted by one who had any misgivings as to the authority of Scripture or of His own. There is a note of quiet, masterful confidence which does not hesitate or doubt. Christ expressed no opinions: "He spake with authority, and not as the Scribes." He never substituted His teaching for that of Scripture. He was not a reformer, cancelling antiquated formulas and advancing more progressive ideas, like a politician. "Till heaven and earth pass," He said, "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v, 18).

By authenticating the Scriptures, the Lord confirmed *their inspiration* without expressly saying they were all inspired. He did say that David spake, by the Holy Ghost; and what Moses said He described as the Word of God. But when the Lord declared, as he so variously did, the immutability of Scripture, He covered their own declarations of inspiration. He was not troubled by the difficulty that Moses wrote in Genesis the history of things that happened before the writer was born; nor does He stay to explain whether Moses collated the facts from oral traditions, which must have been well known, or whether they were given in panoramic or other direct revelations of the Holy Spirit, or whether he received them when he spake with God face to face, as a man speaketh to his own friend. In accepting and authenticating Moses, the Lord implicitly confirmed his inspiration. The more difficult it was for Moses to write of things of which he had no personal knowledge the more necessary was it for him to have been inspired in what he wrote. And as the Lord confirmed the truth of Moses He must have confirmed His inspiration, because Moses could not have written the truth without inspiration, nor have repeated the phrase, "The Lord said." We, therefore, conclude that the Scriptures the Lord declared to be the Word of God were the original inspired Scriptures of which we have translations, all the parts of which are of equal authority, and that they are true.

The *Lord's knowledge of the Scriptures* and His regard for them awakened in others such expression of astonishment that it appears as if His attitude to the Word of God was so unique as to be sensational. "Whence hath this Man this wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son?" they asked at Nazareth, after hearing Him in the Synagogue (Matt. xiii). "The Jews marvelled, saying 'How knoweth this Man learning, having never learned?' Jesus answered them, and said, 'My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of Myself'" (John vii, 15).

Here, it is evident, the Lord had been expounding the Scriptures, so that in the very shrines of Judaism, in synagogue and Temple, Jesus showed that He knew more of the Scriptures than His teachers; gave it such spiritual meaning; made it a help when the Scribes had made it a hindrance; that their jealousy was aroused, and He had to say, "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill Me?" (John vii, 19).

It was after this that a most extraordinary thing happened: "Some of them would have taken Him; but no man laid hands on Him. Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees; and they said unto them, 'Why have ye not brought Him?' The officers answered, 'Never man spake like this Man'" (John vii, 46).

Were His words like lightning that made them afraid, or did He call down the thunders of Sinai and shake the earth, or were the words sweeter than honey or the honeycomb, and they had not the heart to serve the writ? If so, they were different from the Pharisees themselves, to whom Jesus said, "Ye seek to kill Me, a Man that told the truth which I have heard of God" (John viii, 46).

As Jesus Himself accepted the judgment of the Scriptures, so He made them the judge of those who believe not: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe My words?" (John v, 47).

In this marvellous passage, the attitude of the Lord to the Scriptures is seen in the strongest light. It is almost as if Jesus said He was without credentials if Moses had not given them,

and it is quite equivalent to saying that if Jesus did not rise to the heights of Moses, He was not the Christ, for Moses wrote of the Christ.

The Scriptures are thus no longer at the bar with Christ as the Judge. Christ is at the bar with the Scriptures as judge. He accepted the verdict of Moses : " If ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words ? "

It is impossible to imagine a man being willing to stand or fall by Scripture, if he had the least doubt as to its inerrancy and infallibility. And it is impossible to concede Divinity to Christ, if He was incapable of discerning the inspiration of the authority by which He decided to support an undertaking which involved the destiny of mankind.

It is quite remarkable that the Lord charged the Jews with trusting, yet not believing, Moses. That such an attitude of mind is possible is proved by people to-day, who conform to religious rites without faith in God. It is much like saying, " O God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul ! "

To believe the Scriptures is to surrender one's own opinion and judgment to the Word of God. A man cannot be born a believer. As he grows up there comes a moment, swift or slow, in which he definitely accepts an authority outside of himself : some find that authority in the Church, and rest there. But if there was one thing upon which the Lord was insistent it was *belief in the Scriptures*, which, according to the passage under consideration is equivalent to belief in Himself.

Everywhere in the New Testament the necessity for belief is emphasized both by the Lord and His Apostles, but the remarkable thing is, that while they declare that they themselves believe, *Jesus never does*. He authenticated the Scriptures ; testified to their authority ; risked His all on their Divine inspiration ; declared that they were inviolable even to the jot and the tittle, and guaranteed their truth. Yet it may be asserted, even at the peril of being misunderstood, that *Jesus did not believe* the Scriptures ; more, it can be adduced, as an evidence of the inspiration of the New Testament, that *it never says He did, while it says everyone else did, and that He insisted that they must*. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a book dealing favourably with our subject which did not say that Jesus *believed* the Old Testament Scriptures.

We can only reply, that if our Lord believed His Bible, there must have been a time when He did not believe it. There is a

time when every man is not a believer in the Bible. He may not be an active disbeliever, but a passive non-believer. It may or may not take him years to make up his mind, but he only becomes a believer when he decides that there is sufficient ground for accepting the Scriptures as the Word of God, or when he feels shut up to the choice between that and perdition. Such a thing never took place in the case of the Lord Jesus. Man believes. Omniscience knows. Christ knew, so that we might believe.

Every reference of the Lord to Holy Writ opens up its special line of thought, showing not only diversity in unity, but resilience with inflexibility, as witness the words, "Is it not written in your law, 'I said, ye are Gods? . . . to whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken'" (John x, 34).

The portion of "the law" here referred to is Ps. lxxxii; "the Word of God" that came to Israel is the law of Moses, which the rulers had to administer, and these are described as the "Scripture which cannot be broken." With a touch as sure as it is light, the Lord in this great sentence shows the mobility and inflexibility of the Old Testament both in its whole and in its parts.

Whatever led Him to do it, whether it was the condescension of Deity or the ambition of humanity; whether He was the Truth or whether He was an impostor—Jesus Christ regarded the Scriptures as referring to Himself, and made the written Word and the Living Word stand or fall together.

Such a proceeding would have been open to suspicion if the Lord had spiritualized away, as did the Jews, the sufferings of Christ, and attempted to hasten the Glory that should follow. But He did nothing of the kind, though pressed to do so by His contemporaries when they sought to make Him a King. In claiming that He was the Christ, He accepted the fate of the Christ; not blindfolded, but with open eyes and calm deliberation, turning over, as it were, day by day the leaves of prophecy as they fell due.

In a great mystery the Lord showed that He undertook not only to explain and authenticate the Scriptures but to *fulfil them*. He magnified the law, and made it honourable by keeping it. In His life He was without sin, and was the only Man who ever lived that never transgressed the law of God.

But a broken law exacts penalties. The broken law of God demands the death of the transgressors. For thousands of years

substitutionary sacrifices were accepted by God, as satisfying justice for sins "passed over through the forbearance of God" (Rom. iii). The Lord Jesus knew this and undertook responsibility for the, as yet, unredeemed pledges, which were sealed with "the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer."

He undertook, not only Himself to keep the law unbroken, but to take up all that was due to Divine righteousness as pledged by the sacrifices of the law, and bear it in His own body of flesh through death. Such an undertaking was only possible to God manifest in the flesh, and it is here that we see in its most solemn aspect the attitude of Christ to the Scriptures. He set His face like a flint toward the Cross. Its shadow had fallen over every step of His holy path, and now that the clouds of judgment were gathering over His head, He pressed on, despising the shame.

The predictions of Scripture foretold the blood-red way down which the suffering Christ must pass through the valley of the shadow of death. With unflinching consecration to His terrible task, the Lord went forward, His devotion to the Scriptures unchanged to the end. They were as inflexible when they said He must suffer, as when they said He must be glorified.

The swelling current of prophecy was running swift when the Lord said, "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, 'The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner' . . . and when the chief priests and Pharisees heard . . . they sought to lay hands on Him." (Matt. xxi, 42; Ps. cxviii, 22, 23).

The Great Hallel may have been the Lord's morning portion that day, when He "drew nigh unto Jerusalem." A Psalm was again on His lips while Judas still remained at the supper-table on the night before Christ's death: "I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scriptures may be fulfilled, 'He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me'" (John xiii, 18; Ps. xli, 9).

When the traitor had gone his way, the Lord, as if His finger were on the plan, said: "This cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, 'They hated me without a cause'" (John xv, 25; Ps. xxxv, 19).

Had Jesus been only a man, He could not thus have taken up the clues in the labyrinth that led to Calvary without missing one, but rather looking them out, so that the Scriptures should stand, even if He must perish.

Thus, in a tense moment, when within sight of the end, and

when He might be excused if He felt it did not matter now, the Lord Jesus, His hand still on the Book said : " I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in Me, ' And He was reckoned among the transgressors ; for the things concerning Me have an end ' " (Luke xxii, 37 ; Isa. liii, 12).

When, an hour later, the Lord was taken in Gethsemane, there was an attempt at rescue. Peter's sword might have been of little use, but Jesus said : " Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels ? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be ? " (Matt. xxvi, 53). With the certainty that the armies of Heaven would have ensured His deliverance, had He so willed it, the Lord chose between the breaking of His body and the breaking of the Scriptures.

When Jesus had been on the Cross for three hours, and the cup of agony was full, the Book of the law did not depart out of His mouth, for " at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, ' My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ? ' " (Mark xv, 34 ; Ps. xxii, 1). It is said that the Lord repeated the whole of Ps. xxii while on the Cross. If so, the first words were uttered with a loud voice, while the last words, " It is finished," were scarcely breathed, and can only be faintly identified with " He hath done it," the last words of the Psalm.

There is nothing in all history like this mysterious quotation of prediction by Jesus as He fulfilled it unto death ; and though His heart and flesh were failing, it appears as if the mind of the Lord was still fixed on Scripture, for He went out with the words, " Father, into Thy hand I commit my spirit " (Luke xxiii, 46 ; Ps. xxxi, 5).

On the first day of the week the Lord Jesus rose again from the dead. The first thing He said to His disciples was " O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken : ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory ? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself " (Luke xxiv, 25-7).

There are no words that can express the devotion with which Jesus consecrated Himself to the trusts appointed in the Word. Only the absolute certainty that they were the trusts of God would have induced any man to keep them.

It is good to do good when it is pleasant. But to choose the

heaviest burden ; to be anxious that not one demand of the law should be slurred over or one sacrifice of love unpaid, this shows, not the rectitude of a legal mind ; not the appreciation of a literary expert ; but the breadth, and depth, and length, and height of the Love which passes knowledge.

The handwriting of ordinances was nailed to His Cross without erasures. The penalty exacted by Righteousness was paid in full. This is the measure of Christ's attitude to the Word of God.

The testimony of the Scriptures to Christ, as the Messiah and Son of God, is good ground for accepting Christ's testimony to the Scriptures, as the true and inspired and infallible Word of God. If, however, as some think, it is proved that the Lord compromised with falsehood, either in history or science, the proper thing to do is to reject His claim to be the Christ of the Scriptures ; instead of which, some of the most devoted in their allegiance to Christ are those who hold the most pronounced views against the Scriptures. This would be reasonable if Christ were only a man who " wore the white flower of a blameless life," and, though His supremacy condemns us all, He is the pride of humanity and the idol of a Christendom that denies His Deity.

But there are also some who admit the Deity of Christ, and are perplexed by the fact that He gave His and God's imprimatur to a " bookful of errors." For Jesus did not guarantee the Scriptures on His own responsibility alone, He committed God to them : " The Word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me " (John xiv, 24). Because of this, attempts are made to retain the Christ of the Scriptures and reject the Scriptures of Christ. This is as impossible as it would be to remove the dome of St. Paul's and leave the cross where it stands.

There are two methods articulated for the purpose of explaining away Christ's attitude to the Scriptures : one suggests that the Lord accommodated Himself to the current error of the day ; the other tries to prove that His knowledge was limited by the necessities of the Incarnation.

The accommodation theory is not supported by any proof-texts. It just cannot accept as true such stories as the Flood, the passage of the Red Sea, and Jonah and the whale—all singularly enough connected with water, but considered as incapable of " holding water."

The Kenosis theory, like the accommodation theory, is valuable as corroborative evidence of Christ's emphatic confirmation of the Scriptures. Satan attacked Christ, who turned the attack from Himself to the Scriptures. The Kenosis attacks the Scriptures, and refuses to allow the attack to be diverted to Christ. It determines to have the Christ of the Scriptures without having the Scriptures of Christ. This, again, violates the inductive principle by building the evidence on the verdict, instead of building the verdict on the evidence; which is exactly what Judge Jeffreys is said to have done at his "Bloody Assize."

Being *unable* to deny that Christ authenticated records incredible to modern criticism, and being *unwilling* to deny His divinity, the Kenosis theory finds a way out of the difficulty by assuming that the knowledge of Jesus was limited by the necessities of His Incarnation. To support the assumption, Phil. ii, 7, is advanced as a proof-text; and Mark xiii, 32, is cited as the Lord's own admission, that there was one thing which He did not know. Neither of the passages has any direct reference to the inspiration of Scripture, but it is suggested that if the Lord's knowledge was limited in one instance, it is legitimate to infer that it was so in others.

A man might say he did not know the time, but it would not prove that, with a watch in his pocket, he could not tell the time. The frank statement by the Lord that, concerning a certain day and hour, "knoweth no man, neither the angels, no, nor the Son," conveys no more admission of inability to know than that a man's confession that he did not know the time conveys the idea that he was incapable of telling the time. Christ's statement, therefore, that there was something concerning a certain day and hour which the Son of Man did not know, is no proof that His knowledge was limited, for He said the Father did know. He also said, "I and the Father are One." Besides, it would be a very peculiar limitation of knowledge, to give with the same breath a detailed prediction of events that cover centuries, and exclude only a possibly alterable day and hour at which those events would commence.

The least that can be said is, that the Lord was not declaring His inability to authenticate the Scriptures, but was urging the necessity of being ready for a climax which might come at an unexpected moment. And the most that can be said in support of the view, that Christ owned to limited knowledge, is that only one text can be manipulated in favour of a verdict, pronounced

beforehand, on a subject to which the text bears no relation.

What the Lord said concerning the day and hour of the Advent is evidence that, if He was only a man, He was unlike every other man that ever lived. Most men would have suppressed their ignorance of an unimportant detail, for fear of awakening suspicion of greater and more vital utterances. Some men would have filled up the gap from the reserves of imagination; others would have hesitated to prophesy far-future events at all, if they were conscious of limited knowledge. But the Lord was sublimely confident, and said: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." With that solemn affirmation still ringing in the ears of His disciples, He added: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

He could not have intended that His statement should be construed as meaning that His knowledge of the Old Testament was defective. It might as properly be maintained that He was confessing that He did not know His own Mother. Besides, He knew also, that men and the angels did not know and that the Father did know. How was that possible if His knowledge was limited? If he was only a man, other men would know what He knew, as well as He knew what they knew.

But only if we claim that our knowledge is greater than Christ's is it compulsory that we should explain words which He left unexplained. It is sufficient for our present purpose to prove that they do not disqualify the Lord's imprimatur on the Old Testament.

There the matter might rest, if it were not for Phil. ii, 7, which declares that Christ Jesus "emptied himself," some say "of His knowledge" and others "of His glory"; and while the latter are endeavouring to answer one error by another, the clash of conflict obscures the fact that the Scriptures give no support to either addition to the text. "We beheld His glory," says the Apostle, "the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth"; and if that were not sufficient, he says later: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee and manifested forth His glory." The Lord evidently did not empty Himself of His Glory, for He was full of it, and on occasion manifested it.

True, the Lord prayed that His Father would "glorify Him with the glory He had with Him before the world was," but

that refers to merging His manhood in the glory of His Godhood after His Death and Resurrection, in the manner of the rehearsal on the mount of Transfiguration. So that, as the Lord did not empty Himself of His Glory, the suggestion that He did so is no answer to the assertion that He emptied Himself of His knowledge.

The only reply to the latter, is that the passage does not say the Lord emptied Himself of His knowledge or of anything. It says, "He emptied Himself." The context shows that this means, that being originally in the form of God, He was made in the likeness of men. God became Man without ceasing to be God. It was not a Person emptying Himself of an attribute, but the same Person passing from one state to another.

Christ Jesus was as much God the Son in the days of His flesh as He was before the world was made: "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not." "I and the Father are One," He said, and "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

How could Christ have emptied Himself of His knowledge if He still knew the mysterious relationship of the Father and the Son? But the Kenosis only requires for its purpose that Jesus emptied Himself of the knowledge of a particular day and hour. Did He retain all His knowledge except that? The disciples confessed that they had heard enough to warrant them in saying "Thou knowest all things," as it was expected that the Christ should; for the woman of Samaria said, "When Messiah cometh He will tell us all things." Jesus tacitly admitted this when he answered, "I that speak unto thee am He." And He did not add that the woman had over-estimated Him, and that He had emptied Himself of His knowledge. Quite the contrary, for the woman left her water-pot and went to her friends, exclaiming, "Come, see a man that told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?"

Even if Phil. ii, 7, really said that Jesus emptied Himself of *any* knowledge, evidence that He had done so could only be found in His admission that He knew not a certain day and hour, *if it could be determined that He once knew it, but had surrendered that one item when He came into this world.* And then we should be left wondering why He had surrendered it, and how He knew of the glory He had with the Father before the world was; and many other things.

But it is more difficult to deal with those who reject the

Kenosis doctrine than with those who accept it, for they seldom, if ever, believe that the Babe on His Virgin Mother's bosom retained the knowledge of His glorious past. "He grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man," is interpreted as meaning, that in spite of the denial that Jesus emptied Himself of His knowledge, there was a period during which that knowledge was inaccessible to Him, and there must have been a moment when it dawned upon Him that He was the eternal God.

Was it by an accident that He discovered that He possessed supernatural powers? He raised the dead and fed the multitudes, stilled the sea, healed the sick, and did other marvellous things. If the Lord had emptied Himself of the knowledge of His Deity, He must have been as surprised as the spectators to find that nature, and life, and death responded to His lightest touch.

Assuming that He grew up like any other child with His mighty pre-existence a blank through His having emptied Himself temporarily of His knowledge; at what time, and in what circumstances, did it all come back to Him? It was not hidden from Him during His ministry, for He was aware of "the glory He had with the Father before the world was."

Did the Lord Jesus in the lowly cottage at Nazareth pore over the Scriptures with the interest common to lads brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? If He had no knowledge of His divine origin, the Book of the Law would, in those early days, have been just what it was to any other child, sacred, indeed, and by repute the Word of God; but with His own past knowledge an impenetrable void, He must have traced the Scriptures out, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. With exceptional precocity He might have attained a superhuman familiarity with the Law and the Prophets, and learned more than all His teachers, but such an attainment would be exactly that admitted by the Kenosis theory, and no more.

To give divine authority to the Scriptures, the Lord, if ever He lost it, must have awakened to the fact of His pre-existence and Deity. He must have discovered Himself. When and how did that take place? Did it break in upon Him as He studied the Scriptures, which prophesied the birth of Messiah at Bethlehem? Did He say, "That is a remarkable coincidence, for I was born at Bethlehem?" With this thought lingering in

His mind, did He read that the Christ should be a son of David, of the tribe of Judah, and link up the predictions one after another till He exclaimed, "I must be the Christ of God"; saying, like Philip, "I have found Him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write, 'Jesus of Nazareth the Son of Joseph'?"

If the Kenosis theory or any theory proved that at any time Jesus was without knowledge of His goings forth of old, even from everlasting, the day must have dawned when He regained that knowledge. Some think it was when He was baptized of John in Jordan. But Jesus went there, knowing that John was sent before Him to herald His coming, and he expressed no surprise that a Voice from Heaven said, "This is my beloved Son." Had that been the first intimation of His Deity, it would have been like a thunderclap, and Jesus would have been hard pressed to live up to the call after spending thirty years in ignorance of His Deity. Besides, at the age of twelve, Jesus had at least an idea that God was His Father; though that, if it were all, would prove nothing, for a man might call God his Father without claiming to be divine.

We must therefore, without prejudice to its implications, judge whether the Kenosis is true or false. If it is true, and the Lord acquired His knowledge of the Scriptures by learning, then His authorization of them was purely human, and therefore fallible. The purpose of the Kenosis is thus attained. It is no use to say that His matured experience confirmed His early instinct for truth. We can only accept His imprimatur of the Scriptures, if He gave it, as One who knew by Divine Omniscience, and not by acquired knowledge, that the word was inviolable. This, of course, is the point at issue.

The Kenosis prejudices itself from the outset, by the evident intention it reveals to cancel the Lord's authority. Finding that Scripture nowhere states definitely that the Lord was liable to error, it synthetizes its theory by two fragments of inference which in their context contain no words bearing on the question involved. To make up for this lack, words are interpolated into the passage in Philippians which gives its name to the theory. "He emptied Himself" is rendered "He emptied Himself of His knowledge."

An interpretation is thus made to take the place of a Scripture. The context being ignored, which is that "originally subsisting in the form of God, he emptied Himself" (made

Himself of no reputation) and "took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." This surely did not necessitate giving up His knowledge; at any rate, it does not say He did so, but only that He changed His form. He became a Man, and was at one and the same time both Man and God. Everything the Lord said of Himself accords with this view. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"; "I and the Father are One." His consciousness of Deity is expressed in the clearest terms, and it was in His relationship to the Father, that He spake the Word of God: "As My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things" (John viii, 28, etc.)—a divine co-operation of revelation.

And if this co-operation were not in abeyance, as it could not have been, when Jesus said, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the angels, neither the Son, but the Father," He must have said what the Father and the Son agreed must be said.

There may be some explanation of the text beyond finite knowledge, but the fact that it is recorded that the Lord said the words, is evidence that in His wisdom He made a statement which might be misinterpreted, but which to Him did not clash with a series of revelations in the same discourse, concerning things to come, which, from their magnitude, showed that His knowledge comprised future events known only to God.

It would be much more reasonable to say that the Lord's affirmation of the limitless things He did know proved that He *did not* empty Himself of His knowledge, than that His admission that He did not know one tiny fragment proved that He *did* empty Himself of His knowledge. At the most it would prove that He emptied Himself only of the knowledge of one moment of time; an absurd conclusion.

In facing the implications with confidence, we are bound to assume that Christ never laid aside His Deity or ceased from knowledge, but that He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

From the memory of our own dawning intellect we are eager to recognize a parallel with the Lord's; but the cases are really quite different, for we cannot possibly realize a past which was greater than the present, for it does not exist with us. Behind us is an impenetrable blank as impenetrable as the future. But Christ from the valley of His humiliation looked backward and forward to the mountains of eternity.

It is difficult to explain the inscrutable, but in passing from the Form of God to the Form of Man, the Lord's consciousness of His Deity and of His manhood may have been, during the process, suspended, as it would be when Jesus slept. Memory vanishes at the approach of sleep, but it is there all the time, ready to function when we awake. We do not, during slumber, surrender our ability to speak our native language when we wake. So that if the Lord was unconscious in His mother's womb—which there is no absolute reason to assume—when His human faculties developed, His Divine personality would assert itself unchanged, unless in becoming man He ceased to be God.

The Lord's authorization of the Scriptures depends on whether He was Very God of Very God, or whether He was only a highly endowed human being. In the latter case, it is a question of man against man, and Christ ceases to be the final authority on the Inspiration of the Scriptures.

But if, as we have sought to prove, He was God manifest in the flesh, then His authorization of Scripture admits of no appeal. The Law and the Prophets and the Psalms are the Word of God, infallible and true. Inspired of God and "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," and "able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

On the call of the CHAIRMAN, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the Lecturer.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I consider we have listened to a very able address on a most important subject. I quite agree with the Lecturer that it is entirely out of place to speak of Christ "believing" the Scriptures. The Bible is not only the Word of God, and the Sword of the *Spirit*; but it is also the Word of Christ! so that it is incongruous to speak of Christ "believing" the Scriptures which were inspired by His Own Spirit.

As to the reference to Phil. ii, 7, on p. 50, it is just possible that but for the faulty rendering of the latter part of that verse in our Authorized Version, and the word rendered "emptied" in the first

line of the verse in the Revised Version, the difficulty referred to might never have arisen. For, whatever the limitation of our Blessed Lord involved, the Holy Spirit has made it abundantly clear, as shown in the Revised Version of this verse, that this particular passage refers—not so much to anything that Christ may have given up; but rather to the fact that His humiliation implied his taking up of something which He had not before by “*taking upon Him* the form of a Servant, and being made in the likeness of men” (R.V.).

During the late war two men were conscripted—an employer and his employee. Both were placed in the same section of the army; but, by a strange coincidence, the employee became a captain and the employer a common soldier. In other words, the master became a servant; he changed his position, but otherwise he was essentially the same man as before.

So with our Lord, who, in wondrous condescension, became the Servant, and acted as such; yet throughout it all, remained, as indeed He definitely claimed ever to be, the great “I AM”—John viii, 58.

As to that even more difficult verse, Mark xiii, 32, referred to on p. 49. Here again the trouble has been caused by the translation in our English version, which reads:—“Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” The late Archbishop Trench, who was regarded as one of our greatest authorities on words, called attention to the fact that the word “but” in that verse is represented in the original by two Greek words *ei mē*, which mean “if not”; and it is not a little remarkable that we have those two same Greek words in another verse (John ix, 33) with a similar thought; but there the words (*ei mē*) are correctly translated “if not,” thus:—“If (*ei*) this man were *not* (*mē*) of God, He could do nothing.” So that, as Archbishop Trench showed, literally translated, Mark xiii, 32, should read:—“Neither the Son, IF NOT the Father”! In other words, if “I and the Father were not one, even I should not know.” But in view of Christ’s positive statement “I and My Father are One” (John x, 30) the undoubted implication is that, unlike angels and all mere men, who did *not* know, He, being the God-man, *did* know! Hence, the actual words used here by our Lord, instead of being

a confession that His knowledge was limited, are, in reality, a declaration of His omniscience, since He claimed in this very passage to be One with the Father, and, as such, to know all things.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : Mr. Pitt devotes his last eight pages to a not altogether conclusive discussion of certain "proof texts." Should we not, however, endeavour so to frame our arguments as to appeal to those for whom "proof texts" have so little value ? The following line of argument is suggested to that end.

Our Lord's knowledge and teaching are commonly divided into two categories—theoretical and ethical. His "ethical" teaching is often acclaimed with an enthusiasm which appears to be a kind of "set off" against the doubts thrown upon His "theoretical" teaching. But we must ask whether the conflicting view of the nature of the Old Testament have not implications extending beyond the purely theoretical realm ? They involve fundamentally different conceptions of the methods by which God has revealed Himself. Can there be no difference in their moral and spiritual value ? It would not be difficult to show that in the view of advocates of the new conception it is morally superior to the old or "evangelical" view, and more in conformity with the character of God. But if this be so, either our Lord's moral intuitions were at fault, or He deliberately encouraged men to hold what He knew to be unworthy views of the ways of His heavenly Father.

It is difficult to see how either of these alternatives can be reconciled with anything that can reasonably be called "Christianity."

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : We have had a magnificent paper and I join in thanking the Lecturer for it. As regards the difficult passage Mark xiii, 32, I have long felt, with Ambrose of old, that the words "Neither the Son" were interpolated. The parallel passage in Matt. xxiv, 36, led him to take that view. I think that we now know the author of those last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel, and the hand that added them possibly added also this early gloss which has got incorporated into the text.

To me it is difficult even to tolerate a discussion of the *Kenosis* theory. Surely the greatest miracle of the ages past and the greatest that can ever be to come is the Incarnation. We *believe* it, but we cannot *explain* it. When we try to "think it out," we feel our

finiteness and we realize that we are plunging beyond our depth. This is one of the things that even the angels desire to look into. We finite mortals cannot hope to understand it, God only knows. To understand it we must be equal with the Deity. Sometimes "in seasons of fine weather" we get glimpses—a revelation like the annual parallax of the astronomers as we see it from new or different angles. I can recall three such. Once the words of Matt. i, 20, "Conceived in her of the Holy Ghost," came like an illuminating ray into my mind. At another time the study of our Lord's Baptism. I saw in my mind the manifestation of the Trinity; the Incarnate One coming up out of the waters; the Emblem of the Holy Ghost descending upon Him, and heard the Father's voice saying, "This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." What a glorious vision of the Unity of the ever-Blessed Trinity! Our great difficulty seems to be to imagine a "localized Omnipresence." Num. vii, 89, has helped me. Moses went into the Tent of the Assembly to *speak with* God, but there in the presence of the shekinah glory God *spoke to* him; the Voice spoke from off the Mercy-Seat. Was not our Lord just that? Omnipresent and yet localized? "The Word" that once said "Let there be light," men now beheld in flesh-incarnate. I find it distasteful to hear people ask, "When did our Lord realize His Deity?" He never ceased to know it, and when I say that, I do not forget the mysterious moment when He cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken Me?" As a babe He was all that perfect babe should be. As a boy, a perfect boy. As a youth His Father's business was His life's work. He grew in stature, and showed wisdom suitable to His age and did not assume more than was suitable to His age, but was meek and lowly all His life. As a man, He was all that perfect wisdom made Him. He took upon Himself the bodily limitations of His incarnation, and that without ceasing to be the One upon whose shoulders was the government of the Universe. All speculation about the Union of the divine and the human are beyond us. Why should we injure ourselves in our vain attempts to solve that mystery of mysteries? Let the tragedy of Arius be a warning. Let us wait for its explanation in Eternity. To-day let us rejoice in the fact that for our sakes, and our Salvation He, the Eternal Son, became man, the Incarnate God.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : From the point of view of the title of the paper, Mr. Pitt has presented a cogent and lucid argument. It is proper to speak with caution on the profound matters arising in the lecture. On p. 47 reference is made to the supposed repetition of Ps. xxii on the Cross, and it is said that the first words were uttered with a loud voice, while the last words " It is finished " were scarcely breathed. A comparison of the recorded descriptions given in Matthew, Mark and Luke, with John's account, seems to indicate that the words " It is finished " were uttered with a loud voice, as a great triumphant shout. On p. 48 Mr. Pitt says that Jesus committed God to the Scriptures, and quotes in support of this view the sentence, " The Word, which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me." This is scarcely accurate, as the quotation refers, not to the Scriptures, but to the utterances which were then being made by Christ.

In approaching the difficult words of Mark xiii, 32, we are faced with the mystery of the God-man, and the words which Christ spoke should ever be recollected in this connection, namely, " No man knoweth the Son save the Father " (Matt. xi, 27). Many theologians have stumbled and fallen because they have endeavoured to compass the Person of Christ, Who is beyond the mind of man fully to explain as the last quoted words clearly show. It is, however, enlightening to compare what the Lord Jesus said in Acts i, 7, after His resurrection, " It is not for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in His own power." The argument used by the Lecturer in his illustration of the watch appears to me to considerably weaken his case, although the rest of the argument about the things Christ declared He did know is very forceful.

Mr. Pitt raises the question, in conclusion, of the Lord " in His Mother's womb " a subject on which the Scripture is silent. But there is light given on the Incarnation in the Messianic Psalm, which says :—" But Thou art He that took Me out of the womb. Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my Mother's breasts. I was cast upon Thee from the womb. Thou art My God from My mother's belly " (Ps. xxii, 9, 10).

Mr. HOSTE said : While thanking Mr. Pitt most heartily for his valuable paper, I venture to suggest, with reference to the much-

discussed verse, Mark xiii, 32, which seemed to be a favourite verse of those who desired to belittle our Saviour, that our Lord, in including even Himself among those who did not know the exact hour of His coming in glory, was not contrasting Himself with God, for He was Himself in the Unity of the Godhead, and still less was He speaking as some Human Christ, bereft of His Deity, as if such a condition could exist in the experience of a Divine Person, but as the Son, the Second Personal Subsistence in the Godhead, and contrasting what belonged to Him as such, in functions undertaken and exercised, with those of the Father. No one can deny that such differences exist in Divine Relations. The Father does what is proper to Himself, He fore-ordains, predestinates, chooses, determines the "times and seasons," and the hour at which His purposes shall be carried out. He sends forth the Son to carry them out, and He in His turn does so by the agency and power of the Holy Spirit. These functions cannot be interchanged or reversed.

Even after the resurrection, when the apostles enquired "Wilt Thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?" the Lord did not undertake to satisfy their desire for information, but assured them that the Father had the matter in hand. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i, 7), and it is His prerogative to settle such. Would not the fact that the Holy Spirit is not excepted here and must be included in the phrase, "No one knoweth," prove that the verse has nothing to do with some hypothetical "kenosis" imposed on the Lord as the result of Incarnation? Certainly one has never heard the omniscience of the Holy Spirit impugned from this verse, which ought logically to be, were the premise correct. As this is a unique case of our Lord's confessing a lack of knowledge, to argue from it in favour of His being emptied of his omniscience would be like saying that a successful climber of Mt. Everest had failed to take the last half dozen steps because since coming to India he had become a victim of *locomotor ataxia*.

As for the Philippian passage, the teaching is not primarily doctrinal, but ethical. What Christ did is binding on us, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (v. 5). If the words "He emptied Himself" or "He made Himself of no reputation" (v. 7) meant that He lost what He knew and became void of

His Divine knowledge and power, for that is how His critics insist on understanding the passage for Him, why do they not do the same ?

Have we ever heard of their trying to become weak and ignorant ? Do they even lay aside the letters after their names ? I never heard of it. Rather they appear to attach much importance to these credentials of scholarship, even though sometimes honorary. Really the whole conception is a misunderstanding of the passage and of what the position of servant entails. A servant does not forget all her recipes and skill in order to serve, but uses them for her mistress. Otherwise she would get notice speedily. Surely the passage only means that as the Lord laid aside the outward insignia of His glory, and took the position of a servant of the Father in the likeness of a simple man, so we, if we have, or fancy we have, any claims to consideration or preferential treatment on the score of learning, wealth, title, or birth, should take a humble place and let others find it out, if they care to.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Very little that has been said does anything but support my arguments, and I am therefore in the happy position of having only to thank those who have spoken. I think, however, the Chairman is mistaken in contending that there is no difference between knowing and believing. Paul's words, which he quoted, do not help him, for the apostle says : " I *know* whom I *have* believed." Surely Paul might have known Him without believing Him, and he might have believed Him without knowing Him. If a man told me he had a five-pound note in his pocket, he would know and I must believe. But if he told me I had a five-pound note in my pocket I should know I hadn't, and whether he believed or not he would not know.

Some of my arguments may seem rather ineffective owing to abridgment. The essay in its entirety is three times as long as the paper which I read.

729TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 20TH, 1930.
AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., LL.M., 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 the Rev. William Crowe as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., to read his paper on "Scientific Discoveries and their bearing on the Biblical Account of the Noachian Deluge" (being the Langhorne Orchard Prize Essay, 1929).

*SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES AND THEIR BEARING
ON THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNT OF THE NOACHIAN
DELUGE.*

By LIEUT.-COL. L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

1.—INTRODUCTION: THE FORETOLD PREJUDICE.

"There shall come in the last days scoffers, . . . saying . . . 'All things continue as from the beginning of the creation' . . . For this they willingly are ignorant of, that . . . of old . . . the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished."—(2 Pet. iii, 3-6.)

"To this theory" (the theory of Uniformity in all things), "I have always seen very great objections."—(Sir Joseph Prestwich.)

THE question as to whether we possess scientific confirmations of the Biblical Deluge is primarily one for geologists to decide; and it must be admitted that the great majority of geologists to-day would answer the question emphatically in the negative. We must remember, however, that this very negation, *also its philosophic basis*, was definitely foretold in Scripture some eighteen centuries ago, which tends to rob that

negation of some of its weight; and it is also a fact that some geologists have been convinced that the clearest evidences do exist of a comparatively recent and vast diluvial catastrophe, which may be the one referred to in Scripture.

Among these geologists we may mention in particular Sir J. W. Dawson, a former President of the British Association; the 8th Duke of Argyll, a former President of the Geological Society of Edinburgh; Sir Joseph Prestwich, an undoubted authority on Pleistocene deposits; Dr. G. F. Wright, an expert who, as Sir Arthur Keith reminds us, gave a lifetime to the study of glacial phenomena; and Sir H. H. Howorth, a geologist who wrote more vigorously on the subject of the Flood than, perhaps, any other, publishing his views in the leading geological journals of the day, writing bulky monographs on the subject, and openly charging his opponents with failing to face some of the most significant of his facts, or to account for them satisfactorily on any other theory than that of a Deluge.

Here, then, we come face to face with a circumstance which cannot be ignored in dealing with this subject—namely, the existence of a marked *prejudice* against the acceptance of belief in a cataclysm like the Deluge. Now we should remember that, up to a hundred years ago, such a prejudice did not exist—as a general one, at least. Belief in the Deluge of Noah was axiomatic, not only in the Church itself (both Catholic and Protestant) but in the scientific world as well. And yet the Bible stood committed to the prophecy that, in what it calls the “last days,” a very different philosophy would be found to be in the ascendant; a philosophy which would lead men to regard belief in the Flood with disfavour, and treat it as disproved, declaring that “All things continue as from the beginning of the creation” (2 Pet. iii, 3-6). In other words, a doctrine of Uniformity in all things (a doctrine which the apostle obviously regarded as untrue to fact) was to replace belief in such cataclysms as the Deluge.

It is striking, therefore, to note how this prophecy has been fulfilled *within the last century*; for the last eighty years or so have witnessed the complete supersession of the “catastrophism” of Cuvier and his successors by the Uniformitarian doctrine of Hutton, Lyell and the modern school. It also seems unquestionable that this modern doctrine of Uniformity, or Continuity as it is sometimes called, was EXACTLY summed up by St. Peter when he foretold the rise of a belief that “All things continue as from the beginning of the creation”; for it is, to

borrow Sir Archibald Geikie's words, "a fundamental feature in Hutton's philosophy that the present affords the key to the past, and that we are not at liberty to imagine new causes of change when those seem insufficient which occur in our experience." Thus we see how, even when the evidence seems to demand the recognition of abnormal events in the past, the Uniformitarian is "not at liberty" to admit the force of the facts, but is compelled by his philosophy to abide by the pure assumption that "the present affords the key to the past"; in other words, that "All things continue as from the beginning of the creation." And so, after eighteen centuries, we at last find the ancient prophecy fulfilled before our eyes; *for here is, as foretold, where opposition to belief in the Flood lies to-day.* There is no mistaking the fact. It stares us in the face. Anyone, to-day, who argues in favour of belief in the Flood, at once encounters opposition upon these long-foretold lines.

Having noted the existence of this prejudice, however, we will now proceed to examine some of the facts appealed to by the above-named five geologists.

2.—PROOFS OF CONTEMPORANEITY: THE MAMMOTH AND THE FLOOD.

"Sir H. Howorth's arguments from the presence of herds of mammoths, etc., in places where they must have been overwhelmed by a sudden catastrophe, have always seemed to me very strong, and have never been answered by 'orthodox' geology."—Prof. A. H. Sayce (letter to Prof. G. McCready Price).

One of the hardest things to prove, in geology, is the fact of contemporaneity; *i.e.*, that geographically separated deposits were laid down at the same time. It is obvious that this difficulty must be found in its most acute form when we attempt to refer well-separated sediments to a single, widespread and very brief event like the Deluge described in Scripture, the climax of which lasted only a few months. Granted a prejudice, therefore, against admitting the fact of the Deluge, nothing is easier than to throw suspicion upon data which seem to support belief in it, by suggesting that such data are not the results of one general catastrophe, but of numerous minor and local events, well-separated in time, and implying no break in the general continuity of slow cosmic changes. In many cases, too, the objection is probably well grounded. It is by no means easy for the

collector of facts, when he appreciates the difficulties of the problem, to be sure that he can distinguish the traces of the Flood from those of other events.

It seems to have been a true instinct, therefore, which led Sir Henry Howorth to commence his arguments in support of belief in a general Deluge by appealing to the facts regarding the Siberian Mammoth. Here we have a class of circumstances which will repay close attention.

* * * *

All over northern Asia, from the Obi River on the west to Behring Straits on the east (a distance of over 2,500 miles), the remains of an extinct species of elephant (*Elephas primigenius*, Blumenbach 1803, popularly known as the mammoth, and distinguished by its highly specialised teeth and remarkable covering of hair) are found buried deep in the permanently frozen soil. Often they are found intact, complete with skin and hair, showing that they were buried *and frozen* before their bodies had time to decompose. Sometimes complete skeletons or whole carcasses of these great beasts are found standing erect, indicating that they were overwhelmed abruptly by the sediments which now cover them. They are also often found collected in vast herds representing every age, from adult to infant, and associated with innumerable remains of other animals, such as the "woolly rhinoceros" (*R. tichorinus*), the great extinct ox (*Bos primigenius*), the bison, musk sheep, horse, and many other forms both living and extinct.

What is still more remarkable is, that the mammoth and other remains become more numerous as we go further north; the greatest numbers of all being found in the islands of the Arctic Sea, to the north of Asia. The mammoths buried in those islands are distinguished, on the whole, from those of the mainland, by being of lighter build, with much lighter tusks.

Buried in the same deposits with the mammoths and their companions are often found great masses of trees, branches, leaves, etc. Much of this wood has apparently been transported from the south; but a great deal of it obviously grew on the spot, although nothing but hardy mosses or stunted bushes can live in those localities now. It seems that the indigenous fossil timber can be distinguished from the transported specimens by possessing narrower annual rings of growth.

How are we to explain such facts as these? The fact that

the mammoths and their companions are so perfectly preserved indicates that they could not have been transported far ; in other words, as Flower and Lydekker admit, they must have lived in the general locality in which they are found. This is further supported by the consideration that, had they been transported from the south, we would find their remains becoming more numerous toward the south ; whereas the reverse is the case. Local indications also bear this out, for, as we have seen, the most northern specimens are varietally distinct from those found on the continent.

It is only too obvious, however, that such immense mixed herds of animals could never subsist in the same regions to-day, even if they could survive the intense present cold. There would not be enough food to support them. Nor could an animal like the mammoth live on the only *kind* of food that is now found over great stretches of the tundra, where its remains are buried, but where hardly any vegetation but mosses and a few humble flowers can exist to-day. Elephants, however hardy, cannot graze close to the ground like sheep or oxen. The teeth of the mammoth, indeed, witness to the fact that its diet must have been very different from anything now growing where many of its remains are found. Its molar teeth, exhibiting an exceptional number of transverse plates, remind one of the molar teeth of the existing Indian elephant, which exhibit more transverse plates than are found in the teeth of the African elephant, and adapt it, as Falconer has shown, to a more woody and less succulent diet than that upon which the African species normally subsists. The mammoth must have required a more woody diet than now exists where its remains are found, and where even the humble plant life which does exist is often covered deep in snow during the greater part of the year. It seems clear that the fossil wood buried with the mammoth and his companions, much of it rooted and erect *in situ*, obviously indigenous, and distinguishable from drifted masses, must represent the true food of the mammoth, and show us what grew on the spot when he was alive.

This, then, indicates a considerable change in climate since the days when the mammoth and his contemporaries roamed over northern Siberia. The necessity of believing in this change has, indeed, been admitted by many Uniformitarians themselves ; although some, like Osborn, try to argue that no change is really proved, since the teeth and stomachs of certain

mammoths which have been found contain remains of plants of similar species to those existing in the same regions to-day. Such people ignore the fact that the relatively few and stunted bushes, which now exist, could never have supported the great herds of animals whose remains we find entombed; and that, buried with those herds, are the remains of the forests in which they lived. The survival of impoverished representatives of species in a region is quite compatible with a change of climate evidenced by the more abundant and far more luxuriant forms of their predecessors. Such people also ignore other facts, namely, that remains have also been found, in the teeth and stomachs of the Siberian mammoths, of plants such as only grow in temperate regions to-day; and that, buried with the mammoths, are found shells of land molluscs which could not possibly survive in those regions to-day, and whose present habitat is far to the south. It seems clear, therefore, that the change in climate *must be allowed*.

Granting, then, that a considerable change in climate did occur, are we to believe that the change took place rapidly or slowly? Rapid changes are anathema to the Uniformitarian, who will (and perhaps rightly) adopt any explanation which offers a possible alternative. One thing, however, is certain: *The soil must have been soft when the animals were buried*. As well could the animals have been pushed into solid granite, as buried in the soil as it exists to-day. And yet the freezing of the ground could not possibly have been delayed for long after they were buried, since, in that case, the carcasses would have decomposed. The freezing, therefore, must have followed *almost immediately after the burial*. Nor could the containing sediments ever again have thawed, for the carcasses would have decomposed at the first relaxing of the frost; in other words, *the change in temperature must have been permanent, as well as sudden*. It seems difficult to escape from this conclusion, which was expressed in the clearest terms by Cuvier more than a hundred years ago, and has repeatedly been admitted by geologists of the first rank since then. As Howorth complained, he never could get his Uniformitarian opponents to face the facts here, or to accept the necessary conclusions from the same, even when unable to question the justice of those conclusions.

If we, however, admit the force of the above arguments, and admit the evidence of a sudden and permanent change in *climate*,

we are reminded of the fact that such a thing can hardly be purely local; and when we realize that, as Sir Henry shows, frozen "mummies" of mammoths, rhinoceroses, etc., have been found all over northern Asia, from Kamtchatka in the east to the Ural Mountains in the west, we realize that this change in climate must have been *continental in extent as well as instantaneous in time*.

Here, then, we seem to have proofs of *contemporaneity* of a kind unique in geology; proofs capable of establishing the contemporaneity over a great area of an event which must have occurred within limits of time quite as narrow, even, as those implied by the story of the Noachian Deluge. But how abnormal are the circumstances which enable us to recognize the presence of such proofs! Were it not for the permanent *freezing* of these buried carcasses, there would be nothing to prevent our adopting the very natural and reasonable assumption that the animals had been buried at very different times, spread over a very long period; and hence that no sudden or widespread catastrophe need be inferred from the facts—which the Uniformitarians would soon explain away in terms of myriads of supposed minor local tragedies. Let us, therefore, recognize the good fortune which, at least for once, has armed us with proofs of a catastrophe greater than anything dreamt of in our current scientific philosophy.

Granting the contemporaneity of the event, then, we have next to ask: *Under what sort* of disaster did the mammoths and their companions perish? Was it the sudden cold itself that killed them? If not, then what was it that did so? That the sudden cold alone produced the present state of affairs, we cannot suppose. Even if the cold killed, it could not also bury the animals; indeed, by congealing the ground, it would tend to prevent their burial. We must remember that the present soil of Siberia is frozen down to great depths—600 feet at Yakutsk—below the surface. During the short and feeble summers the first few feet below the surface are thawed, but not the deeper-lying layers, which remain permanently frozen; and it is to this fact that the preservation of the buried animals is due. Had the creatures not been buried, and buried fairly deeply, before being frozen, they would have shared in the first surface thaw, and so would long ago have decomposed. If, then, they were buried before they were frozen, it could hardly have been the frost that killed them.

Indeed, we are told by those who have examined the better preserved "mummy" heads for evidence as to the way in which the animals met their death, that the indications seem to point to choking or drowning, rather than frost. Thus the capillaries are gorged with blood, a sign of asphyxiation; or the nostrils are widely distended, as if the creature were gasping for breath.

It has, therefore, been suggested that the animals met their death by being bogged, or that they sank into the mud of river-beds. But why should so many animals of all species and ages have been bogged simultaneously, over the whole north of Asia, at the exact moment when the great frost was about to set in? And what of the masses of timber, so often associated with the animal remains? How could the forests have bogged themselves too? Nor are the carcasses found only in river-beds, or in ground that could ever have been boggy. On the contrary, they are mostly found on the *higher* ground, as if the animals had been trying to escape from torrents of water bringing the sediments—gravel, sand and clay—which now envelop them. Note, too, that the carcasses are most abundant of all on the islands of the Arctic Sea, which must have represented the local hill-tops and plateaux in the days when the mammoth was alive. It is impossible to suppose that those islands could have supported the vast herds of animals whose crowded remains cover their whole surfaces to-day; and the fact that the mammoth once roamed over the intervening lands, which are now covered by the sea, is shown by the circumstances that, as Nordenskiöld tells us, mammoth remains, together with tree trunks, are washed up from the same by every storm, while fragments of mammoth tusks, etc., and remains of the forests in which they lived, were repeatedly brought up by his trawl. It seems clear that the crowded carcasses on the islands must be those of animals that fled there for safety; and it is certain that the islands could not have represented river-beds in the Mammoth Age, nor the likely areas for bogs.

Everything, in fact, seems to point to the coming of widespread torrents of water, heavily charged with sediments from the south. Brandt comments on the fact that three mammoth mummies, or else intact skeletons, described by him, and one described by O. Fisher, all of which were found standing erect, were facing north. The Arctic Islands, which would have represented the last high ground upon which the animals could take refuge from the oncoming flood, are described as practically consisting, in their

upper layers, of animal remains, while tree trunks are piled in wildest disorder against their southern slopes.

Thus the great and sudden *change of climate*, to which the Siberian mummies testify, affords us a proof of *contemporaneity* in regard to numberless facts; and, by linking them up as *simultaneous over a great area*, affords us grounds for holding that they can only be explained by postulating a flood of continental dimensions.

Nor is the time of this occurrence geologically remote. All are agreed that the mammoth and woolly rhinoceros were among the later companions of early man; and a flood which extinguished these, and many other contemporaries of early man, must have fallen within the human period. Indeed, we have positive proof that it did so. Although human remains are scarce in Siberia, yet undoubted human implements have been found, there as elsewhere, associated with the buried mammoth remains.

3.—THE RUBBLE-DRIFT, HEAD, AND OSSIFEROUS FISSURES.

“Many explanations have been suggested for parts, but none have embraced the whole of the geological phenomena. Led to suspect the possibility of an unusual form of water agency, I put the case of a Submergence and subsequent Emergence hypothetically, and found that the consequences which resulted agreed in a remarkable manner with the observed facts.”—(Prestwich, *Phenomena Bearing upon the Tradition of the Flood*, Preface, p. vi.)

“(The) submergence hypothesis not only meets the requirements of each particular case, but . . . it also shows them all to be concordant, and such as would pertain to one common and general cause.”—(Prestwich, *Phil. Trans.*, vol. 184, p. 933.)

It came as a shock to some geologists, themselves very senior, when the venerable Prestwich, then over eighty years of age, and affectionately styled the “father” of the Geological Society, produced a succession of papers announcing his self-conversion to the opinion that a great but transitory flood of waters had enveloped England and Western Europe (including Northern Africa) at the close of Palæolithic times.

The kind of evidence to which Prestwich appealed is very different from that found in Northern Asia, which we have just been considering. Here, in Western Europe, we have not to do with the violent onset of a flood, but with its violent termination; the evidence consisting of masses of local and unrolled

debris, which have apparently been swept with considerable violence into local pockets or catchment areas, without regard to the present drainage system.

There is a singular absence, in these deposits, of anything like complete skeletons. Bones, indeed, abound in them; but, although often crowded together, and sometimes so associated as to imply that occasional complete limbs were buried, these bones seem for the most part to have been detached and swept into heterogeneous collections, regardless of species or individuals, before being buried. Yet they always appear to be fresh, and unrolled; and although they are nearly always broken, and often practically pulverized, yet they show *no signs of gnawing or of weathering*. The bones of carnivora are mixed indiscriminately with those of their natural prey; and the remains are most crowded either on higher ground, or where floods descending from higher ground might deposit part of their loads in hollows or other collecting places passed in transit.

Here, then, is no such clear proof of exact contemporaneity as we found when considering the deposits in Northern Asia. Instantaneous, widespread, and lasting frost did not set in, in these regions, to preserve the soft parts of the victims of the occasion, and compel our recognition of the fact that the various sediments containing them must have been laid down at one and the same time. Consequently, as Prestwich remarked, many different explanations had been invented to account separately for the many different local collections and forms of these deposits. One has only to read the discussions on his papers, too, in order to see how determined some of Prestwich's critics were to continue to regard these deposits as dissociated in time and cause, although they seem to have offered no reason for doing so. The determination often appears to exist independently of particular reasons.

The temporary, yet violent, nature of the action which formed these deposits is shown by the size of the *unrolled* and *local* rocks often found in them. For many of these boulders are of great weight, and have obviously been projected with considerable force well beyond the positions at which they would have come to rest if collecting under the mere influence of gravity, as part of a local scree or talus formation. The angle of deposition, too, of the sediments in general, where formed under cliffs, etc., is far lower than the normal angle of rest which they would have assumed as a simple talus; so here again we have evidence that

these sediments were laid down in a violent manner under the influence of a powerfully projecting force, such as could only have been afforded by a great mass of waters in rapid motion.

How vast this volume of water was, and how great its lateral extent, we find indicated (where deposition occurred along a former coast-line) by the disregard shown by the sediments for local depressions of the old cliffs, which would have localized lesser floods sweeping over the land. Another equally significant fact is that the masses of water seem to have been sufficiently great and enveloping to sweep down *on all sides* of isolated hills, independently of the local river systems. This is exactly what one would expect if the land were emerging from a state of *complete envelopment* by water ; but it is singularly hard to explain on any other theory.

According to Prestwich, the evidence indicates that the land probably sank under the waters after a slow and gradual fashion ; for there appears to be little trace left of the onset of the flood. Animals would seem, however, to have been driven before the advancing waters, and compelled to collect in heterogeneous crowds on such higher grounds as seemed to afford the best local chances of safety. Here, as the waters continued to rise, they were overwhelmed and drowned. Finally, after an interval of time which seems to have been sufficient to allow of the carcasses largely decomposing, the evidence indicates that the land emerged again from the waters by a succession of spasmodic upward movements, each of which produced its own wave of translation of waters off the land, bringing more similar material over the last, shifting the great local boulders further, continuing the pounding action which broke the animal bones, and sweeping the land clear, over its smoother surfaces, of debris for which lodgment could not locally be found.

It seems clear that such an inundation as this one would, by the mildness of its onset and the violence of its termination, leave only *scattered and local* traces. The comparatively *short duration* of the submergence would prevent the formation of marine deposits over the land, such as would inevitably have marked a prolonged submergence. And the violent action of the waters, on the emerging again of the land, would tend to sweep the surface clear of all traces of the disaster, except where local pockets, old beaches, or newly-opened fissures, offered lodgment for the same.

So much for the general character of these deposits, and the theory which accounts for them ; we should now, perhaps,

briefly explain the terms "Rubble-drift," "Head," and "Ossiferous Fissures," as used in this connection. The first term, "Rubble-drift," refers to the sediments in general; the peculiar and often massive collections of angular, unrolled, and local materials tumultuously deposited in local pockets and catchment areas, and generally full of shattered Pleistocene bones, which compelled Prestwich to postulate a vast inundation of the land as the only means of accounting for them. "Head" is a term applied to this Rubble-drift where it masks an old raised beach. For the land often stood lower, in Pleistocene times, than it does now, and Raised Beaches at various heights above the present sea-level are now found all over Western Europe and the Mediterranean, and are clearly of Pleistocene age, since the shells on them are all of recent species. When the Rubble-drift was being swept off the surface of the land by the retiring waters, it was poured over the tops of the old cliffs on to these former sea beaches, often covering the latter up entirely, and forming a gradual slope from the cliff tops down to the sea, far beyond the locations of the old shore-lines. The very existence of the old beaches was thus often concealed, until rivers, etc., cutting through the sediments, exposed sections of them and their overlying "Head."

The "Ossiferous Fissures" are peculiarly interesting, since they seem to represent catchment areas which did not pre-exist the catastrophe, but were formed at the time of the catastrophe itself. The great strains to which the land was subjected, while rising again from the waters, seem to have caused the opening of local rents and fissures in the surface rocks. Some of these are of considerable size, and many are very deep. Their contemporaneity with the deposition of the Rubble-drift is shown by the fact that they are full of it (with its characteristic unrolled sediments and broken bones), and not of other types of deposits. Indeed, it is probably due to the fact that they were filled with this drift as soon as they formed, that they did not close up again.

The bones in these Fissures cannot be of animals which fell in alive, for no skeleton is complete. They cannot have been brought by beasts of prey, for none are gnawed. They were not brought by streams, for none are rolled; nor are they accompanied by rolled, or any but purely local materials. The bones could not have lain exposed for long, for none are weathered. They were not covered up normally, for they were broken by the violence of their deposition together with the associated

rocks. That water had to do with their deposition is indicated (here as with other forms of the Rubble-drift) by the very general cementing together of the deposits by calcite. The formation of these Fissures in so many places, at the precise time of the formation of the Rubble-drift (proved by their filling to the top with that peculiar kind of drift *and no other deposit*), seems to confirm the belief that the Rubble-drift itself did not owe its origin to normal causes, but to something catastrophic in the nature of *earth-movements*.

Prestwich also points out that these Ossiferous Fissures are often found upon *isolated hills* of considerable height. Such are the very localities where animals would naturally gather for safety in times of flood, and where (owing to the limited catchment areas found on the hills themselves) only a general inundation, covering the whole surrounding country to a great depth, could bring powerful water action to bear. A classical example of such an isolated hill is the "Montagne de Santenay," a flat-topped hill 1,640 feet high, and rising 1,030 feet above the surrounding plains, near Châlons-sur-Saône in Burgundy. A Fissure near the top of the hill is crowded with animal remains of a typical Rubble-drift type. No skeleton is entire; very few of the bones are in their proper relative positions; yet none of the bones have been gnawed. The bones are fractured, but unweathered; mixed together, but unrolled. As Gaudry remarked: "Why did so many wolves, bears, horses, and oxen scale a mountain isolated on all sides, and whence came the vast body of water necessary to wash them into the crevice, and to deposit the carbonate of lime with which they are surrounded?" All theories of glacial floods, as Prestwich and Howorth point out, break down here, and a general deluge can alone meet the case.

The Channel Islands were regarded by Prestwich as affording a "crucial test" of the accuracy of his views. Thus both Jersey and Guernsey are surrounded by fragments of raised beaches, which are covered by a "Head," ten to thirty feet in thickness, composed of fragments of local rock in a matrix of brick-earth or Loess. The distances to which many of the larger blocks in this "Head" were carried witness to the violence with which it was deposited. Prestwich points out that the rapid emergence of the Islands from a totally-enveloping flood would alone explain the existence of this "Head" *on all sides* of the Islands, and supply the necessary force for its deposition; for no theory of local streams would ever do so.

Space will not admit of our quoting more instances of this class of evidence, for which reference should be made to Prestwich's works; but we may note that, according to Prestwich, the Rubble-drift deposits of England indicate a submergence to a depth of at least 1,000 feet; for to that height above the present sea-level are such deposits found. On the Continent, where Prestwich regarded the high-level Loess as representing a form of the Rubble-drift, he postulated a submergence to a depth of at least 3,000 feet. He found, however, that Rubble-drift deposits become very scanty in the extreme east of the Mediterranean region; so that he could not carry his proofs of a flood, from this particular type of sediment, further to the east.

We must remember, however, that the formation of the Rubble-drift depended primarily upon: (1) A spasmodic and violent termination of the flood; and (2) a depth of waters *over the land* not much exceeding 1,000 feet. For it was only when the waters had subsided to a certain remaining depth over the local land surface, that currents due to further spasmodic reductions of that depth would have much effect upon that surface. So we cannot gauge the total depth of the inundation by the height of the Rubble-drift remains. The latter only indicate certain *minimum* depths of water at times when *spasmodic* reductions of the inundation were having effect upon the underlying land surface.

So it seems clear that land to the east or south of the Mediterranean may have been equally flooded; but if the emergence of the land there had been gradual, as well as its immersion, there would be none of the classes of deposits found, to mark the flood, which we have hitherto noted as characterizing Northern Asia and Western Europe.

4.—THE ASIATIC LOESS, &C.: EVIDENCE OF SLOW EMERGENCE OF CERTAIN AREAS.

"The investigation convinced us both that the original loess of China must be regarded as a marine deposit . . . and its marine origin requires us to believe in the submergence within recent geologic time of the greater part of Central Asia."—(Kingsmill and Skertchley, *Nature*, November 10, 1892, p. 30.)

"(Its) present distribution over northeastern China was mainly secured by the agency of gradually receding water, the presence of which would be obtained by a temporary general depression of the land about 3,000 feet."—(Wright, *Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 13, 1902, p. 134.)

Evidence that certain great areas of land remained submerged for considerably longer than Western Europe—that

they rose from the waters after a much more gradual fashion—has been collected by several geological observers; but the strongest evidence of a fairly *prolonged* immersion of certain great areas was collected by Dr. G. F. Wright. This well-known American glacialist, who had long accepted Richtofen's theory as to the æolian distribution of the Asiatic Loess, and Geikie's ideas as to the extensive glaciation of parts of Central Asia during the Pleistocene, visited Asia himself, in the year 1900, hoping to collect definite evidence of this glaciation. He never found it. What Wright did find, however, was what he regarded as abundant evidence of a widespread inundation. He went to collect evidence of glaciation; he returned, talking about a flood. It was shortly after this that he published his series of papers on "Geological Confirmations of the Noachian Deluge" (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. lix, 1902). His later writings show that he held to these opinions until he died, in 1921.

The principal facts he noted were briefly as follows: Extensive deposits of Loess are found all round the south-eastern and northern borders of the Mongolian plateau (the northern borders of which extend nearly 2,000 miles from east to west). These deposits are for the most part very different in character from the hummocky collections of Loess made by æolian action in certain places. The former, apparently older and far more extensive, deposits are spread out for many hundreds of miles in flat, terrace-like, extensions from the base of the mountains, filling the depressions between the mountain chains; and they are constantly *intercalated with beds of gravel and fragments of rock*. They have all the appearance of having been laid down by torrents depositing their sediments into a body of standing water, which must at that time have covered the lower lands right up to the very base of the Mongolian plateau, both where the latter faces China to the south-east and Siberia to the north. In other words, the whole of China and Northern Asia must have been submerged, at that time, to a depth of 2,000 to 3,000 feet.

Messrs. T. W. Kingsmill and S. B. J. Skertchley confirm the fact that the Chinese Loess, below the Mongolian plateau, was laid down in marine waters. Kingsmill reports finding a band of limestone rocks near Tsinan-fu, which was bored by pholades and crustaceans up to a height of about 1,100 feet. They point out that the Chinese Loess has been traced "almost continuously beyond the limits of the eighteen provinces to the

foot of the Pamirs. West of the Pamirs, loess occurs in the valley of the upper Oxus, probably in the Kizil Kum, and up to the Caspian, and its marine origin requires us to believe in the submergence within late geologic time of the greater part of Central Asia."

Similarly, the present writer has seen vast sheets of sediment, often of great thickness, spread over large tracts in North-western India, which apparently correspond fairly closely in type to the deposits described as Loess in Europe, Central Asia, and America. They have the same property of homogeneity, of standing in vertical cliffs when cut into by streams, and of being full of calcareous concretions of various shapes (known as *kankar* in India, *löss-kindeln* or *löss-puppchen* in Germany, and *poupees du löss* in France). In many places these deposits seem to be impregnated with salts; surface pools are brackish, and the whole ground is often white with saline efflorescence after rain. In his opinion these broad sheets of sediment (through which the existing streams cut deep channels, as saws cut into planks) can only have been laid down by water and in water; the latter being probably saline. They are utterly unlike wind-borne deposits, which now exist over large parts of the same area, but are quite distinct and also apparently *later* in character. Thus, in one of these now *desert* areas, with its drifted hummocky sands, the writer and an archæologist friend whom he was visiting in the winter of 1906, found, some 20 miles from the railway junction at Sibi, a number of great mounds or small hills, formed entirely of *fragments of Buddhist pottery*. No habitations exist there now, the nearest little Baluch mud-village being some miles away; and these mounds prove, as the archæologist at once remarked, that in pre-Mohammedan days all this area must have been well-wooded (to provide fuel for large pottery factories), and very different from its present barren condition. The evident desiccation of these parts shows that desert conditions there are relatively *new*; and the Loess deposits are certainly not æolian in origin, although now locally receiving æolian readjustment.

Further evidence of extensive submergence (though probably representing a later stage in the retreat of the waters from some parts of the land) is afforded by Dr. Wright's discovery of a shore-line deposit of gravel at a height of 750 feet above the sea, at Trebizond, on the Black Sea. Corresponding shore lines, as he points out, have been reported at Soudak, on the south shore of the Crimea, nearly opposite Trebizond; also near Samsun, a

hundred miles further west, on the south side of the Black Sea ; while at Baku, on the east side of the Caspian Sea, stands yet another post-Tertiary shore-line at a height of 600 feet above sea-level. Water standing at this level would, as Wright goes on to remark, submerge, with the exception of the Ural Mountains, " Northern Germany, all Russia, the Aral-Caspian basin, and all Central and Western Siberia " (*Origin and Antiquity of Man*, pp. 472, 3).

That this submergence took place *since* man appeared in these parts, and apparently at the end of the Pleistocene (*i.e.*, at the same geological period as the immersion spoken of by Howorth and Prestwich) is shown, as Wright points out, by Professor Armachevsky's discovery at Kief on the Dnieper, which is one of the largest tributaries of the Black Sea, of numerous remains of flint implements, also heaps of flint cores, associated with a large number of mammoth bones, with charred wood, broken and partially burnt bones, etc., at a depth of 53 feet below the undisturbed surface of the Loess which covers the region. Similar discoveries of flint implements, charcoal, and mammoth bones, associated together and buried under the Loess, were also made by Professor Armachevsky in five other places in European Russia ; and Wright compares these facts with the similar discovery in Siberia, by Professor Kaschenko in 1896, of deeply-buried mammoth remains associated with flint knives and scrapers, etc. (*op. cit.*, pp. 313, 314).

Now the European Loess was definitely regarded by Prestwich (*pace* Richtofen) as one of the forms of his " Rubble-drift ; " and he pointed out that analyses had shown that " in certain districts in Belgium the Loess is largely impregnated with salt . . . In general " (he adds) " the Loess is so permeable that the rain-water would remove any salt that there might have been left in it, but in some instances the Loess is sufficiently argillaceous to . . . favour the retention of the salt." The presence of this salt seems to be worth noting, for, according to Professor Sollas (an eminent supporter of the æolian theory), the Loess was blown on to its present position by winds driving outwards from ice-sheets during periods of glacial accumulation, and such winds would hardly bring salt with them. Surely the presence of the salt supports those who attribute the distribution of the Loess to the action of *marine waters* rather than continental winds. The submergence hypothesis, as Prestwich remarked, alone accounts for all the facts.

5.—INLAND LAKES AND SEAS: PROOFS OF GENERAL DESICCATION.

“(It) is in place to point to the indubitable evidence of the recent existence of an inland sea as large as the Mediterranean over the area of the desert of Gobi, and connecting, probably, through the Sungarian depression between the Thian Shan and the Altai mountains, with a vast submerged area in Western Turkestan and Siberia. The existence of this internal sea of Central Asia is attested by the abundant sedimentary deposits about its margin . . . and also by the Chinese historical references to it as the ‘Great Han Hai,’ or Interior Sea . . . (A) general depression of Central Asia must have occurred to account for the phenomenon we have presented, distributing the loess in the peculiar manner indicated, and filling the central depression of Mongolia with an inland sea.”—(G. F. Wright, *Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 13, 1902, pp. 135–8.)

“Since the end of the Ice Age the drying up of the plateau has been rapid.”—(R. C. Andrews, *On the Trail of Ancient Man*, 1926, p. 296.)

When we study a contoured, or relief, map of the world, we see that there are many inland areas which form great basins, shut off from the sea, and often situated far above the level of the sea. A general flood would have filled them with salt water, which could not have escaped when the rest of the waters drained off the land, but would have had to wait to be evaporated away. By affording extra areas for evaporation, too, these trapped waters would, at first, have induced a considerably greater rainfall, which would have progressively decreased as these inland waters dried up. Have we, then, evidence of such a *progressive desiccation* of inland basins in recent times?

It seems that we have. It has, indeed, surprised the present writer to find how uniform the testimony seems to be that *all* the great inland basins of the world are in a state of progressive desiccation.

We have seen how Wright argued that the whole of Northern Europe and Asia must have been submerged to great depths under marine waters at a very recent geological date. This submergence must, he pointed out, have been to a depth of at least 2,000 to 3,000 feet in Central Asia. That it was originally even more, and had caused the flooding of the Mongolian plateau itself, he infers from the fact that for a great extent all over that plateau the Loess has accumulated in level areas which resemble lake basins. “In many cases,” he tells us, “these are without outlet, and contain remnants of larger bodies of water, which are now drying up, leaving well marked terraces at elevations of considerable height around the rim” (*Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.*,

vol. 13, 1902, p. 132). Chinese historical records actually refer to the former existence of a very large body of water in these parts which they call the "Great Han Hai," or inland sea.

Yet this very area now forms the Gobi Desert. Of the progressive desiccation of the Gobi, Dr. Andrews gives an interesting illustration. A skeleton was found by his party, of a post-Pleistocene man, who had been buried *wrapped in birch bark*. Andrews says: "It must have been pre-Mongol, for now there are no birch trees within hundreds of miles of this region, and there have been none for centuries."

Further evidence that the whole of Siberia was recently submerged to great depths under marine waters is afforded by the presence in Lake Baikal (the surface of which stands more than 1,500 feet above the present sea-level) of the remains of a considerable *marine* fauna, including an Arctic type of seal, closely resembling seals now frequenting Spitzbergen. It seems significant that very similar seals are found in the Caspian Sea; and their remains have been found in the Aral Sea as well. Wright infers the geological recency of this general inundation from the fact that not only have the extensive Loess and gravel deposits, which were laid down while this inundation lasted, suffered comparatively little from the powerful geological agencies which have ever since been brought to bear upon them, but that Lake Baikal itself is still very far from being filled by the immense quantities of sediment brought into it by the Selenga River. (The freshening of Lake Baikal is explained by the fact that the Angara River, which flows out of it, continually drew off its salt waters, while the Selenga River continually brought in fresh water.)

How slowly a great part of the trapped waters disappeared is shown by the presence of extensive physical evidences of the gradual reduction of the Caspian and other inland seas to their present limits. Most of these seas are now comparatively fresh, but they are surrounded by scattered salt-pans, etc., testifying to their former greater extent and salt contents. According to von Baer, the relative freshness of the Caspian Sea (which is only about one-third as salt as sea water) is due to the concentration of salt in shallow lagoons round the margin of its basin; the biggest of these lagoons at present being the Karaboghaz, which is excessively saline. As the water in these lagoons evaporates, and the salt becomes more concentrated in them, fresh salt water is drawn from the main basin.

The latter is thus always passing on to these lagoons more of its own saliferous contents, and replacing the same by fresh water flowing into it from rivers entering at spots remote from the lagoons. Hence the main basin tends to become gradually fresher, and the bordering lagoons more salt. Finally, if the inflowing fresh water is not sufficient to replace all that is lost by evaporation, then the main basin (with its fresher contents) becomes smaller, leaving dry salt-pans isolated on the surface of the surrounding country. W. B. Carpenter tells us that deserted salt-pans are to be found "in different parts of the great area of the steppes of Southern Russia. . . . Everywhere the sand of these steppes contains an admixture of salt; and there are various local accumulations of salt, often associated with marl, having shells and fish-bones embedded in them, and thus clearly marking the sites of lakes which survived for a time the reduction of level and recession of the northern border of the Caspian, but which are now entirely dried up." Bogdanoff points out that "the polar fauna may be traced through the succession of salt lakes lying to the north of the Aral Sea, and that its proportion increases as we approach the Polar Ocean." *Marine* shells scattered over this area are said to be "much larger than the shells of the same species now inhabiting the weakly-saline Caspian"; the gradual freshening of the Caspian being unfavourable to its surviving marine fauna. Similarly, shells of *Pecten* and *Mytilus*, characteristic of the Aral Sea, have been found in the Kara Kum Desert, 33 miles south of that Sea, and up to 200 feet above its present level, showing both how that Sea has shrunk, and how recent the Kara Kum Desert is *as a desert*.

If we turn to Southern Asia, we find that Mr. D. N. Wadia, in his *Geology of India*, talks of the "well-marked desiccation" of the Kashmir lakes, and the evidence the old high-level beaches afford of the former "greater rainfall and humidity" (p. 344). Further to the north, we find the vast enclosed basins of the Tibetan tableland, the highest country in the world (averaging 16,500 feet above the present sea-level). Numerous lakes, generally salt or alkaline, and salt bogs, are scattered over its western and north-western regions. These are apparently the remains of larger bodies of water which formerly existed. "The desiccation of the Tibetan lakes," says Wadia, "is a phenomenon clearly observed by all travellers in that region. . . . This . . . is one of the signs of the increasing dryness and

desiccation of the region north of the Himalayas following a great change in its climate" (p. 22). "All travellers," say Waddell and Holdich, "bear witness to a gradual process of desiccation in the Tibetan uplands. Everywhere there are signs of the diminution of the lakes and the recession of the water line—a phenomenon that has also been observed in the Pamirs."

Thus it seems to be much the same story everywhere. If we approach Africa to the west, we pass the Holy Land. The desiccation of this region is marked by the fact that, as Dawson tells us, old Dead Sea deposits have been noted at a height of 1,400 feet above the present level of that Sea.

According to Herodotus, early tradition stated that at one time "all Egypt, except the Thebaic canton, was a marsh, none of the land below Lake Moeris then showing itself above water."

Further to the west, we find that the Sahara, during the early human period, was anything but a desert. It possesses the skeleton of a well-marked river system, with numerous water-cut valleys, now dry; and masses of water-worn pebbles cover great parts of its surface. Boule mentions the "extraordinary abundance of Stone Age antiquities" found in the Sahara, "in almost every part of this vast desert" (*Fossil Men*, 1923, p. 379). Herodotus and Pliny record the fact that, even in historic times, the rhinoceros and the crocodile used to exist here, where the environment is now utterly alien to such creatures. The salt efflorescence and deposits of salt found on the Sahara, together with the remains of marine mollusca scattered over certain parts of its surface, also seem to be worth noting in this connection.

Further to the south we find that Lake Chad, in the Sudan, which is situated 850 feet above the sea-level, is shrinking in size. It was also once more salt than it is now. Like the Caspian and Aral Seas, it is becoming less salt as it shrinks; the salt being concentrated out in lagoons and pans to its sides. We are told that the shrinking of the Lake is due to the "progressive desiccation" of the region, which is "most marked," and that "Saharan climate and conditions are replacing those of the Sudan."

Still further to the south, we find that the great Kalahari Desert, standing on an average 3,000 feet above sea-level is scored, like the Sahara, by the beds of dried-up rivers. Saline mud-flats cover extensive areas of its surface; and the whole country, we are told, is "suffering from progressive desiccation." Ngami Lake, which stands at the central part of the water system of this region, has completely dried up since David

Livingstone visited it in 1849, at which date it was still of considerable extent.

Thus desiccation appears to be evidenced *all over the world* (for similar facts could be adduced for the New World as for the Old). As another writer has remarked: "(In) all deserts the dryness is probably progressively increasing" (*Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., vol. 23, p. 1005). Why is this? We cannot attribute it to a drying up after the mere melting of the ice at the close of the Ice Age, for such an explanation would not account for the *marine* faunas of the Caspian and Aral Seas, Lake Baikal, etc.; nor was there any Pleistocene glaciation in the regions, *e.g.*, of the vast Gobi, Sahara, or Kalahari deserts. Desiccation is not confined to recently glaciated regions, but is everywhere marked in regions where waters would have been trapped after a general inundation. Thus the facts seem to accord best with belief in a recent general deluge. So does the frequent connection of salt deposits with these desiccating areas.

N.B.—Wright points out, in this connection, that the mountain region of Armenia, where the Ark is said to have grounded after the Flood, is one which would naturally have been among the first to become dry land after the Flood. Also that, while so much of Northern and Southern Asia, etc., was still emerging from the waters, or still covered with great sheets of trapped waters, the *adjoining regions* of North Persia and Southern Turkestan, extending into Central Asia, would have been about the most fertile in the world. Later on, as desiccation proceeded, these parts would become more arid, while lower lying areas became cleared of swamps, etc., and more habitable. It seems significant, therefore, that what appear to be some of the oldest traces of post-Deluge (or Neolithic, etc.), civilizations, older even than those of Mesopotamia and Egypt, are to be found in these regions, where the oases are now so reduced.

It is, perhaps, during a general counter-wave of migration westwards, after the lower lands began to compare favourably with the upper, that the story is resumed in Genesis xi, with the account of the descendants of Noah entering the Plain of Shinar during their journey *from the east*. (Cf. Wright, *Origin and Antiquity of Man*, pp. 56-64; 366-370; 469; 474-476.)

6.—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

“The main evidence of the Noachian Deluge must always be historical ; but it is the prerogative of science to consider the degree of its intrinsic credibility, and so to remove unwarranted prejudicial bias.”—(Wright, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. lix, 1902, p. 537.)

Limits of space have forbidden our dealing with this subject in any but the most cursory manner. What we have tried to bring out, however, is the fact that, while the great majority of present-day geologists would emphatically deny that geological evidence exists of a great deluge such as that described in Genesis, yet some fully qualified geologists have insisted that such evidence does exist. The proofs to which these various experts have appealed have been of very different (though by no means conflicting) kinds in different localities. And this was only to be expected ; for, although the Flood itself was, *ex hypothesi*, wide-spread over the globe, yet the earth movements which brought it on, or which attended its close, would naturally have been very different in different localities. In Northern Asia we see the apparent effects of its locally very sudden onset ; in Western Europe of its locally more abrupt termination ; in other regions of a slower emergence of the land. And, all over the world, we find that inland basins are everywhere desiccating, as if recovering from a recent *general* drenching by what may well have been *marine* waters (to judge from the associated prevalence of superficial salt deposits). Everywhere we find that inland areas of the earth are *drying up* ; that the great deserts are all of geologically very recent development, and are progressively increasing their extent.

Nothing will, of course, prevent the Uniformitarian from inventing separate local explanations (often strangely conflicting) of these phenomena, in order to avoid the necessity of admitting such an abnormal event as the Biblical Deluge ; but even he will hardly find it easy to account for the ancient prophecies which so exactly foretold, not only his denials, but also *the very postulate upon which they are based*.

The writer himself, as a geologist, is satisfied that belief in the Flood is at least *tenable* on a basis of physical facts ; and, as a Christian, he regards with keen suspicion our modern unbelief in the Flood—an unbelief which seems to be ultimately founded upon the very postulate which was foretold, over eighteen centuries ago, as due to become dominant in the “last days” of our age, and to produce the very effects which we find it producing before our eyes to-day.

APPENDIX.

The following list shows some of the principal addresses, papers or books by the five geologists referred to, which bear on the subject of the Flood :—

ARGYLL, the 8th Duke of : Address to the Geological Society of Edinburgh on its Fiftieth Anniversary, 1883. Paper on Geology and the Deluge, in *Good Words* for January, 1884.

DAWSON, Sir J. W., K.C.M.G., etc., F.R.S. : Paper on the Lebanon Caves, *Trans. Vict. Institute*, vol. 18, 1884. Presidential Address to the Geological Society of America, December, 1893. "Modern Science in Bible Lands," 1895 (3rd ed.) (Hodder & Stoughton). "The Meeting Place of Geology and History," 1895 (2nd ed.) (R.T.S.). "The Historical Deluge," in *Present Day Tracts* (R.T.S.).

HOWORTH, Sir H. H., K.C.I.E., M.P., F.G.S. : Scores of papers, from 1869 to 1918, in *British Assoc. Rep., Geol. Mag., Nature, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.*, etc. ; also the following books : "The Mammoth and the Flood," 1887 (Sampson Low & Co.). "The Glacial Nightmare and the Flood," 1892 (Sampson Low & Co.). "Ice or Water," 1905 (Longmans, Green & Co.).

PRESTWICH, Sir Joseph, Kt., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.G.S. : "The Raised Beaches and 'Head' or Rubble-Drift of the South of England," *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, vol. xlviii, 1892, pp. 263-343, Plates VII and VIII. "On the Evidences of a Submergence of Western Europe and of the Mediterranean Coasts, at the Close of the Glacial or So-Called Post-Glacial Period, and Immediately Preceding the Neolithic or Recent Period," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 184 (1893), A, pp. 903-984, Plate 33. "A Possible Cause for the Origin of the Tradition of the Flood," *Transactions of the Victoria Institute* for 1894. "On Certain Phenomena Belonging to the Close of the Last Geological Period, and their Bearing upon the Tradition of the Flood," 1895 (Macmillan & Co.).

WRIGHT, G. FREDERICK, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A. : "Recent Geological Changes in Northern and Central Asia," *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, vol. 57, 1901, pp. 244-250. "Origin and Distribution of the Loess in Northern China and Central Asia," *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, vol. 13, 1902, pp. 127-138, Plates 16-21. "Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences" (D. Appleton & Co., New York. For the Flood, see especially pp. 149-165). "Geological Confirmations of the Noachian Deluge," *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. lix, 1902, pp. 282-293 ; 527-556 ; 695-716 (Bibliotheca Sacra Company, Oberlin, Ohio ; and Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co.). "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History" (3rd ed.), 40 illus., 450 pages (Bibliotheca Sacra Company, Oberlin, Ohio). "The Origin and Antiquity of Man," 1912 (John Murray).

DISCUSSION.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS said: I remember that as a child I read all the missionary books I could get hold of, and I think that each one, whether from the South Sea Islands or Africa, or Asia, all gave some native traditions of a great flood. It has been said that All Saints' Day, when people in some countries go to cemeteries, is a commemorative day of the Flood. It seems incredible that an event so momentous and so well authenticated can ever be disputed, but to-day it is disputed. Alas, it is the same with many other things that were once regarded as beyond all question. The central attack seems always to be at the Word of God—the veracity of Holy Scripture. Behind it all is a great master mind of constructive evil, who directs the attack—the mystery of iniquity, working with uncommon success, in these last days, and blinding the minds of those who believe not. I think that the day will come when it will be seen that the Flood and the Ark explain satisfactorily most of the supposed arguments for evolution. Let us try and imagine the Ark in which so many species seemed to hibernate for about a year. Of course, all the once created species were not there, but certain representative species found in that part of the globe were there, with potentialities that were almost infinite. Take the classic case that Darwin quotes—the pigeon. He found that if all the almost endless varieties of pigeons were allowed to breed together they went back to the rock pigeon; therefore, if there were seven rock pigeons in the Ark there were thousands of varieties potentially preserved. The same may be said about others, *e.g.*, the dog. To me the Ark and its miraculously collected menagerie is a key to unlock all these mysteries.

As to the universality of the Flood, without being a geologist, I believe it. I recall more than forty years ago standing on the Coupée at Sark, between those two rocky islands, and gazing at the remains of the sandy deposit that once covered the Channel. I thought of tidal waves which I had seen, and tried to imagine a mighty wave five or six miles high, that, sweeping round the globe, smashed up some parts of the old world, and deposited the debris of some Atlanta or Atlantas, and yet swerved from the garden

described in Gen. i, 8-14, the place which the Vedas call "the navel of waters." Then I remembered that the next Flood will not be of water, but of fire.

Lieut.-Col. MOLONY said: Our essayist's proposition is to be found on p. 63 of his printed lecture; he says, "Some geologists have been convinced that the clearest evidences do exist of a comparatively recent and vast diluvial catastrophe, which *may* be the one referred to in Scripture." I think we shall all agree that this proposition has been fully proved, for which aid to faith we ought to thank our lecturer.

But in this discussion we surely ought to submit the witnesses he cites to some cross-examination. There is one verse in Genesis which at least three of them tell us they cannot corroborate if read quite literally. It is Gen. vii, 19, which reads: "All the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered."

Dr. G. F. Wright in his book, *Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences*, pp. 141, 142, gives eight cases where it is practically impossible to take Biblical statements literally. With special reference to Noah's Flood he says: "The language describes what appears to the senses, and does not go beyond the phenomena which are visible."

"As Sir Wm. Dawson has well expressed it, the story of the Flood in Genesis reads like a log book in which many things are set down as they actually appeared, and without attempts to reconcile apparent discrepancies."

Dr. Wright continues (p. 142): "It is therefore doing no violence to the spirit or letter of this ancient document to give it an interpretation which limits the phenomena to a comparatively small area, in which the civilization of the world was then centred." On the other hand, he speaks of a submergence which was much more extensive than the Euphrates Valley.

Sir Joseph Prestwich, in his book on the tradition of the Flood, begins by calling the universality of the Deluge a physical impossibility. But he then gives evidence for believing in a simultaneous submergence, or marine flood, affecting England, Central Europe, Syria, all the Mediterranean islands to North Africa, but not Egypt. He believed that this left the higher ground and hills

uncovered, and that these served as places of refuge for the life that survived the catastrophe. He believes that the glacial period came within 10,000 to 12,000 years of our times, and remarks that some American geologists would make it 8,000 only. This is at the close of a section headed "Date of the Submergence," which he evidently holds to have happened *after* the end of the glacial period.

Sir Henry Howorth, in his book on the Mammoth and the Flood, says: "We can best explain these anomalies by supposing that these tribes are the descendants of fragments of a once continuous community broken asunder by some great disintegrating cause, which destroyed great portions of the human races—a revolution which left only isolated fragments behind which have spread out again." In the preface to his book called *The Glacial Nightmare and the Flood*, Sir Henry makes it clear that he does not wish to give any countenance to the notion that the postulated flood was universal, or that it destroyed all life.

When asked to believe in a universal flood, people naturally want to know where the water all came from and where it all went to. As these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered, I hold that the interests of Revelation are best served by not asking people to believe in a *strictly* universal flood. Our lecturer has advisedly refrained from stating any such opinion.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: There are three separate and overwhelming sources of evidence that the Flood of Noah's day was, in fact, universal. (1) It is an undeniable fact that in practically every part of the inhabited world there are legends of a great deluge. (2) It is an undeniable fact, as has been shown by the lecturer to-day, that there are undoubted geological evidences of a deluge which was world-wide. (3) There is also a three-fold testimony to the same fact in Holy Scripture itself—two in the Old Testament and one in the New—and Scripture, after all, must ever be our final court of appeal.

We are told very definitely what kind of Flood God was going to send upon the world of the ungodly: "The Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast and all creeping things, and the fowls of the air; for it

repenteth Me that I have made them" (Gen. vi, 7), "and God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before Me" (Gen. vi, 13). "And behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven, and everything that is in the earth shall die" (Gen. vi, 17).

Again, in equally explicit language, the Bible tells us what kind of a flood did actually come. In Gen. vii, 19 to 23, the following description is given: "All the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered; and the mountains were covered, and all flesh died that moved upon the earth; all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth, and Noah only remained alive, and those that were with him in the Ark." If language means anything, this language describes a *universal Flood*.

Then again, when we come to the New Testament, we find exactly the same thing, for in 2 Pet. iii, 6, we read: "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The question has been asked, if the Flood was really universal, where did all the water come from and where did it go to? The first part of that question is very clearly answered in Gen. vii, 11, where we read, "The fountains of the great deep were broken up and the windows (or flood-gates) of heaven were opened." And as to where the water went to, although we are not actually told, may not evaporation explain the difficulty? There is a remarkable instance of evaporation to-day in the case of the Dead Sea, where from time immemorial the waters from the melting snows of Hermon have been flowing down the Jordan into that sea at the rate of 6,000,000 tons a day, and yet, although there is no outlet from that sea, its waters show practically no sign of rising; the explanation being that, owing to the great heat in that district, an immense quantity of water evaporates every day!

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: This paper traverses a good deal of ground and ably cites a large number of scientific and geological facts, but it cannot truly be said that the subject is discussed. It should carefully be observed that the title is "Scientific Discoveries

and their Bearing on the Biblical Account of the Noachian Deluge." There is no discussion of the relation of the "scientific discoveries" to any of the recorded facts in the Biblical account. From first to last there is not one sentence quoted from Genesis. So far as the lecture is concerned there might never have been a *Biblical account*. How interesting and valuable the paper would have been if Col. Davies had shown in what particulars scientific discoveries were related to or corresponded with the recorded facts of the Bible? Opinions are divided as to whether the Deluge was local or universal. If it could be shown that the Flood was local the elaborate argument of the paper is irrelevant. If, on the other hand, it could be shown that it was universal, there is abundant material for the development of the subject. A third consideration is important. It is possible that the facts cited by Col. Davies may refer, not to the Deluge, but to some other colossal catastrophe.

On p. 74 of the paper it is said: "A classical example of such an isolated hill is the 'Montagne de Santenay,' a flat-topped hill 1,640 ft. high, and rising 1,030 ft. above the surrounding plains, near Châlons-sur-Saône, in Burgundy. A fissure near the top of the hill is crowded with animal remains of a typical Rubble-drift type." The Biblical scene of the Deluge is some little distance from Burgundy, and it would be interesting to know how and when these animals reached this place.

Mr. W. HOSTE remarked that such an occasion would lack something in its possibilities if no reference were made to Mr. Leonard Woolley's discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees, of which he gave an account at the Royal Institution last June. He would venture to remind the audience of the generally well-known facts. They had been excavating a royal graveyard outside the city, which rested on what had been in previous centuries the city dust-heaps. Going down 60 feet and passing through still more wonderful graves, giving proofs of an extraordinarily advanced civilization, they were suddenly pulled up by a layer of clay about 8 feet thick, distributed uniformly on all sides and completely interrupting all traces of civilization; containing no pottery, and evidently laid down all at once in a very brief period. Digging through this clay they found remains of a much older and quite distinct civilization.

Mr. Woolley had not the slightest doubt that this layer of clay was deposited by the Sumerian or Noachian Flood, which has always been supported, not only by the Bible narrative, but by such widespread and persistent Sumerian (and indeed, universal) tradition. Dr. Stephen Langdon, Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, though at first hostile, has declared his conversion to this view. All Mr. Woolley's other discoveries were received by the large audience at the Royal Institution with demonstrations of applause, this with the dearest silence, showing how far from eager the ordinary modern is to welcome any proof of the Divine accuracy of the Scriptures.

Whether the absolute universality of the Flood is intended by the language of Scripture has been questioned, but the lecturer has shown that the signs of a *world-wide* inundation are not wanting, and certainly the idea that enough water could not be found to provide for such an occurrence is not very sound. He believed that it is a generally admitted fact that, were the ocean depths raised and the earth became a uniform spheroid, there is enough water in the oceans alone to cover the whole earth to a depth of two miles. Then we must remember that the amount of moisture suspended in the atmosphere is enormous. "God divided the waters that are above the firmament from the waters that are below." We not only read that the fountains of the great deep were broken up, but that the windows of heaven were opened, and such a rain as has never been known on the earth continued for forty days and forty nights.

If the Flood consisted merely of enormous waves of translation, how could the Ark survive except by a continual miracle, of which there seems to be no hint in the Genesis record? It is difficult to see how a local flood, covering the highest hills visible to Noah, could have been prevented from running off the plains of Mesopotamia and the Syrian regions into the sea. On the other hand, it may be noted that the human race had not then been divided, and was concentrated in the first cradle of the race. We are on the only safe ground if we find out exactly what the Scriptures teach, and believe that. Certainly *it* "has more understanding than all *its* teachers" or critics.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Lieut.-Col. A. G. SHORTT wrote : The lecturer deals with geological questions in general. He touches on the subject of heavy rainfall, but his remarks generally appear to deal with subsidence and influx of sea water. This general treatment is necessary, but one could wish that he had dealt more directly with the conditions in the Euphrates Valley.

That this valley is subject to floods which would answer to the Flood of Noah is unquestionable. Shells from the Euphrates have been found thickly strewn fifty miles away from it, indicating the wide extent of the river's influence, and the excavations at Kish, under Prof. Langdon, and at Ur under Mr. Leonard Woolley, have revealed alluvium deposits which they both claim to be the result of the Noachian Deluge. There are serious objections to this view, however, as the great thickness of these beds (20 inches at Kish and some 12 feet at Ur) seem too much to have been laid by a flood lasting only one year, and it is doubtful if food could have been carried in a ship for very much longer.

A flood due to influx of sea water seems to be ruled out. It would be possible in the ordinary way, no doubt. In 1876 a tornado in the Bay of Bengal raised a tidal-wave forty feet in height, which cost 100,000 lives, or as Delitzsch says, 215,000, whereas the Deluge was thirty feet only. But Sir William Willcocks, the irrigation engineer, maintains that no sea water could enter the Euphrates Valley because of the high level of the Karan delta. As one who has travelled up and down the land of the Two Rivers, with Bible in one hand and level in the other, his opinion has much weight, and, moreover, it is borne out as regards the Deluge, which in the Bible account is spoken of as due to heavy rain, and by the fact that the deposits at Ur and Kish are fresh-water deposits.

As arising out of this evidence, there are several questions which would appeal to a geologist, and which are necessary before any decision can be reached ; but it is quite possible that, with such assistance, far-reaching inquiries may be opened up. For instance, what amount of deposit might be expected from a year's flood after compression by overlying earth, and then whether

denudation is possible rather than deposition, since the overlying earth is only, perhaps, twenty inches in thickness? The great interest in it, however, lies in our possibly being able to date the deposition of the alluvium, as there are ruins and foundations of houses below them, and thus to clear up a great deal of chronological uncertainty.

Dr. JAMES KNIGHT, D.Sc., F.R.A.S., F.G.S., etc., wrote from Glasgow: It has long been known that the Uniformitarian theory of Hutton and Lyell is quite inadequate to explain certain physio-graphical phenomena, and that elaborations of various kinds have had to be invented, recalling the cycles upon epicycles invented for a similar purpose to make the Ptolemaic system square with the observed facts of astronomy. The Uniformitarian theory was a much-needed reaction from the catastrophism of earlier geologists, but here, as in almost all branches of human knowledge, the pendulum has swung too far to the other side, and truth, as usual, lies in the middle line.

In his book on Hume, in the "English Men of Letters" series, Huxley exposes once for all the weakness of this uniformity fetish. "Nature," says he, "means neither more nor less than that which is—the sum of phenomena presented to our experience; the totality of events, past, present and to come. To put Hume's argument in its naked absurdity, that which never has happened never can happen." It cannot be too often repeated—to such an extent are men, even scientific men, the slaves of words—that there are no such things as laws of nature, for "these laws, even when they express the results of a very long and uniform experience, are necessarily based on incomplete knowledge, and are to be held only as grounds of more or less justifiable expectation."

In his latest book (December, 1929), *A History of Science, especially in Relation to Philosophy and Religion*, Dampier-Whetham again reminds us that so-called laws of nature are only statements of averages, probabilities, amounting sometimes almost to certainty, but never actually attaining it, for such a result implies omniscience, knowledge of "the totality of events, past, present and to come." Babbage has shown experimentally that a series may be uniform for a hundred million terms, and yet vary with the next term, all

the time working on a pre-determined plan in obedience to a law in the mind of the inventor.

The geological evidence for a widespread flood is fairly conclusive, although the Scripture narrative makes no such demand, using as it does the language natural to an eye-witness. When, however, this is supported by the evidence of ethnology, supplying Flood traditions all over the earth from China to Peru, and by the still more recent discoveries of archæology, as at Ur of the Chaldees and elsewhere, the cumulative evidence becomes irresistible. Ancient history, now being unearthed, has the same tale to tell, for the early Sumerian historians actually made the Flood their date-point, reckoning their dynasties as ante- or post-diluvian, and in his most recent account of the excavations at Ur, Mr. Woolley claims to have found objective evidence of the Flood in the eight-foot layer of sediment separating the relics of old and later Ur.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

The question is raised as to the universality of the Flood. The Bible, in both Old and New Testaments, speaks of the Flood as destroying the whole human race, with the exception of a single family; it is therefore hard to limit the extent of the Flood, since it is difficult to say where Palæolithic man did *not* exist. I am not concerned with the personal ideas of Prestwich and others as to the limitations of the Flood, because there is nothing in the evidence itself to show that the Flood was limited in the various ways they suggest; on the contrary, the evidence produced by one writer generally seems flatly to contradict the limitations suggested by another.

Mr. Ruoff complains that I do not quote a "single sentence" from Genesis. My space was limited, and I had to assume that people know the story; but Mr. Ruoff will find Scripture quotations, or references to the Scripture story, on pp. 62, 63, 64, 68, 76, 79, 83, 84, etc., and consistency to the Scripture account will be found throughout my paper, which is (despite Mr. Ruoff's remarks) concerned solely with supplying evidence of just such an event as that of which Scripture speaks, namely, a vast, abrupt, and short-lived inundation of the habitable parts of the world, occurring *since man appeared on the earth*. Mr. Ruoff also complains that I do not deal with the "Biblical scene of the Deluge"; but the "Biblical scene" was, so far as we know, the whole world; and the only actual locality

mentioned in Genesis is ARARAT. I have duly referred to Flood evidences in the vicinity of Ararat, and in regions all round it; and I would remind Mr. Ruoff that, since Scripture says nothing about where the Ark was built, it may have started on its voyage from almost anywhere, and so it may just as well have passed over the region of Burgundy (to which Mr. Ruoff apparently objects) as over any other. Mr. Ruoff seems to be trying to limit the Flood of Noah to the Euphrates valley; a popular practice in these days, but one devoid of Scripture support. The Bible, in fact, does not even mention the Euphrates valley in its account of the Flood.

It is impossible to suppose, as Lieut.-Col. Shortt suggests, that the Flood was due entirely to rain. Rain alone could never have carried the Ark on to the highlands of Ararat, from wherever it started; and the Bible itself talks of marine convulsions *first*, when alluding to the causes of the Flood.

The fluviatile deposits at Ur, exposed by Mr. Woolley, seem to me to be far too late in date and too local in type to suit the Biblical (and senior) account of the Flood, although they may well have to do with the localized, and later, form taken by the Chaldean flood stories.* Local events must often have blended with, and altered, the local memories of a great primeval event common to the whole human race.†

The question as to "where the water came from, and where it went to," will only trouble those who hold extreme views as to the fixity of oceanic and continental levels. If the sea beds can rise, and the continents sink, there is no difficulty whatever in finding enough water even for a universal Flood.

* Palæolithic man has now been found in all the continents—Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia. But the deposits at Ur seem to be much later than Palæolithic, so the admittedly very local "flood" which they indicate could not be regarded as destroying all mankind *before the race first spread abroad*. If, therefore, we are to look for an event which all but exterminated mankind, we can only concentrate upon the far greater flood, at the close of the Pleistocene, whose effects apparently *were* universal. In that case, the Ur event becomes a purely minor and later episode, accounting perhaps for the shape taken by the Chaldean legends, but not for the far simpler and grander cosmic story found in Genesis.

† Many details, common to the Bible account and to flood legends, etc., of primitive tribes in America, Australia, and eastern Asia, are missing in the Chaldean legends, showing that the Bible account *antedates* the Chaldean stories.

730TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3RD, 1930,
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 the election of the following:—Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., as a Member, from Associate; and as Associates, Mrs. H. Lander Johnston, F.R.G.S., M.R.I., Mrs. E. M. Moore, Lieut.-Col. A. G. Shortt, B.A., Rev. W. Ellis, M.A., B.D., and the Rev. Frank Madeley, M.A.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A., in the absence of the author, to read the paper by the Rev. W. M. Christie, D.D., on "Arabs and Jews in Palestine."

ARABS AND JEWS IN PALESTINE.

By REV. W. M. CHRISTIE, D.D., Mount Carmel Bible School,
Haifa, Palestine.

ANCIENT REFERENCES.

THERE can be little doubt that the Midianites, Ishmaelites and others mentioned in the earlier works of the Old Testament belonged to the Arab stock, though the name "Arab" does not occur till the middle of the ninth century B.C. Then we find them named in 849 B.C. as bringing tribute to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 11); and in 845 B.C. in connection with an attack on Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxi, 16). These references to the much maligned work of the Chronicler receive a very strong support from the Assyrian mention of Arabs at the Battle of Karkar in 854 B.C. Thereafter we find references to Arabs in

many of the succeeding cuneiform records. Jeremiah and Ezekiel knew them, and Nehemiah had his own troubles with representatives of this people (ii, 19; iv, 7; vi, 1). The Nabathean section had occupied Petra before 312 B.C. driving out the Edomites, and they had also extended their authority over the Hauran, forming there the Kingdom of Beni-Ghassān. In the first century of the Christian Era, they traversed Palestine as traders, and in A.D. 70 they evidently made visits with their camels to Jerusalem (B. Keth. 66^b). It seems quite clear that the Arabs were well known in the neighbourhood of Palestine for nearly two millenniums before the conquest by the followers of Muhammed in A.D. 636.

IMMIGRATIONS.

So far as evidences go, the Moslem invasion did not in any degree constitute the settlement of the new population or the extirpation or removal of the earlier peasantry. There are evidences of the settlement of sections of Yemenite and Kaisite Arabs in Nazareth and Cana of Galilee (Strange, "Moslems in Palestine"), and there were also representatives of the Moslem rulers settled in the larger towns—Jerusalem, Hebron, Nablus, Jenin, Nazareth, and Acre. These are probably represented to-day by the Effendi class, who claim, without genealogical proof, however, to be the descendants of the conquerors. Of them we shall speak later. Other Arabic-speaking settlers have come from various places outside of Palestine proper. Thus the native Christians of Nazareth claim to have come from the Hauran and from Merj-Ayun; the Christian element in Safed are immigrants from Hasbeiya at the N.W. foot of Hermon, and their grandparents came in the second half of the last century. The Christian population of the coast towns and Jerusalem represents a people made up of fragments of all the Levant races, and the only soldering element is their common Arabic speech. In some of the towns of Galilee we meet with Maronites and Druses, both clearly immigrants, and in connection with Upper Galilee we discovered a tradition regarding the Metawileh (or Shiite Moslems) population that indicates a non-Galilean origin. In 1891 we were told that when Saladin was hard pressed by the Crusaders, he begged help from Persia, and in response there came 150,000 Persian Moslems, who ultimately received for services rendered lands in Upper Galilee and in the Sidon district.

This tradition fully and satisfactorily accounts for the presence of these people who show more of an Indo-European than of a Semitic physiognomy. As this people reside mainly in the French mandated territory, they hardly count to-day in Palestinian politics. The most recent immigration is that of the Moghrabiyeh Arabs, and this has been beset with the most serious consequences. They consist of groups of the various populations of North Africa from the provinces extending from Tangier to Egypt. When the various tracts of land indicated passed under European authority, these Moslems were discontented with what they considered Christian rule and prepared to move out. They were received by Turkey and allowed to settle within her borders. Apart from smaller groups, they occupy mainly a large quarter in Safed, and the portion of Jerusalem that lies between the Wailing Wall and the Dung Gate, which has from them been re-named "Bab-el-Moghrabiyeh." They constitute the most fanatical section of the Palestine population. To a great extent without education, they are ready to accept any statement concerning things done to the detriment of Islam, and to act without sense of responsibility. In Safed it was this community that in 1877 attacked the Conder-Kitchener Exploration Party and left Kitchener for dead in a thicket of brambles and thistles. Twelve years later, in 1889, we often heard it remarked that the 10,000 Moslems living in a state of barbarism in the Moghrabiyeh quarter were a real danger to the city. In the recent massacres in Safed, it was this party that carried through the nefarious work.

THE PEASANTRY.

There remains the "Arab" peasantry, or villagers. Every evidence points to their being Arabs only in the matter of language. They have much less Arabic blood than any of the sections of the people already named. As the peasantry of a country survives every revolution, there can be little doubt that the peasantry of to-day represents the old race formed by the amalgamation of Canaanites and Hebrews with an admixture of the blood of every race that has, since the downfall of Israel, occupied or ruled the land. In Galilee there would be an infiltration of Phœnician, but that is still Canaanite blood; while in Judea there must have been a strong Edomite, but that is still Hebraic, strain. We were confirmed in this opinion, when

in our early days in Galilee (1889-95) we made a study of the peasant dialect, and discovered that the same mistakes were made in the spoken Arabic of this people as were made in New Testament and in Talmudic days, namely, the confusion of the gutturals (Mt. xxvi, 73; B. Erub. 53^a). This section of the population is, apart from incidents arising out of robbery, in which they do not hesitate to indulge, quiet and, we should say on the whole inclined to be, law-abiding.

THE SAMARITANS.

There remains the Israelite, Hebraic or Jewish element. To this the Samaritans may be reckoned. They are now a feeble folk, occupying a quarter of Shechem (Nablus). They numbered 152 at the end of the war and are now increased to 192. As an element of the population they might be ignored, but there are points of interest connected with them that are still of value. It is worthy of note that the old enmity between Jew and Samaritan has now passed away. In this the Jew took the initiative. When the Samaritan quarter of Nablus was destroyed by an earthquake in 1927 the Jews of Tell-Aviv came to their help with waggon loads of food and a doctor to attend the injured. It was interesting to have the old High Priest declare to Mr. Rohold and myself: "What men have been trying to do for ages (to bring about peace between Jew and Samaritan) and failed, God did in seven seconds" (through the earthquake). The attitude of the fanatical Nablus Moslems was very apparent on the same occasion, for they actually stoned those bringing friendly assistance. The other point of interest and value is the Samaritan testimony to the practically pre-Exilic existence of our present Pentateuch. Had it been a compilation or selection by Ezra, the Samaritans could never have accepted it as canonical; on the contrary, they would have had a magnificent opportunity of attacking the Jews on this vital point. This testimony of course fixes the canonicity of the Torah at some considerable time at least before 520 B.C., after which the Samaritans could not have accepted it. Even if the Samaritans should now be absorbed in Israel, it is a remarkable example of divine working that they should have been preserved till this late era to bring this testimony to the old Torah at the time when it is so much needed.

OLDER JEWISH CONDITIONS.

Jewish history in Palestine has been a chequered one during the whole Christian era. The Fall of Jerusalem destroyed the state and brought deportations (A.D. 70). Restoration came to a certain extent during the brilliant Jamnia Period (A.D. 70-135) but the Barcochab Rising again led to disaster. The Galilean Period was a happy and successful one (A.D. 140-425) and the literary work was continued at intervals till the time of the Crusades. These movements reduced the Jewish population to a minimum and already Benjamin of Tudela (1160-1173) can tell of only "few men left," the representatives of a population of perhaps 2,000 living poverty-stricken lives in a few of the towns. Such conditions as he describes must have remained till the Expulsion from Spain (1492) brought re-population and revival to the land. Jerusalem, Tiberias and Safed again became Jewish centres of light and learning, and in the last named there arose the famous Rabbinical College and a constellation of literary characters almost equalling the most brilliant that Spain had produced. In addition to Sephardic settlers there were also Ashkenazim. Yiddish has had a history of centuries in this mountain stronghold of Judaism, and representatives of the families of the 16th-century settlers are still to be found there. The Haluka system began about 1600 and this meant the re-population of the four Holy Cities—Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias, and Safed. In every other centre of importance, we find during the next two centuries groups of Jews also, mainly engaged in business.

TURKISH RESTRICTIONS.

On the whole, the Turk and the Arab have treated the Jew with consideration, recognizing in his faith something more akin to their own absolute monotheism than the Christian Trinitarian doctrine presents. The most that the Jew has hitherto experienced has been associated with Moslem belief that the words of the prophets will be fulfilled in the Restoration of Israel. He has sought to take precautions. This is manifest in the Golden Gate in the Eastern Wall of the Temple Court, which has been kept built up since the advent of the Turk in 1516, "because when the Messiah comes, He will enter by that gate, Turkish power will then go for ever, and the Jew will be the man in

possession." The same faith has made itself felt in the restrictive laws made against the Jew. He could come to the land as a pilgrim for three months and then leave, but he could not settle nor could he acquire land. It is quite true that owing to the influence of the Rothschilds, permission was from time to time granted to establish small colonies, but whether said or not, it was understood that these were as outlets for the existing population, and by such men the first experiments were made.

DIFFICULTIES AND WORRIES.

The regulations we have indicated were, however, altogether invalid. Backsheesh was much more powerful than any decree a sultan could make. Jews on the landing-stage became a source of revenue to every official in the passport and customs departments, as also to the Municipal officials wherever the immigrant might settle. Accordingly immigration went merrily on till in 1906 it could be said "every fifth man you meet is a Jew." But this was not the only vexation to which the Jew was subjected in the matter of "bleeding." He came at the best with a foreign nationality, generally Russian or Austrian, and failing such, he generally tried to acquire some nationality, the British being eagerly sought after and at times not difficult of acquisition. This arose through the fact that during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877, the British Government undertook the protection of the non-combatant Russian Jews, and issued them the regular registration certificates. By backsheesh to minor officials, passports were got and the nationality was preserved for the children. This is really the worst offence we have to record against the Jew during our long years' experience of the East, and considering the conditions in which he lived we think it highly pardonable.

But even then he was not free from worries. Their condition was very often that with which we were acquainted in a city where several hundred such "British subjects" resided. They became practically a "milk cow" for the native employees about the Consulate, who were ever ready, when occasion required, to raise the question of "your nationality." Continental subjects were in still worse condition, for as soon as a young man reached the age of 18, he was called to the Consulate and informed that he must serve in the army. This had to be "arranged,"

and a payment of £20 to £50 to the Consular agent and a fee for a "certificate of bad health" from a doctor, secured remission for a time. These conditions throw light on what we shall say later.

HEBREW RENAISSANCE.

Coincident with the re-population of Palestine was the Renaissance of the language. This began nearly fifty years ago with Ben Jehuda's settlement in Jerusalem. His aim was to make Hebrew the living speech of every Jew in the country. But the orthodox considered it too holy to be spoken. He was starved, stoned, persecuted on every hand by his kinsfolk, but he persevered. In twenty years he was able to command respect for his ideal, and now 98 per cent. of the Jewish population speak Hebrew, and it has become the one uniting element for all the sections of Judaism. Distinctions are being forgotten. Jews are no longer Ashkenazim or Sephardim, but Israelites. "Ephraim no longer envies Judah, nor does Judah vex Ephraim." And to the immigrants both Yiddish and Spanish have to go soon after their settlement in the land; they are no longer printed and the Jew reads his newspaper in Hebrew. And with that the output of literature is enormous. In addition to original works in every department of learning, the best of the literatures of all nations has been translated. Whatever is accessible in any European language can be had in Hebrew.

BALFOUR DECLARATION.

We can well understand the impetus given to the movements for immigration and renaissance of the old tongue by that timely document, the Balfour Declaration. It has been much discussed and much condemned, but this is because it has been misunderstood and mis-represented. With full knowledge of the conditions of the Jews and of the land as we have set them forth, we never for a moment had a doubt as to its eminent fairness. It gave the Jew not a single right or privilege that men of every other nationality had not all along possessed. It abolished the regulation, made only against the Jew, which prevented his entering the land and acquiring property, and which law had already become obsolete by means of backsheesh which all along had passed into Arab and Turkish pockets. But what of the

“national home” that has been so much denounced? That, too, gave the Jew nothing he did not possess before—the opportunity of acquiring the nationality of the country of his residence, *i.e.*, he might give up his old nationality and become a Palestinian. He had found security in the past in not being Turkish, now he might, under British mandate, be better as a Palestinian than anything else. And in not a single point has there been an infringement of the terms as we have understood and explained them. Immigration has been carefully controlled and limited, with a view to absorption. The unsuitable have been eliminated by the Zionists, and those who have come in have done so in the spirit of goodwill. Every yard of land acquired has been purchased, very often at high prices, the intermediaries being generally the Effendi class who bought at low rates from the peasantry and re-sold to the Jew at enormous profits. But the land once got, the Jew has tried to make the most of it. When you see a green spot in Palestine to-day, you may be sure it is a Jewish colony. We knew the Plains of Esdraelon and Gennesaret when they were covered with thorns and thistles, but now the former is covered with sheaves of golden grain, and the latter is fast becoming what Josephus called it—“the ambition of nature.” (B.J., III, x, 8.)

CAUSES OF RECENT HOSTILITY.

(1) *Not Wailing Wall*.—Whence then the hostility that led to the disastrous outbreak in August? And what part does the Wailing Wall play in it? We begin with the latter question, and the answer is that the incidents connected with the Wailing Wall are merely created as an excuse and ground of offence. After the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Jews began to weep and pray over the ruins (B. Maccoth 24^b), and gradually the western wall became the centre for this worship. There was no question of Jewish right in Turkish days.* From the time of the introduction of printing, prayer books were provided with the prayers for this shrine. We ourselves possess several copies printed in Jerusalem in Turkish days, and, of course, with the approval of the Turkish censor. In 1894 and on later occasions,

* In *Shemoth Rabba*, sec. 2, the Western Wall is definitely named with its present-day designation in such a way as to show that it had for long been a sacred shrine. An early fourth-century rabbi there declares that “the Shekinah never moves away from the Western Wall.”

we have seen benches, chairs, and carpets on the pavement at the Wailing Place, for the convenience especially of older worshippers. Under Turkish rule nothing serious ever happened. The most would be the treatment of the Jew with something of contempt or derision, and the use of the epithet, "Jew," in a tone of despitte.

(2) *Ecclesiastical Intrigue.*—The hostility has a different cause and comes from a different source. It has something to do with international jealousy and more to do with ecclesiastical intrigue. From the close of the war it has been taught in Syria that the cutting away of Palestine from the north is a wrong, and that both ought to be under one mandate, and that in the hands of France. To such an extent has this teaching been carried that the employment of mission workers of Lebanon origin has rendered Gospel work impossible in some instances. The treatment Lord Balfour got in Damascus was a demonstration allowed, if not engineered, in favour of the same idea. Beginning at the close of the war, too, there was a propaganda begun in Palestine and mainly by pupils trained in the schools of a sect having great influence in Syria. The Jews were first approached and informed that, if they would throw Palestine into the hands of France, they could secure even better terms than the Balfour Declaration gave them. They rejected this, and then the Arabs were informed that they were to be displaced and the land given to the Jews. This created feeling and led to the incidents of 1921.

When the Crown Prince of Italy visited Palestine 18 months ago, the propaganda began anew, but with this difference that it was proposed that Italy should get the mandate. The whole movement means neither Italy nor France, but that Palestine became an appendage of the Papal State. If confirmation were wanted it is to be found in the assertions openly made in November, "There will be peace in another month, for the Pope will be the man in authority," and further, by the fact that there is a combination of Moslems and Latins, publicly explained as being against the Jews and Protestants, and having as a badge the Latin Cross inserted in the Moslem Crescent, and worn as an ornament, generally a scarf-pin.

HOW THE OFFENSIVE WAS ARRANGED.

And if this was the powder, the spark was formed within the Holy Land. The Effendis had made money at the expense of

the peasantry, who now saw what the land could produce, and what they had lost, and it was to the interest of the Effendis to turn the attention away from themselves to the Jew. False statements were made to incite the peasantry, and the common Moslem objection to Jews and Christians being made equal to them also found a place. These things formed the spark and thence the conflagration. The Effendis themselves are intensely fanatical and they found an equally fanatical tool in the Moghrah-biyeh Arabs, who did all the evil work in Safed, and who were the nearest aggressors at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem.

OUR DUTY.

What should now be done? Without hesitation we say "maintain the mandate." Explain it if necessary, but make no modifications or concessions. Let the Arab know that the Jew has got nothing more than he himself may have in any country in the world—the right to settle, to acquire property, and to become a citizen. Britain must retain the mandate. No other country can deal even-handed justice to all races and creeds. There is no room for fanaticism in what is the Holy Land of all, and under the influence of the Papal State, there would be no toleration and little liberty. And in dealing with all, there must be the firm hand. It must be felt and seen. The "Indian Moslem bogey" must have no place. Islam is as much divided as the Christian world, and, with the family of Osman gone, it has no political head. Firmly administered law and even-handed justice will prove the secret of British success.

HOPEFUL OUTLOOK.

And what of the future? With a definite manifestation of policy and a strict administration many things will happen. Peace will be maintained, the land will be developed, the harbour at Haifa will be completed, and railways will more fully link up the whole of Western Asia with Africa through Palestine; Haifa will be the great oil centre of the Near East, and Palestine, in some sense, the key to the trade of the three continents. There will be work and wealth for all, and peace will be found more profitable than unrest. The Jew will come in increasing numbers, for the land that can support three millions cannot be left desolate with a population of seven hundred thousand. Already we see instead of thorn the fir tree, instead of the brier, the myrtle,

and with the opportunities that are bound to come, all Palestine may be turned into a garden land, and the desert blossom like the rose.

RECONSTRUCTION.

And changes will take place among the peoples, too. Nothing seems more certain than that with an increasing non-Moslem population and a recognized Christian government, such communities as the Moghrabiyeh Arabs, themselves immigrants here, would move out, seeking citizenship in what they consider a Moslem state. And the Effendis, too, might find it advisable to seek fresh pastures. The "Arab" peasantry of the land, a broken and in some sense degenerate, through mingling, fragment of ancient Israel, might very well have a place, if not amongst the people, at least in the land. Indeed, there seems to be provision made for such cases as theirs. To the sojourner Ezekiel gives a place and an inheritance in the separate tribes (Ezek. xlvii, 22-23), while Zechariah (ix, 7-8) confers on the remnants of the Philistines the fullest privileges. Thus in a reconstituted Israel there seems a place for just such a remnant. And the changing attitude of the returning Israelite should make this all the easier. The modern immigrant has done with the bitter fanaticism that characterized the older orthodoxy, and which was the outcome of persecution. Now not the Old Testament only is wanted, but "the whole Bible." The New Testament also belongs to the Jew and so does the Lord Jesus Christ. Soon we shall see the glorious reunion of Land, People, and King.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. A. H. FINN, speaking from the Chair, said: Having been born in Jerusalem, and spent my childhood there and in the neighbourhood, and having twice re-visited the city in recent years—having, moreover, inherited a great deal of information from my father (who for over 17 years was British Consul for the whole of Palestine), I think I may fairly claim to have had some special facilities for getting to know about the country and its inhabitants. As to Dr. Christie's paper, I may say that I can endorse almost the whole of it. Indeed, it takes almost the very line which I took in a paper on the Mandate drawn up some little time ago, a paper

submitted, I believe, to certain high officials of the Government and printed in the *Hebrew Christian Quarterly*. There are one or two points in the paper you have heard which may bear a little amplifying. On p. 98 there is a section about the Peasantry (Fellahin, Ploughmen), and on the next page an allusion to their confusing the guttural letters. That makes it probable that the folk called Ta'amri round about Tekoa may really be descendants of the Amorites, the letter "Ain" having been substituted for the Hebrew Aleph. My mother, during her long residence in Palestine, got to know much of the Fellahin, and became convinced that they must be of Canaanite origin. She set forth the reasons for this conclusion in a little work entitled *Palestine Peasantry*. One bit of significant evidence is the survival of Canaanite practices forbidden in the Mosaic law (e.g. seething a kid in its mother's milk).

About the Wailing Wall, from the first I felt sure that this agitation was factitious, engineered by those who wished to stir up strife. For a very long period the Jews had enjoyed, without any kind of opposition, the privilege of worshipping in the narrow passage before the Western Wall of the Temple, a privilege for which they paid a rental of £200 a year. That passage was till quite lately an absolute *cul-de-sac*. It was only last year that certain Moslems obtained permission to make an opening in the wall that blocked the southern end, and this made it possible to claim that the passage was a thoroughfare, through which Moslems could pass to disturb the Jews at their devotions. It may not be generally known that the reason why the Jews attach so much importance to praying at this place is the belief founded on Solomon's prayer (1 Kings viii, 47-49) that if their prayers pass through the crevices between the stones of the wall, they would ascend to Heaven from the Temple area (whence the Jews are excluded) and be favourably heard.

I am very glad that Dr. Christie has spoken so plainly in favour of maintaining the Mandate. What I saw in my recent visits of the marvellous improvement in the condition of the country during the British occupation convinced me that the one and only hope for the future of the land and its varied inhabitants lies in the continuance of the British Administration, carried out by firm and impartial officials.

In conclusion, the Chairman called for the thanks of the meeting for the paper submitted by Dr. Christie, and the same were accorded with acclamation.

Mr. ISRAEL COHEN, Secretary of the Zionist Organization, an invited speaker, said: I should like to express my thanks to the Council of the Institute for their courtesy in inviting me to open the discussion on the most interesting paper that has just been read, and also to say how pleased I am to have the opportunity of speaking before so sympathetic an audience. I do not wish to say anything on the first part of Dr. Christie's paper, which deals with ethnological questions, but would like to offer a few observations on the second half. I feel impelled to point out that Dr. Christie considerably underrates and minimizes the importance of the Balfour Declaration. That important document gave to the Jewish people a right that they do not possess in any other country in the world, namely, the right to reconstitute their National Home in their ancestral land.

The only rights that Jews possess in other countries are those which they enjoy as citizens of those particular countries. The Balfour Declaration itself was embodied and amplified in the Palestine Mandate, which contains a number of Articles specifically laying down the particular rights of the Jewish people in connection with the establishment of their National Home. Since the Mandate was ratified by the League of Nations, and even before, the Jews have done their utmost to profit by the opportunity that they have in Palestine, but unfortunately the expectations that they entertained as regards the co-operation of the Mandatory Power have not been fully realized.

Suffice it to point out that, although ten years of British Administration have already elapsed, the Article in the Mandate which provides that the close settlement of Jews shall be encouraged on State and waste lands not required for public purposes has remained a dead letter, as not a single square inch of land has yet been given by the Government for Jewish settlement, whilst, on the other hand, a very large tract of land at Beisan was given some years ago by the Government to Arab squatters on a part of it, who have neither been able to pay the dues nor to cultivate the

whole of the land, and have since been trying to sell what they do not need at speculative prices.

I fully agree with what Dr. Christie says respecting the conflict connected with the Wailing Wall as being merely a pretext for the attacks that were made upon the Jews last August. In the course of the hearings of the Inquiry Commission many of the Arab witnesses gave as one of the causes of provocation their alleged grievances in regard to the land. It should, therefore, be pointed out that throughout the whole week of slaughter in Palestine not a single cry was heard on the part of the Arabs that they had been dispossessed of their land by the Jews. The attack had obviously been organized by the Arab leaders at a time when they believed that the Administration would be too weak to resist them. The whole talk of the Arabs that they had suffered, either materially or otherwise, through the settlement of Jews in Palestine was entirely false. The fact is that they have benefited considerably, both directly and indirectly. The Jews have bought land from the Arabs during the last ten years for an aggregate sum of nearly £4,000,000, whilst the land in general in Arab possession has greatly appreciated through the influx of Jews. The Arabs have also found considerable employment in Jewish colonies; they benefit greatly by letting houses, shops, and other buildings to Jewish tenants; and also they profit by selling vegetables and other produce to an amount which has been estimated to be about £800,000 per year. So far as the land itself is concerned, there is ample room, not only for all those at present living in Palestine, but even for an ultimate total population of 3,000,000, provided that intensive cultivation were everywhere adopted.

What Palestine above all needs is that the senior officials engaged in the Administration should be men who are thoroughly in sympathy with the policy of the National Home for the Jewish people. Unfortunately, we have seen during the last few years that a number of officials, who were formerly in the Administration, have returned to England and since then written articles in the reviews which have shown bitter hostility to the whole spirit and purpose of the Palestine Mandate; and from that can be deduced what their attitude was while actually in Palestine. There are, unfortunately, still a number of officials who are antagonistic to the

policy of the Jewish National Home, and it is therefore necessary that they should make room for others who are in sympathy with that policy. Until the Palestine Administration is manned by officials in perfect sympathy with the letter and spirit of the Mandate, it will not be possible for the Jewish people to make that progress in Palestine which they are so anxious to achieve.

Dr. MOSES GASTER, late Chief Rabbi of Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Congregations, also an invited speaker, said: The atmosphere in which I find myself to-night differs entirely from that which I have experienced at other meetings. I have listened with great pleasure to Dr. Christie's paper. Here we have the views of a man who had been living on the spot for many years, and who is animated with profound sympathy for the great Jewish movement in Palestine. I am not going to traverse or discuss the first part of the paper, dealing with historical problems which, for the time being, are not of actual consequence. We are facing now an entirely different position, which has been created in Palestine during the last few years. Dr. Christie has evidently fathomed the position without bias, and with a sympathetic understanding of the conditions which have prevailed; and yet it is necessary to remember that Palestine has always been a volcano, and is now more so than ever. Religious interest has clashed in Palestine at almost every point. The slightest incident is sufficient for rousing the greatest possible resentment. Events are exaggerated or minimized out of all proportion according to religious considerations. Fanaticism grows apace, and explosions of a more or less violent character are always to be expected. These forces for evil have been fostered almost ever since the power of the Turks was broken and Great Britain had obtained the Mandate over the Holy Land. In former years, and here I am going back to some of the details mentioned by Dr. Christie, the situation had been entirely different, and I may also correct some statements contained in the paper.

The first colonization of Palestine on a large scale was started in 1883, mostly by Roumanian Jews. It was the work of a small committee in Roumania, of which I formed part, and it is through our endeavour in all directions—financial, economic, and political—that we have been able to create, in the first place, the colony now

known as Sichron Jacob, formerly known as Samarin, at the foot of Mount Carmel, and the other colony in Galilee, known as Rosh-Pinah. We were assisted at that time by Laurence Oliphant, who had already planned the establishment of a small colony near Tiberias, for which he had sought a charter from the Sultan. It was only two or three years after the colony had been established that, owing to various conditions, we found it advisable to transfer it to Baron Edmond de Rothschild of Paris. It was through his munificence that the colonies were able to grow and to flourish, and to constitute the premier colony in Palestine. These colonies were allowed to settle because it was after the Russo-Turkish war, when Roumania obtained its independence; and the plea of all these Jews who wished to settle in Palestine was that they preferred to remain rayahs subject to the Sultan rather than to the Roumanian Government. It was later on, through political intrigues, that the entry of the Jew into Palestine was made more difficult.

Dr. Christie rightly describes the means by which those who were able to enter the land conditionally could settle permanently. But there was peace in the land, and although bakshish was a powerful factor, still, for all that, no Arab ever ventured to lift up his hand, or to raise a claim; nor did he find fault with the purchase of land by the Jews. On the contrary, when I visited Palestine in 1907, I held conversations with some of the leading sheiks, and they all expressed themselves as very pleased with the advent of the Jews, for they considered that with them had come "barakat," *i.e.* blessing, since the rain came in due season. When the delimitation of the frontier between France and England were under consideration, I was anxious to obtain for England the northernmost frontier. In discussing, at that time, these questions with the late Sir Mark Sykes, I suggested to him to take the lines of demarcation found in the Bible as the bases in the negotiation. On the whole, this advice was adopted, but since then other factors have intervened, which cause me not to be able to share the optimism of Dr. Christie as to the immediate future. No one is a prophet, and it would be dangerous to attempt to prophesy as to what may happen within measurable time. All the reasons which have been advanced in order to explain these murderous outbreaks on the part of the Arabs, and curiously enough shared in by many

of the Christian Arabs, scarcely give a clue to the real factor in this drama. These things have been prepared by a long hand; there is system in it and tenacity of purpose, and this is the gravest danger which confronts us concerning the future of the Jewish settlement in Palestine.

It must be clearly understood that the interpretation of the National Home such as given by Dr. Christie is one which we cannot, under any consideration, accept. It is no inducement to the Jews to emigrate there merely to be called Palestinian; that is not a National Home. Nor can I subscribe to the suggestion, made by Dr. Christie, that in one way or another one ought to get rid of a portion of the Arab population now in the Holy Land. Whilst quite agreeing that the Moghrabin are an immediate danger by reason of their wild fanaticism, still there is no necessity to send them away forcibly: a strong hand should be able to curb their fanaticism. As for the idea that those of the Arabs who are not satisfied with the development which is to take place in Palestine should emigrate, that would be simply grist to the mill of the Arabs. We cannot for a moment entertain such an idea. It would prove to the Arabs that the Jews are bent on driving them away, which is far from being our intention or desire. But simply to be allowed to live in that country and become a Palestinian, I do not think there is a single Jew who would ever subscribe to such a theory. He would rather prefer to be an Englishman, or a Frenchman, or an American, than to become a citizen of a small mandated territory with all its political limitations and shortcomings. A National Home, such as we understand it, is that the Jew will feel himself quite at home in a country which is his own, sharing it no doubt with the rest of the inhabitants, but not as a mere protégé. Law and order are an indispensable condition for any civilized Government, and this is such an elementary duty that one cannot call it a special privilege. But it is against the fundamental principle of a Jewish National Commonwealth that a great power is to-day working: that power is the Roman Catholic Church.

It so happened that, about 1921, the Greek Patriarchate in Jerusalem was practically bankrupt. Russia, which had been the main support of the Orthodox Church, had passed under the rule

of the Soviet Government, and no further help could be expected from that quarter. It was then that the Latin Patriarch started negotiations for the purchase from the Orthodox, the Church of the Sepulchre and all the other properties, of such tremendous religious importance. Of course, if this had actually passed into the possession of the Catholic Church, it would have given to it a paramount place, not only in Palestine but in Christendom. The British Government, however, hearing of what was going on, stepped in. It could not allow such a change to take place under the prevailing conditions, as they relate to the churches in Palestine. Assistance was rendered to the Orthodox Church, and the plan of the Catholic Church was thus frustrated. Hence virulent enmity, with every means possible henceforth to be employed to create difficulties in Palestine, with the design of dealing a blow to the prestige of the English Government and to the Protestant Church. And so Catholic emissaries were prepared, and sent from Syria, especially from the school in Beirut, to take advantage of the ignorance of the Arabs, to enflame their passions and to play upon their fanaticism, to bring about one riot after another, and to create a situation so inflammable and dangerous, as is to-day the case.

It is all intended to embarrass the Government. How far the Administration played into the hands of that propaganda is not for me to say; but that they did nothing to check it is so well known that it hardly requires repetition. Since then tactics have changed, and the outcry against the outrages perpetrated in Palestine, under the very eyes of the British Government, has shocked the world. Nothing would be gained by further terrorism as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, but the position of the Jews becomes intolerable; they are kept in a state of suspense and constant fear. These fears are sufficiently strong to prevent any healthy development, and they certainly make it impossible for the establishment of a National Home as the same is understood by the Jewish people.

A new policy is now being followed. It has been recognized that possession of land creates vested interests, and, accordingly, the more land that is bought by others, the less will be left for Jews to buy. If things are so arranged that new villages cut athwart Jewish colonies, or hem them in, in one direction or another, then

the future development will become impossible; such conditions will throttle further expansion. We see during the last few weeks, therefore, that large tracts of land are being bought by the Latin Patriarch in ever-increasing quantities. The policy is plain—it is simply to make Palestine an appanage of the Pope. Hence also the suggestion, deliberately circulated, that England might transfer its Mandate to Italy. This is a matter which affects Great Britain very closely, and the British Government is sure to look after its own interests, which are paramount in preserving the Mandate. Personally, I have no doubt that we are all united in the hope that Great Britain will not waver in her determination to keep the Mandate, and to preserve law and order in the land, as supplying the first condition for a peaceful development. Therefore, the future of a Jewish National Home does not appear to me to be so promising as Dr. Christie thinks. The Jews may settle there, and work and till the ground and form small colonies; that may be possible, but that anything which would evoke Jewish enthusiasm or justify sacrifices—physical, financial, or moral—is likely to happen is another thing. But though the danger may be great, and the future rather dark, still, we Jews have passed through many trials, and have been able to surmount many difficulties. The Divine promise stands. The land is ours, and in God's own good time it shall be ours. No human power will be able to withstand the will of God, and though the golden gate in Jerusalem may have been walled up by the Turks, there is another golden gate through which salvation will come. It is the Gate of Heaven.

Mr. HOSTE remarked that he too had a small mandate, and it would illustrate what had been pointed out. The Continental Powers who, no doubt from purely philanthropic motives, wish to replace the British Mandate by their own, are not morbidly particular as to the means they employ. He had been asked to show to the meeting, for the sake of those who might not have seen it, the badge of the alliance to this end between the Latins, or R.C. powers, and the Moslems, formed, as was an open secret, against the British Government and the Jews. (Mr. Hoste displayed the badge in the shape of a silver scarf-pin—a Crescent with a Latin Cross in the embrace of its horns.) As for the peroration of Dr. Gaster's address, he might say that the

doctor was not alone in looking for the advent of the Messiah from heaven; Christians, too, had that hope, and when He did appear, he felt sure of one thing—that then for the first time in history believing Jews and believing Christians would, in the language of the prophet Isaiah, “see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion,” and would rejoice together.

Mr. W. R. ROWLATT-JONES wrote: It is encouraging, in these pessimistic times, to read such a fascinating paper as Dr. Christie has written, although some of us may think that it is just a trifle too roseate-hued. The remarks on the degradation of the peasantry serve to emphasize the importance with which the Jew invested the keeping of genealogical tables. Register your genealogy, and you would benefit under the Mosaic law of Jubilee, whereby your inheritance would never be finally alienated. Failing registration, you not only lose caste, but probably sink back into servitude (*see* Ezra ii, 62). When we consider the status of the Holy Family, this is a matter of the highest importance, though hitherto ignored.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

On words by Dr. Gaster on p. 110 I would remark: At the close of the war I met and discussed the boundaries of Palestine with several generals as well as others. I advocated the River north of Tyre, the Qasmiyeh, Litani or Leontes as the northern frontier, and I said to General Money, First Chief Administrator: “Make the boundaries as in our Bible maps.” Later, Mr. Bonar Law spoke in Parliament about the northern boundary as running across country from Ras en-Nakurah to the Huleh Lake. I immediately wrote to him and pointed out the difficulty of making a boundary between British and French Mandated territory over hill and valley through brushwood. Further, I pointed out that some colonies would thus be in French and some in British territory, notably Metulleh. The boundary was then changed so as to include all Jewish Colonies in the Southern Mandate. No doubt it was done at the request of the Jews, as the absurdity was so apparent that they must have remonstrated. The Qasmiyeh is a “natural boundary,” as at some points one can stand on the south side and look down on the water flowing almost 2,000 feet below.

I did not say, as suggested on p. 112, anything about "getting rid of" the Arabs, or suggest anything "forcible." Moslems frequently move from under a Christian government, as they did in Cyprus and Crete to a great extent. I do not doubt the great mass of the "Moghrabiyeh" will move. They left North Africa for a like reason. I have all through hesitated to go further than the words "National Home." "Jewish National Commonwealth" can very easily be twisted into something that might be used to arouse ignorant fanatics. The Jews in all these troubles have been made to suffer from deliberate misrepresentations plausibly set forth.

731ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17TH, 1930,
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 a Member, John W. Laing, Esq.; and as Associates, Gordon Davidson, Esq., Miss H. J. MacEwan, and Miss Eleanor M. Shubrick.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Brig-General H. Biddulph, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., to read his paper on "The Date of Ecclesiasticus."

THE DATE OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

By BRIG.-GENERAL H. BIDDULPH, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

AT the present time it is generally held that Ecclesiasticus was written by Ben-Sira about 180–175 B.C., and the object of this paper is to try and show that, from the evidence afforded by the Hebrew text, the date of its composition must be considerably earlier.

As Mr. R. R. Ottley states in his *Handbook to the Septuagint*, "the point is important because the Prologue alludes to the Law, Prophets, and other Books; and various books of the Old Testament are referred to in the body of the work."

There are two statements, one in a Greek Prologue, and the other in the book itself, which might be thought to fix the date, and are all that we have to go on. The author of the Prologue

states that "coming into Egypt in the eight and thirtieth year in the time of Euergetes" and continuing there some time, he found and translated into Greek out of Hebrew the work of his grandfather. In chapter 50 of the book itself we find a long eulogy of the High Priest, Simon, the son of Onias (Jochanan), evidently written by a contemporary who had seen him officiate in the Temple in the years now past and gone.

Unfortunately there were two Ptolemies who bore the name of Euergetes, viz.:—Euergetes I, 247–222 B.C., and Physcon (Euergetes II), who reigned in Egypt 146–117 B.C. He had been proclaimed by the Alexandrians in 169 B.C. during the life of his brother and predecessor Philometor, and had been given Libya and Cyrene by the Romans. After the death of Philometor he succeeded to the throne of Egypt in 146 B.C.

Similarly there were two High Priests, Simon, the son of Onias, viz., the celebrated Simon the Just, whose date was either 310–291 B.C. or 300–270 B.C., and his grandson Simon, whose date was about 219–199 B.C. It will be noted that Euergetes II and Simon II both died about a century after their illustrious predecessors and namesakes.

In the Prologue a crucial point is the real meaning of the phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου. Does the writer mean "in the thirty-eighth year (of some unspecified era) in the time of Euergetes," or "in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes II," counting from the time when he was proclaimed by the Alexandrians 170–169 B.C.? Many are like Dr. Oesterley, who holds the latter view and refers to Hag. i, 1, and Zech. i, 1, in the LXX, to papyri inscriptions and the Rosetta Stone, in support of this translation, and writes, "we may therefore take these words as referring to the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Physcon Euergetes, for he is the only Egyptian King of this name who reigned over 38 years." Reckoning, therefore, from the date of proclamation, referred to above, viz., 170–169 B.C., we arrive at 132 B.C. as his thirty-eighth year, and adding some fifty years for the grandfather's *floruit* we fix 180 B.C. as the approximate date of the authorship. Dr. Pusey was emphatic on grammatical and linguistic grounds that the phrase cannot mean "in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes," parallel to ἐπὶ Δαρείου in the LXX (Hag. i, 1), for he observes that the Prologue does not contain a single Hebrew idiom, and insists that the ordinary methods of Greek translation must be adopted. He considers, therefore, that it is most natural to understand

the phrase as meaning in the thirty-eighth year of the translator's life, and that the Euergetes referred to is Euergetes I. There is certainly this much to be said for the argument that, since Pusey's date, the greater part of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew has been discovered, and the discovery proves that the grandson did not possess a very facile or accurate knowledge of Hebrew, for, to quote Sir F. G. Kenyon, "the translator took considerable liberty of paraphrase, and sometimes did not understand the Hebrew before him."

Mr. Hart,* one of the moderns who still hold the older view, maintains that, while the thirty-eighth year may be that of Euergetes, it may equally well belong to some familiar and unspecified era, and that this is the common Egyptian era which began with the accession of each king and ended with his death. Now Euergetes I came to the throne in the thirty-eighth year of his predecessor, Philadelphus, who reigned 285-247 B.C., and the phrase would mean in the thirty-eighth year of the era of Ptolemy Philadelphus, but just after Euergetes I had come to the throne. This view is not generally accepted.

Dr. Swete, in his Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, writes, "it is not clear whether the thirty-eighth year is to be reckoned from the commencement of the reign of Euergetes, or from some other point of departure," and Mr. Ottley, who also appears to occupy a neutral position, says, "there is no rendering of the phrase which is really secure."

A further point against identifying this Euergetes with Physcon (referred to by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Hart) is the fact that Physcon hated foreigners, while Euergetes I was very tolerant, and, according to Josephus (*c. Apion ii*), had a liking for the Jews and their religion. The reign of Physcon, that monster of foulness and brutality, would not have been an auspicious time for a foreign Jew to come and make a prolonged stay and publish a religious work. On the other hand, Mr. Hart's opponents think that too much can be made of this argument.

Additional points which would affect the question are (*a*) the integrity of the text and the number 38, (*b*) the term "grandfather" sometimes includes a more remote ancestor (and Easterns notoriously use terms of relationship in a generic rather than in an exact sense), and if so a reference to Euergetes II would not give any chronological clue to the "grandfather,"

* Ecclesiasticus, Greek Text of Codex 248.

and (c) that if Euergetes II were intended, it would seem more natural to identify him further, to avoid confusion, just as the coins of King James I bore the name Jacobus, while those of his grandson James II had the numeral added; and, indeed, Pusey* states, "Those who called him at all by the name (Euergetes) entitled him Euergetes the Second, or Euergetes Physcon, to distinguish him from the Ptolemy to whom the title belonged." The same argument applies to "Simon, the son of Onias." If the second were referred to it would seem natural for further identification to be made in order to prevent confusion just as the author in the Hebrew text signs himself Simeon, the son of Joshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira. On the whole, therefore, I think we may say that the reference to Euergetes fails to give us a definite clue to a date for the composition of the book, and we must now consider the eulogy of the High Priest, Simon, the son of Onias, contained in the fiftieth chapter.

Those who hold that Euergetes II is referred to in the Prologue identify this Simon, the son of Onias, with the second of that name, but such a conclusion presents great difficulties if the commonly accepted facts about the two Simons hold good.

Simon I has usually been called Simon the Just, for, as Josephus writes: "He was called Simon the Just because of his piety toward God and his kind disposition to those of his own nation." He left behind him such a reputation that it led to his being singled out in an early tract of the Mishnah† as one of the last remnants of the Great Synagogue; the Jerusalem Talmud has much in his praise and of the notable things that distinguished his office of the High Priesthood, and, in fact, to quote Dr. Edersheim,‡ his is "one of the greatest names in Jewish traditional history."

Further, according to Jewish tradition,§ the Ineffable Name was heard in the Temple for the last time from his lips; henceforward whosoever should attempt to pronounce it was to have no part in the world to come. As Dr. Edersheim|| says, "One relates who had stood among the priests in the Temple and

* "Lectures on Daniel."

† Pusey, ref. *Pirke Aboth*. c. 2.

‡ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

§ *Jewish Encycl.*: ref. Yoma 30 b. Tosef Sotah xiii. Etheridge, *Targums* ref. Sanhedrim x, 1.

|| *The Temple*, ref. Rabbi Tryphon in Jerusalem Talmud.

listened with rapt attention to catch the mysterious Name, it was lost amidst the sound of the priests' instruments, as they accompanied the benediction of the people."

Now if we turn to the eulogy of Simon, the son of Onias (Eccclus. I), several peculiarities are to be noted. First, its great length; it contains in the LXX no less than sixty lines, to which the Hebrew adds another ten, a number greater than that of any of the eulogies of the worthies who are praised from chapter xlv onwards. Thus Abraham's praise is recorded in 13 lines, Moses the Great law-giver's in 16 lines, Aaron's in 63 lines (55 only if we omit the eight lines which merely record the fate of Korah and his company). Phineas has 9 lines allotted to him, Joshua has 30, Samuel has 23, David has 34, many of which relate to his psalmody and his ordering of the Service of the Lord; Elijah has 20 lines allotted to him, Hezekiah has 18 lines, Isaiah has 8 lines, and so on. Next we notice that our author praises Simon for his public character and acts, as well as for the beauty of his High Priestly offices (the latter in no less than 51 lines). He is praised for strengthening and repairing the Temple, for fortifying the City, and for "*taking thought for his people.*" Both as a leader, a patriot, and as a High Priest his memory is gratefully remembered; and the record tallies exactly with Josephus's testimony that Simon the Just was famous for "*his piety toward God, and his kind disposition toward his own people.*" Indeed, so strong is the conclusion that the author of Ecclesiasticus can refer to none other than Simon the Just that apparently in order to justify a later dating for the work, some like Herzfeld and Derenbourg have boldly stated* that Josephus is in error, and that Simon II and not Simon I was Simon the Just. Such a conclusion or theory does not, however, solve the problem, as I hope to show.

We have seen how Simon is praised for fortifying the City, and Gratz† maintains that this can only refer to Simon I repairing the walls torn down by Ptolemy Soter, and agrees with the Talmudic accounts of Simon; although Dr. Oesterley‡ attributes this work on the Temple and City walls as being done by Simon II with money granted by Antiochus the Great, who was friendly to the Jews and gave grants to the Temple (*Antiq.* xii, 3). Be this as it may, let us now turn to the Hebrew text

* Charles, Apoc. and Pseud. of Old Testament.

† *Jewish Encycl.*

‡ Eccclus. 1912.

which, as Canon Charles declares, contains the genuine original text, though with many corruptions.

Here we find most significant differences between the Hebrew text and the Greek version ; and little doubt can be felt as to the inferiority of the Greek version, and the strong suspicion, amounting to certainty, of alteration in the latter.

In the Greek version we read that, after Simon had completed the offerings, the sons of Aaron shouted and sounded trumpets and made a great noise (*v.* 16), the people fell upon their faces (*v.* 17), and the singers praised God, so that the whole House was full of melody (*v.* 18). Then follow verses 19 and 20, "and the people besought the Lord Most High, in prayer before Him who is merciful, till the worship of the Lord should be ended, and so they accomplished the service. Then he (Simon) went down, and lifted up his hands over the whole congregation of the Children of Israel, to give blessing unto the Lord with his lips, and to glory in His Name."

The Hebrew text* of these two last verses runs : "and all the people of the land shouted in prayer before the Merciful One, until he (Simon) had finished serving the altar and had presented his dues unto Him. Then he went down and lifted up his hands over all the congregation of Israel, and the *blessing of Jehovah was on his lips, and with the Name of Jehovah he glorified himself.*" We see at once the differences. In the Greek version the phrase "the people of the land" becomes "the people," betokening that in the interval between the composition of the book and its translation the phrase had begun to be considered somewhat derogatory, whereas when it was used by our author no such suspicion could be attached to it. The alteration is made to suit the sentiment of the translator's age, and finally (what is most significant) the Hebrew text declares most explicitly that the Ineffable Name was pronounced by Simon and was his glory. The Greek version, for good reason, alters entirely this half verse. As we have noticed already, Jewish tradition declares that Simon the Just was the last High Priest to pronounce the Ineffable Name. From verses 18 and 19 in the Greek it appears that the service ended with the priests shouting and blowing their trumpets, the singers singing, and the whole house being full of melody, while the people fell on their faces in prayer before God, and this accords with Rabbi Tryphon's testimony

* Facsimiles Univ. Press : *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, Smend.

(quoted by Edersheim) that the sound of the sacred Name was lost in the sounding of the trumpets and music.

The Hebrew text gives us the primitive practice, the priests play, and the common people shout in prayer (compare Lev. ix, 24; Ezra iii, 11), and then silence ensues while the High Priest descends, and lifting up his hands over the whole congregation, pronounces the blessing of Jehovah, pronouncing the Sacred Name thrice (Num. vi, 23). Well might his admirer and contemporary (a priest, if I mistake not, *cf.* chap. xlv, 6-25) declare it to be Simon's glory, for he was the last to do so, and to this day no one can be certain as to how that Name should be pronounced. If we say that this Simon is Simon II, then we bring down to as late a date as 199 B.C. the practice of audibly pronouncing the Tetragrammaton. Such a conclusion seems to be impossible; in the LXX that Name is neither transliterated nor translated, and the LXX version of the Law is assigned by general agreement* to the days of Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.), a date not so very long after the death of Simon I. This confirms the traditions identifying Simon the Just with Simon I, and proves that at the time of translation the use of the Name had ceased.

A further evidence of the translator's feelings is to be found in the eulogy on Solomon in ch. xlvii, 18. The Hebrew text runs: "Thou wast called by the glorious Name, which is called over Israel; thou didst, etc.," referring to the name Jedidiah (beloved of Jehovah) given to Solomon by the Lord (2 Sam. xii, 25), but the Greek version alters this verse to avoid what seemed to the translator such a daring statement, and gives us the very lame substitute of: "By the Name of the Lord God, which is called the God of Israel, thou didst, etc."

Next let us examine the ten last lines of the eulogy in the Hebrew text, which in the Greek version have been so altered as to have no connection with Simon, a detail which has been alluded to above.

The significant lines in the Hebrew are:

- v. 22. "Now bless ye Jehovah, the God of Israel
* * * *
- v. 24. May His mercy be sure with Simeon,
And may He establish with him the covenant of
Phinehas,
That one may never be cut off from him, and
his seed as the days of heaven."

* Swete, Introduction to Old Testament in Greek.

In the Greek version these lines become :—

v. 22. " And now bless ye the God of all

* * * *

v. 24. To intrust His mercy with us
And may He deliver us in His time."

We see that all reference to Simeon is omitted, and that the prayer for Simeon and his posterity is changed into a prayer for the deliverance of God's people. No one can doubt that the change is intentional and also significant. If we go back to the time of Simon I we find that on his death he left behind him one son, a boy of tender years, incapable of succeeding to the High Priesthood forthwith. Two uncles, Eleazar and Manasseh, successively preceded him in office, and Onias II did not become High Priest until after their deaths. Well might Ben-Sira, who had witnessed the solemnity and beauty of Simon's service in the Temple, pray that Simon's line, hanging on one life, and that a youthful one, might be continued for ever, in the hope that a noble son and line might continue the memory of a noble father.

When, however, we consider the period after the death of Simon II, an entirely different state of affairs and men of very different characters come on the scene. Simon II left behind him no less than four full-grown sons, three of whom held the High Priesthood, while the fourth was deputy High Priest, and of these four sons three were men of the vilest character and actually apostates in practice. The four sons were :—

- (1) Onias III, who was deposed by Antiochus about 174 B.C., under the influence of a bribe of 360 talents paid by Jesus, brother of Onias.
- (2) Jesus, High Priest, 174–171 B.C., who apostatized and took the name of Jason, and died in exile and poverty.
- (3) Onias IV, High Priest, 171–163 B.C., of the same name as his elder brother, who played upon Jason the same trick which Jason played upon Onias III. He bribed Antiochus, ousted Jason, like him apostatized, took the Greek name of Menelaus, and added to his impiety by raising payment of his bribes to Antiochus and others by the sale of the gold vessels of the Temple, and by securing the murder of his deposed brother Onias III for protesting against this sacrilege. His crowning infamy was aiding

and abetting Antiochus in his desecration and defilement of the Temple. He had to fly from Jerusalem, and was put to death at Aleppo by Lysias, the lieutenant of Antiochus.

- (4) Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus and deputy High Priest to him, was also an apostate and was slain by the incensed populace for his share in selling the Temple vessels. The successor of Menelaus in the High Priesthood was Alcimus or Jacimus (? Eliakim or Jehoiakim), a man of priestly stock, but apparently not of the High Priest's family. He was an apostate, a man of infamous character, a persecutor of the Nationalist Jews, and perished in an attempt to tear down the wall of the Court of the Inner Temple.

[The succession and relationships given above are from Josephus. The author of 2 Macc. makes Menelaus the brother of one Simon, governor of the Temple, whom he describes as a Benjamite. Unless Menelaus was the half-brother of Simon, son of the same mother, but son of a priestly father, it seems difficult to believe that a Benjamite could become High Priest. It has been objected, further, to Josephus' account that Menelaus had the same name as his brother, viz., Onias; but one may observe that brothers or sisters sometimes bear a name in common. Further, the process of turning Hebrew names into Greek forms may well lead to corruption, and, finally, the name Onias may have been looked on almost as a family patronymic, for the youthful son of Onias III who should have succeeded in due time to the High Priesthood was also named Onias, and it was this Onias who fled to Egypt and founded the Schismatical Temple at Heliopolis, in which he officiated as High Priest. In this connection one might refer to the ancient practice of the Eastern Churches, *e.g.*, the Nestorian Patriarch always assumes the name of Simeon, the Jacobite Patriarch that of Ignatius, and the Maronite that of Peter.]

Another verse also supports the view that the time immediately succeeding Simon I is indicated, rather than Simon II, viz., chap. xlv, 26, which closes the lengthy eulogy of Aaron. In this case the reference to Simon is indirect, requiring few changes by the Greek translator. The verse in question runs, "and may He give you wisdom in your heart to judge His people in righteousness, that their good things be not abolished, and that your

glory may endure to all generations." The prayer is undoubtedly one on behalf of the High Priest then living, and is most applicable and suitable to the youthful Onias II, as the author recalls the righteousness and wisdom of his father, the good things that he did toward his nation, and the glory of his priestly offices. Such a prayer would not come naturally to the lips in the troublous times that followed Simon II's period; in fact, the Greek translator felt so forcibly that dignity and glory had departed from the High Priest's family, that he changes "your glory," the glory of the High Priest, to "their glory," *i.e.*, the glory of Israel at large.

From this study of the eulogy of Simon the son of Onias in *Ecclus. 1*, we conclude that from its character and importance it must refer to Simon the Just, for it is impossible that any other than a most famous man in the eyes of his contemporaries could receive such praise; further, his character as revealed in the eulogy, and the splendour and dignity of his sacred offices accord with what tradition has to say on these subjects; and Josephus definitely states that Simon the Just was Simon I.

If, on the other hand, we assume that Simon II was Simon the Just, we are faced with two great difficulties:—(a) The Hebrew text witnesses that this Simon's glory was his utterance of the Sacred Name, and it seems impossible to believe that this practice was carried down to as late a date as 199 B.C., when we know from the evidence of the LXX version of the Law that the practice had ceased long before that time; and the Greek version of *Ecclesiasticus* shows us that when the translation was made not only had the practice ceased, but that it had ceased for so long a time that the translator did not like to suggest (or did not know) that even Simon the Just had ever done so. Simon I seems most certainly to be indicated rather than Simon II by this evidence; (b) the second difficulty is that the prayer for Simon's posterity and the welfare of his house suits exactly the minority of Onias II, his only son, and the conditions of the time when his uncles Eleazar and Manasseh officiated in his stead; while, on the other hand, it is distinctly opposed to the period of the sons of Simon II. No such prayers are befitting the vile and apostate sons of that Simon, even if we give full weight to the integrity of the eldest son, Onias III. The change in the Greek version, however, takes full cognizance of the painful change that had come over the High Priesthood, since Ben-Sira wrote his eulogy of Simon the Just. That family

apostatized and every one of the four sons of Simon II came to a violent and disgraceful end: a man of another Levitical family occupied for some three or four years the office and perished miserably. The man who should have become High Priest started a line of Schismatical High Priests in Egypt, and finally the High Priesthood at Jerusalem was conferred by popular suffrage on the family of the Maccabees. Well might the Greek translator change the prayer for the house of Simon the Just into a prayer for the deliverance of God's people from the grievous troubles of the times in which he lived.

The evidence again seems to point clearly to Simon I being the Simon praised by Ben-Sira; and from the fact that his son Onias II had neither the public nor private virtues of his father (for Josephus depicts him as a miserly, ignoble character, devoid of public spirit), I think that the eulogy must have been written before his succession, or at any rate before his public character had time to reveal itself.

If, therefore, the Greek Prologue is genuine and free from corruption, and if the phrase "in the thirty-eighth year in the time of Euergetes" means "in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes II," I conclude that the word "*πάππος*" used by the translator means here "ancestor" (as is sometimes the case), and not "grandfather." Further small points in favour of a greater interval than that between grandson and grandfather are to be found perhaps (a) in the translator's words:—"I found a book of no small learning," as if he had discovered a work by his ancestor, of which he had never heard, and (b) the translator's somewhat indifferent knowledge of Hebrew, despite the fact that he was not an Alexandrian Jew, and presumably had come into Egypt from Palestine.

It seems, therefore, that the historical facts concerning Simon, contained in the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, fit in very exactly with what history and tradition have to tell us of Simon I and his period, whereas they accord but ill with the age of Simon II and his successors; while on the other hand, the alterations in the Greek version reflect plainly the evil days of the translator's time, and which began really with the accession of that ignoble man Onias II, son of Simon the Just.

We place the date of the composition of the work, therefore, a little time before or immediately after the accession of Onias II to the High Priesthood, approximately 270 B.C., and it is interesting to note (especially from chapters 44-49) that our author

had an exact knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures; indeed, although the Hebrew text is defective and corrupt, and the Greek version corrupt and inexact, Ben-Sira appears to refer to or to quote from all the books of the Hebrew Bible except Ecclesiastes, Daniel, and Esther; and his references are entirely free from uncanonical accretions or alterations. The deductions to be drawn from this, in connection with the dating which I suggest, are important, and would afford interesting matter for further study, but I must leave that to some better qualified person than myself.

APPENDIX.

Names and dates of the earlier Ptolemies (from Swete's Introduction to Old Testament in Greek).

	B.C.
Lagi or Soter	322-285.
Philadelphus	285-247.
Euergetes I	247-222.
Philopator I	222-205.
Epiphanes	205-182.
Eupator	182.
Philometor	182-146.
Philopator II	146.
Physcon, Euergetes II	146-117.

Succession of High Priests from Jaddua until the Maccabees (from Josephus), with some approximate dates from Jewish Encyclopædia:—

Jaddua (Neh. xii, 11).

Onias I (son of Jaddua).

Simon the Just (son of Onias I), 310-291 or 300-270 B.C.

Eleazar (brother of Simon the Just).

Manasseh (uncle).

Onias II (son of Simon the Just).

Simon II (son of Onias II), 219-199 B.C.

Onias III (son of Simon II).*

Jesus (Jason), brother of Onias III (deprived by Antiochus), 174-171 B.C.

Onias IV (Menelaus), brother of Jason (driven out by the people) 171-163 B.C.

Alcimus (Jacimus), 163-160 B.C.

* Another Onias, son of Onias III, founded the temple of Heliopolis.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Thirtle) said : It is with profound interest that I have listened to the paper read in our hearing this afternoon. If we have been brought face to face with a difficult problem, it cannot be said that General Biddulph has shown any lack of fairness in placing the facts before us. He has quoted authorities for and against the position which he had been led to maintain ; indeed so manifest was his restraint, that for a time we reasonably asked ourselves, first, which Ptolemy, and then, which Simon, was to be commended to our special confidence, in studying the critical question raised as to the date of the Book of Ecclesiasticus.

Authorities have been found to be at variance, and we have been plainly advised of the fact ; and not until the General had brought the case before us with judicious fullness, as seen from different points of view, did he proceed to indicate the deep importance of the issue raised, and to contend for the *first* Euergetes and the *first* Simon.

Some may inquire—*To what end ?* An answer has been given to this question, although the critical result has not been pursued. Here, in the prologue of the Book of Ecclesiasticus there appear—with the emphasis of repetition—terms descriptive of the Old Testament Scriptures—“the Law, and the Prophets, and the other books”—and it is in view of critical positions that have been widely held as to the larger portions of the Old Testament, that we are induced to trace the date of origin, or anyhow the date of translation into Greek, of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, otherwise “the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach.” With reason, we ask, at what period are we when we first meet with this particular expression, this formula, comprising the whole of the books of the Old Testament ? Was it the third century, or the second—or was it earlier still or later still ?

From the investigations pursued by General Biddulph we see that it is not easy to reach any satisfactory conclusion as between Euergetes I and II, but the character of the two Simons seems to be decisive, and with the preference shown for Simon the Just (son of Onias I), we are taken with assurance to the third century before Christ. As pointed out by General Biddulph, the reading of the

Hebrew text—fragments discovered during recent years—has an important bearing on the practice of sanctifying the Sacred Name as it was understood in Israelitish worship, up to a certain time, though not later. Just here, also, the statement on p. 123, with reference to King Solomon is of deep interest, though it is a statement which is sadly clouded, not to say misrepresented, in the generally accepted Greek version of the book. Just here the newly found Hebrew fragments render material assistance in reaching a solution of the problem in regard to the Tetragrammaton ; and in calling attention to this fact the General has made an important contribution to critical studies bearing upon Holy Scripture.

I do not profess to have given sustained attention to the various questions debated in the paper, but I feel deeply thankful for the excellent start to-day given to a very useful discussion. I call special attention to the words used on p. 127—“ the historical facts concerning Simon, contained in the Hebrew Book of Ecclesiasticus, fit in very exactly with what history and tradition have to tell us of Simon I and his period, whereas they accord but ill with the age of Simon II and his successors ; while on the other hand, the alterations in the Greek version reflect plainly the evil days of the translator’s time, and which began really with the accession of that ignoble man, Onias II, son of Simon the Just.”

The difference is one of a hundred years or so, speaking generally ; when the Greek version of the book was made, the use of the Sacred Name was a fascinating memory, and no more. For myself, I thank the General for indicating an interesting course of study—the study of an author who referred to (or quoted from) nearly all the books of the Hebrew Bible ; and I have pleasure in asking that we give a hearty vote of thanks for the paper read in our hearing.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said : It seems to me that the early date of Ecclesiasticus is amply proved. A very short study of the book should convince any unbiased person. I take it that it is a sort of commonplace book giving mainly the sermons and sayings of Simon the Just rather than the wisdom of the Son of Sirach. In the chapters 44–50 (of famous men) after going through the Bible characters from Enoch they all culminate and end with Simon. The

prayer for the return of the tribes of Jacob (chap. xxxvi, 11) seems to point to a very early date, when it was still the prayer and hope of Jerusalem. I see no reason to reject the prologue of the unknown writer or that of the translator. The latter took a journey to Egypt—probably to Alexandria where he found in some Jewish synagogue the book written by his grandfather. The Septuagint translation LXX was begun about 280 B.C., but no doubt translations of Hebrew writings were already in the air.

A book of his grandfather's was found by him or was shown to him, and he undertook to translate it and has done so. May I quote the passage in his prologue? "For in the eight and thirtieth year coming into Egypt, when Euergetes was king, and continuing there some time, I found a book of no small learning, etc." It seems quite clear to me that the only Euergetes known at that time was Ptolemy III (247-222 B.C.), otherwise he would have made clear which of the two kings of that name was meant. It was "when he was King." I suggest the king had not died very recently, and yet not very long before. Let us suppose that ten years before this king's death the translator made his journey, say, 232 B.C. I suggest that it was in the translator's 38th year, and therefore he was born about 270 B.C. If his father was 30 years of age at his birth, and his grandfather the same, that would carry us to 330 B.C. As Simon the Just died about 291 B.C. it would permit of the writer having known and heard the famous high-priest for years, and to have been nearly 40 years of age when he died.

[Mr. Edwards compared the chapter on Wisdom xxiv, with Prov. viii and other portions, and said that, interesting as the book was, it was woody, petty, and devoid of high principles, in a word—uninspired, and unworthy of admission into the Canon of Holy Scripture.]

MR. C. C. O. VAN LENNEP drew attention to the first few lines of the prologue, and especially to the words, "this man therefore lived in the latter times, after the people had been led away captive, and called home again, and almost after all the prophets." The last of these words especially bear out Brig.-General Biddulph's contention in favour of an earlier rather than a late date for the author of the book.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The chronology of the period of Simon I is very uncertain within some 30 years, and this affects correspondingly the date of Ecclesiasticus. With reference to the theory that Simon II was Simon the Just, and not Simon I, one feels that it is based more on subjective ideas than on the objective statements of history and tradition; and it will be interesting to quote Dr. J. E. H. Thomson from his book, *The Samaritans*. He writes: "Both Josephus and the Talmud (the latter inferentially) declare Simon I to be Simon the Just; but critical opinion asserts that not he but his grandson Simon II had the title; this grandson Josephus dismisses with a single sentence as a person of no account. The sole authority quoted for this identification by Cheyne (except a reference to the Talmud which is not decisive) is Derenbourg. This latter asserts this identification and supports it by a passage from *Yoma*. Derenbourg declares that nothing in the history of Simon I or in the circumstances which surrounded him, either justifies or explains why this title, The Just, should have been given to him. Simon the Just lived in an extraordinary time when ancient institutions were crumbling, and when the gradual enfeeblement of religious sentiment in the priesthood was punished by visible signs of Divine displeasure."

Then follows the quotation from *Yoma*: "During the forty years of the pontificate of Simon the Just, on the Day of Atonement, the lot for the goat destined for Jehovah always fell to the right hand; afterwards it was sometimes the right and sometimes the left. In his time the red thread which surrounded the head of the goat destined for Azazel became white, which indicated that the sins of the people had been pardoned; afterwards it sometimes became white, and sometimes did not. Under Simeon the lamp lighted at the west of the Temple shone always; after him it at times went out. While he lived, the wood once arranged upon the altar, the flame remained always strong, and the priests had only to bring a few faggots of small wood to fulfil their duty; after him the flame often went down, the priests were busy the whole day carrying wood to the altar."

I submit that all this proves precisely the opposite of what Derenbourg says it does; what the Talmudic writer evidently

means to teach is that the period when Simon the Just was high-priest was one of strong faith and unswerving faithfulness, which was rewarded by numerous signs of Divine favour, which ceased in the age which followed. Yet this is the passage which Cheyne quotes as proving his point !

Dean Stanley says : " Derenbourg has conclusively established that the Simon of Ecclesiasticus was Simon II." If that is the critical idea of proof, we shall not be surprised, should they direct their attention to the history of the Tudor period, that they would " establish," from Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, that Bishop Bonner was a kindly ecclesiastic with a leaning toward Protestantism. Yet it is something like an axiom of scientific (?) criticism that Simon II is Simon the Just.

Thus far Dr. Thomson, and it seems to me that all the evidence, whether internal or external, points indubitably to the fact that the Simon of Ecclesiasticus is Simon I, better known as Simon the Just.

732ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 3RD, 1930,
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 CHAIRMAN called on Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner to read his paper on "The Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord Jesus Christ."

*THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
SCRIPTURES TO OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.*

By LIEUT.-COL. T. C. SKINNER, R.E. (ret.).

THE task before me to-day is difficult. Already this year we have had a very valuable paper on "Christ and the Scriptures"; a paper of such merit that the Council, rightly as I think, adjudged it worthy of award under the Gunning Trust, and where it may be thought that the last word has been spoken, my task is to go over much the same ground, opening up another line of study altogether; one, moreover, that the earlier paper may be thought to have closed for good and all. Anything like controversy over the things that are most surely believed among us concerning the Deity of our Blessed Lord is to be deprecated, and in offering my thesis, I desire to do so with the utmost sympathy and respect for those who hold another and perhaps more conservative view. My task is

indeed most difficult, and to assist me, as you alone can, I ask you to follow the line of thought closely and sympathetically as it is developed, suspending judgment till presentation is complete, while on my part I give you at the outset clearest assurance that you will not have to abate one iota of conviction of the Deity of Christ, but rather, as I hope, your trust in Him and in the sacred Scriptures to which He has for ever set His seal will be immeasurably strengthened.

One other matter I will refer to here, the very common belief that because a truth is veiled or hidden, it is beyond our power or our province to understand it; a formula into which we are all quick to retreat when asked to face up to a reasoned disturbance of our cherished opinion, but one that, as I submit, represents a mistaken attitude altogether. Our Lord plainly taught His disciples that when the Spirit of Truth had come, He would guide them into all Truth, and where He does not definitely draw a line, we should not draw one for ourselves or for others. It is well also to remind ourselves now and again that no one individual or association of men, however spiritually minded, has a monopoly of Truth. With these observations I will now proceed.

Our subject being "The Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord Jesus Christ," we may properly approach it in the first instance from the Old Testament. The eleventh chapter of Isaiah opens with this prophecy, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the Spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins."

The testimony here is clearly of Jesus, the rod of the stem of Jesse, and examining it reverently we learn that the Spirit of the LORD was to rest upon Him in fullness, and was to make Him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD. The marginal reading for "understanding" (which, I take it, gives the

effect of the Hebrew) is "scent or smell"; He was thus to be quick-scented in the fear of the LORD by the operation of the Holy Spirit, that is quick to discern, instant to apprehend, the mind and will of God the Father, and, as the direct outcome, infallible in judgment among men.

Turning now to the New Testament for fulfilment of the prophecy, let us read first the word of the Angel to the Virgin Mary as given to us by St. Luke in chapter one, v. 35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," for us a very sheet-anchor of fundamental truth, assuring us of the Deity and sinless perfection of the Christ.

Then in Luke ii, 40, we read, "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the Grace of God was upon Him," while from verse 47 we learn that, as a boy of twelve, in the Temple, His understanding and answers were such that all who heard Him were astonished. Yet, again in verse 52 we are told that He "increased in wisdom and stature, and" (most amazing fact) "in favour with God and man."

We have thus a perfect picture of the Divine-human child, advancing from birth, through the tender years of infancy and growing boyhood, towards manhood's estate. We are told that at Jerusalem, at the age of twelve, He showed such marked mental and spiritual intuition as to excite wonder among the teachers of the Law; yet is it abundantly clear that His intellectual development, though phenomenally rapid, was as natural as His physical growth; He grew in wisdom and stature. Commenting on this visit to the Temple, Dr. Graham Scroggie says (S.U. notes, July 31st, 1929): "In His thirteenth year He became a 'son of the law,' and, for the first time, He went with His parents to 'the feast.' Read verses 43-47: Jesus had been brought up to love the Word of God, and the House of God. He was not teaching in the Temple, but *learning*"; and further commenting on verse 49 ("*Knew ye not that I must be in the things of My Father?*") (Gr.) Dr. Scroggie adds, "This verse (49) shows that Jesus at thirteen had a consciousness of His Divine Sonship, and it also points to a great moulding purpose on His part."

Thus does St. Luke record fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy in the development of the boy Jesus, quick-scented in the fear of the LORD.

If this picture of His development be true—and if we accredit St. Luke at all, we must, I submit, accept it as it stands—it presents at once to the devout mind three questions, all legitimate: Did Jesus bring with Him from the Glory the Divine knowledge of which St. Luke here gives us the first hints, but which later, in His brief public life, shone out in such matchless splendour? “Never man spake like this man.” If not, then at what stage in His human experience did this knowledge come? And third, by what means, or through what channels did He learn? But before taking these up and reverently seeking answers, it is necessary first to clear the ground of that spurious doctrine of the higher critical school styled the *kenosis* theory.

I take the following extracts from an article on the theory which appeared in “Practical Christianity” (journal of the Officers’ Christian Union) in April, 1923:—

“ . . . That He so divested Himself of His Godhead as to be merely imbued with the ideas current at the time among the Jews, and in fact that He often stated what was not the real truth. It is with this latter contention that it is proposed to deal particularly in this article. It may be said to rest firstly on an incorrect interpretation of Phil. ii, 7, of which the Authorised Version is as follows: ‘(Christ Jesus) took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.’ From this it is made out that our Lord humbled Himself to such an extent as to become empty of all Divine knowledge and insight. Hence the term ‘Kenosis’ (classical Greek for ‘emptiness’) is applied to this theory. . . . This theory amounts ultimately to denying that Christ was Truth as well as the Way and the Life, as He claimed to be in John xiv, 6. This is not an overstatement. . . .

“The following extract from an article by Principal E. Griffith Jones, in Peake’s ‘Commentary’ shows what has been stated above does not misrepresent the theory. ‘We cannot claim infallibility for Him on questions of history, such as the authorship of Old Testament books, or on the problems of science. In these directions, He must be quite frankly considered to have accepted the current notions of His time.’”

So wrote Principal Griffith Jones, and I accept it and the other extract as fairly defining or at least illustrating the *kenosis* theory. With the implications of that theory we can have no parley; we can only repudiate and condemn. Jesus, alone of all men, could say, “Heaven and earth shall pass away

but my words shall not pass away." (Matt. xxiv, 35.) His words were infallible.

But having said this much, we need to remind ourselves that no heresy could stand for twenty-four hours if it contained no single element of truth, for the supreme danger of a heresy lies in the misuse and exploitation of some fragment of truth that, in its appropriate connection, should be unhesitatingly received. And such is the effect of the *kenosis* theory; it claims for support the passage in Philippians already quoted, but more correctly rendered in the Revised Version, "but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant" (or bond servant), and argues therefrom that Jesus laid aside His Divine attributes, and came to us as any other man, of human parentage on both sides, fallible, and hence failing, subject to human limitations in knowledge and understanding, and hence often mistaken in His pronouncements.

As to this I fearlessly affirm that it is not possible for God to divest Himself of Deity. There are some things that even Almighty God cannot do. But that there was an emptying in some sort the Scriptures assure us. I say "Scriptures" (plural) advisedly, since it is only as we compare Scripture with Scripture that we can rightly divide the Word of Truth.

In what, then, did the emptying consist? The passage in Philippians pictures to us a progressive emptying that reached its climax in the death on the Cross; but it is with an early phase, only, that we are here immediately concerned; and here, with utmost reverence for those who hold another view, let me state it as my own conviction that when Jesus, born of Mary, came a little babe to Bethlehem, He came in all helplessness and simplicity as any other new-born child, dependent in the first instance on His mother and His foster-father for care and development of body and mind; a perfectly natural child developing along natural lines, as St. Luke so plainly shows.

Let me put it this way: When God gave His Son to us, He gave Him absolutely. That the infant Jesus had in Him a consciousness of the Divine, one may well believe. Indeed it is scarcely possible to conceive of any moment of His human experience when there was not in Him something of response to the Father in Heaven, the Spirit bearing witness with His Spirit that He was the Son of God. And yet surely it would be such response as might be predicated of a newly-born child, rather than that of a grown man, and the suggestion that, as

He lay in His manger-cradle, His infant mind was charged with the knowledge of eternity past and to come, is to me—let me say it in all humility—*impossible* and *repellant*.

In answer, then, to the first question, I state my humble conviction that Jesus did not bring with Him, as a new-born babe, the knowledge and understanding He had with His Father in the Glory; and to any who would join issue with me here, I again plead for patience to follow through to the end.

If not inherent at birth, then at what stage of His early life did the knowledge come? To this I reply, "Line upon line, precept upon precept," as it was Divinely and suitably presented to His ever-developing mind. Jesus "increased in wisdom" as well as stature (Luke ii, 52). This brings us to the third question: by what means or through what channels did He learn? Surely the answer is, Through the same means as were open to other Jewish children of faithful, God-fearing, God-loving parents. Let us briefly review these. First, can we doubt that His mother taught Him to fold His baby hands in prayer? or that, later, as He was of age to receive it, she may have disclosed to Him some of the deep things long hidden in her heart—the Angel visitation; the Shepherds; the Magi; the prophecies that went before on Him? Would not Joseph have taught Him to read, as no doubt later he would have taught Him his trade? Would He not have attended the village school, there to acquire such learning as was imparted to other Jewish children of His own age? If, as we are told, we go to school "to learn how to learn," such early tuition of His day, though meagre, would not be without its formative value even to the boy Jesus. Then there was for Him, as for all who trust and obey, the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit (subjective); and yet again—if indeed it be possible to differentiate—there was the Father's voice from Heaven; though not till He was about to enter upon His public ministry are we told that God thus spoke to Him direct from Heaven. The circumstances, too, of His daily life, and His intercourse with others, all doubtless played their part in training mind and heart. But yet another source of inexhaustible truth and teaching lay open to Him, through hearing, and later, reading, for Himself the Word of God in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament; and it is to this, chiefly, the immeasurable significance, to Him, of these Old Testament Scriptures, that I will presently direct your

attention, after that I have asked, and endeavoured to answer, a fourth question.

If it be true that Jesus, Son of God unique, learned through the same channels as are open to all who are children of God by faith, wherein did He differ from these? Was it not in this that, being sinless—"holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners"—there was in Him no impediment, no faintest obstacle whatever, to immediate, perfect apprehension of the mind and will of God the Father; through all these differing means, and especially, in our immediate reference, through His study of the Scriptures. Let us, from now onward, concentrate our thoughts on the significance of the Scriptures to His growing mind.

Picture the boy Jesus as He hears these read, or Himself reads in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; quick-scented, by the Spirit, in the fear of the LORD, would they not flash to mind and heart instantly with meanings far beyond the discernment of the most spiritually minded men of His own or of any time? Was it not this, his marvellous intuition, that caused the doctors of the Law to marvel?

Consider next what it was He would have learned as He read, taking only a few illustrations out of literally thousands available, for time presses. Consider Gen. iii, 15, the promised seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head; consider Deut. xviii, 15, the prophet to come, like unto Moses, and of their brethren, but speaking with Divine authority; Jer. v, 1, the one man whom God was seeking, whose righteousness should save Jerusalem; 2 Chron. xvi, 9, the eyes of the LORD searching the whole earth for the perfect heart; Isa. xi, 1, etc., the rod of the stem of Jesse; Isa. lxi, 1-3, which He appropriated to Himself in the Synagogue at Nazareth; Num. xxi, 8, 9, the serpent of brass, cited in John iii, 14, 15; Isa. liii, that wondrous chapter that speaks of Christ in every line. In all these and in countless others He would infallibly identify God's requirement of One who should fulfil all His will.

Take a few more: Gen. xxii, Abraham offering up His son Isaac; Gen. xxxvii, Joseph betrayed by his brethren and sold into Egypt, to become their prince and saviour; 2 Sam. xv, etc., David the King rejected; Exod. xii, etc., the passover lamb; the sprinkling of the blood; all the marvellous symbolism of the tabernacle and its services, etc., etc.

These types, figures and prophecies innumerable, when

interpreted to us, do indeed strengthen our own belief immeasurably that all was of God from the beginning, but inasmuch as we have, in the New Testament, the *fact* of Christ Himself, the question must often have arisen in our minds, "Was that the only, or even the chief, reason for their having been written beforehand?" As a first answer we will probably reflect that to train the Jewish mind and heart were they written, "To make ready a people prepared for the Lord." And yet, judged by results, even this explanation seems but partial and incomplete, leaving us to seek for something still deeper, fuller, and more satisfying; Ps. xl. furnishes the key; I read in the Revised Version, with marginal renderings, verses 6 to 8.

"Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in;
 Mine ears hast thou bored;
 Burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required;
 "Then said I, Lo, I am come;
 In the roll of the book it is prescribed to me;
 "I delight to do thy will, O my God;
 Yea, thy law is within my heart."

The bored ear, as in Exod. xxi, 5, 6; seal of the perpetual, willing service of surrender to the will of God. "Lo, I am come; in the roll of the book it is prescribed to me;" Divine prescription for the Divine Son, written hundreds, yea thousands, of years before, that when He should come in fashion as man, made like unto his brethren, He might find there these excellent things in counsels and knowledge, and might know the certainty of the words of truth, verifying them in His own experience by a trust that never failed. *The Hebrew Bible was His book.* Little as they themselves knew it, the holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, in testifying beforehand the sufferings unto Christ, and the glories that should follow, spake and wrote, for Him, that in His holy childhood, His boyhood, and His young manhood, He might be perfected in knowledge, thoroughly furnished in all the will of God.

Is it a thing incredible with you that God, who could choose a humble Jewish maiden to be the mother of our Lord, should have prepared, in anticipation, this sacred Word to be matrix of His mind? Is it not rather what we should expect of the God Whose glory it is to conceal a thing that kings may search it out? (Prov. xxv, 2).

In the light of this thought let us now consider more in detail Gen. xxii, verses 12 and 15-18 (read these). You recall the first promise, of seed "as the dust of the earth," and the second, of seed in number as the stars (ch. xiii, 16, and xv, 5), first the natural, and afterwards the spiritual; and now as He brings these together, with precedence to the spiritual, can we not hear Heaven's arches ring with the outburst of exultant joy, "By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply . . . because thou hast obeyed my voice." Why? Surely because that self-same day, through the obedient faith of this simple-hearted "friend of God," there was laid a tried foundation for the future education of God's own dear Son.

Is this in doubt? Then contrast the Divine displeasure with Moses (Num. xx, 7-12) who, when enjoined to "speak" to the rock once-smitten, as in Exod. xvii, 6, smote a second time, to the destruction of the parable, leaving to God no alternative but to severely censure His unfaithful servant that thereafter he who ran might read.

After childhood, boyhood; after boyhood, manhood; but of Jesus' early manhood we are told nothing. Yet we can surely picture this time as a time of intensive preparation for the years to follow, most momentous in all human history. How, especially, He would store mind and heart with the Scriptures of Truth, saying, like Jeremiah of old, "Thy words were found and I did eat them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by Thy name, O LORD, God of hosts," or with Job, "I have esteemed the word of His mouth more than my necessary food," or with the writer of the 119th Psalm, "Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage for ever: for they are the rejoicing of my heart. . . . I rejoice at thy word as one that findeth great spoil."

And as the time of His baptism drew near, how precious to Him would be those words of the 2nd Psalm, "The LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," while, at the baptism, St. Luke tells us it was *when He was praying* that the Heaven was opened, and with the descent of the Holy Ghost came the voice of God, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." Do we then reverently inquire what

was the burden of that prayer? Let the wondrous answer speak. Was it not for confirmation of the faithful Word on which He was staking all the issues of life, death, time, and eternity, and for enduement with power for what lay before?

Mark what follows with almost breathless rapidity: "Straightway the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness," there to endure for forty awful days and nights the cumulative temptation of the devil. And what was the nature of the temptation? Was it to satisfy hunger by a miracle? Was it to make spectacular appeal to Israel? There is an element of vulgarity about these that, notwithstanding our Lord's distress, must have foredoomed them to failure even in Satan's eyes, and I conclude he only employed them to mask the real attack upon our Lord's unquestioning confidence in the Word of His Father. "*If thou be the Son of God . . .*"; *if, if*; mark the subtlety, only to be defeated by rapier-thrusts from the same unfailling Word.

Recoiling from his flank attack, Satan next comes into the open and boldly offers Jesus a short cut to His promised inheritance, but at cost of His allegiance to God. Foiled here as elsewhere, the devil, as St. Luke tells us, "departed from Him for a season," "and Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee." Thereafter, throughout His earthly ministry, seeking God continually in prayer, He both taught and wrought in the power of the Holy Ghost, "For God was with Him" (Acts x, 38).

Stage by stage, too, was He Divinely helped and strengthened. In the wilderness angels ministered to Him (Matt. iv, 11). At the Transfiguration there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Yet again St. John tells of a voice from Heaven, in answer to Our Lord's prayer, "Father, glorify Thy name;" all enabling Him to endure the contradiction of sinners, and even of His own loved disciples who would have turned Him back from the way of the Cross. Again, in dark Gethsemane there appeared unto Him an angel from Heaven, strengthening Him for the final assault, when, having secured His crucifixion and certain death, they reviled Him, saying, "*If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the Cross.*"

When men are about to make a desperate "push" to reach some desired objective, be it the Pole, the battle front, or the mountain top, they first do all that is humanly possible, by

preparation of forward depots, caches of food, etc., to prolong endurance and ensure success. Picture to yourselves the infinite refreshment to our blessed Lord in His dying agony as His eyes surveyed the scene below the Cross and He remembered, "They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." It is written ; it is written.

One more scene : Jesus, our sin-bearer, had uttered that cry of inexpressible anguish, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ?" but all three synoptists unite in recording yet another loud cry, with which St. Luke associates the prayer, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit." How should we understand this prayer ? Was it the last whisper of unbroken communion breathed through dying lips ? Rather, as I read it, communion already broken, this was itself the last loud cry, triumphant shout of unquenchable faith—"Father"—ere He passed into the outer darkness. "Truly this man was the Son of God."

"It is finished," and three days later, Jesus, author and perfecter of faith, declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, draws near to two broken-hearted disciples as they walk. What does He talk with them about ? "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures *the things concerning Himself*." No wonder their hearts burned within them while He opened to them the Scriptures ; His own book, who should know them as He ?

Later, appearing in the midst of the disciples, Jesus . . . said unto them, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day : and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations . . ."

May God open our eyes to behold wondrous things out of His Law ; and to such as rush in to criticize the Word, trespassers all, we will say, Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the very ground whereon thou standest is holy.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Thirtle) said : It is with sincere pleasure that I listened to the paper read by Colonel Skinner. We shall acquiesce, I doubt not, in his own utterance, that such studies can only be conducted with profit if inspired by reverence to the Lord Jesus, and submission to the teachings of Holy Scripture. From the first age of the Church, as we do well to remember, men have lost their way in speculation as to the nature of Christ and the implicates of the Incarnation. We shall, however, agree that Colonel Skinner has exercised good judgment in his treatment of a very difficult theme.

With commendable prudence, the Colonel has—with the exception of a single paragraph—avoided convictions of an order that might be described as *exclusive*. For example, while maintaining that, as He “increased in wisdom,” the Lord gathered light from the writings of the prophets, he did not go on to suggest that the Lord was wholly confined, or in His experience limited, to such a single source or channel of instruction and wisdom. Such a position, quite manifestly, would have involved very serious problems, and would have neutralized the plea that the study was complementary rather than contradictory.

The prophets, as we know, gathered guidance from the writings of their predecessors, at least in some cases ; all the same, as we must recognize, they were borne along with heavenly light that was ministered to them individually. Beyond question, then, the Son of God could not be denied a corresponding initiative, a like equipment with a divine source of illumination—if not a still more intimate command of the will and thought, and word of His heavenly Father.

In regard to Himself, His nature and dignity, and likewise His teaching, Christ claimed to speak the words of God, and therefore could not have been confined to things that were learned from writings of a past day. With this the Colonel would, I suppose, in large measure, agree. Certain it is that Christ knew the Scriptures, but whether those Scriptures formed the warp or the woof—the framework, or the superstructure—of His knowledge, we

may not be careful to inquire, much less to decide. All the time, we must allow that He had access to wisdom which was beyond the reach of other men, whether prophets or priests or kings in the chosen nation of Israel.

The subject before us has its psychological bearings, and if psychology is beset with difficulties when applied to the human creature, what shall we say when we find it applied to One who was at the same time human and divine? It is conceivable that the prophetic consciousness in a prophet was stimulated by the reading of the books of earlier prophets; but dare we assert the conclusion that, in the case of Christ the Messianic consciousness was excited, or awakened by the writings of men who themselves were without the Messianic faculty? All the same, we may be allowed to reason that, in the providence of God, the Messianic consciousness of our Lord, as He grew in wisdom and knowledge, may have been confirmed and encouraged by the God-implanted hope voiced by prophets, which showed that in due time God would visit and redeem His people by His only-begotten Son.

Whatever may have been the case of the Lord as a learner from Holy Scripture—and it is largely with that that Colonel Skinner has dealt—we are assuredly on strong and inconvertible ground when we contemplate the place of our Lord as a divinely qualified exponent of the Word. This was made clear by Colonel Skinner in the last page of his paper, in which, in helpful fashion, we were reminded of the occasion when, in presence of His disciples, the Lord “expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.” Whatever may be doubtful, this is beyond question, and serves as a demonstration of “the significance of the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord,” and that in part answers to the title of the paper which has been read this afternoon.

The extent to which the Lord was a learner may be in doubt, at least in some degree; but the certainty that He was a teacher, an instructor thoroughly furnished, speaking with authority, and as for God himself, should supply the groundwork of a study, making for complete confidence in regard to revealed truth as we have it in Holy Scripture—the Word of God, who spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, but at the end

of these days spoke unto us in His Son, the appointed heir of all things.

[The Chairman moved a vote of thanks to the lecturer, and the same was carried with acclamation.]

Mr. G. WILSON HEATH said: I regret that I am unable to agree with the lecturer. In fact, I definitely disagree with the paper—if I have understood it—from first to last, except alone the last paragraph, which is a prayer and a warning with which we must all agree.

That the old Kenosis theory and its implications is one with which “we can have no parley” I agree, but the lecturer substitutes a new Kenosis theory, which I for myself repudiate and condemn as heartily. This theory is sought to be upheld by references to daily notes and “Scripture Union” portions of July, 1929, and February, 1930, by Dr. W. G. Scroggie, a servant of the Lord whom the lecturer introduces to us as “well known to be orthodox.” I can only say that the orthodox of to-day may be the unorthodox of to-morrow, and that our faith alone should be in Christ and His word. The thought of our Lord as “helpless,” “impotent,” “innocent” and “ignorant,” merely a “new factor entering into human history” causes me a shuddering shock. I am aware it is not new—I remember that some thirty years ago a well-known teacher and writer made similar references to our Lord, and that under the general protest he withdrew the offending words and substituted others which distinctly affirmed, that although babyhood in itself did not express Deity, yet He who was the Almighty God was pleased also to dwell in the Babe of Bethlehem. It is all a mystery, far beyond our finite comprehension. I wish to ask the lecturer to reply to four questions, to enable us exactly to appreciate what he means:—

1st.—Are we to understand that Jesus the Son of Mary, was actually and perfectly a MAN. Not a fallen and sinful man, but a MAN, a perfect transcript of the mind of God for man originally? or

2nd.—Are we to understand that Jesus, the Son of Mary, was a development of a fallen race, with all the weakness, ineffectiveness, and defects of this race, but sin apart?

3rd.—Was Jesus from birth to death GOD TABERNACLED in grace in a human, yet sinless, and holy body, and yet at any, and at all, times capable of manifesting Himself as God, God incarnate in flesh ?

4th.—Was not the Lord Jesus, whilst seen outwardly by the natural eye, to be in all the conditions of human life, from His babyhood to manhood, really all the time THE ALMIGHTY GOD and THE DIVINE WISDOM and this in *all* His earthly pathway, that is from the cradle to the grave ?

Rev. F. W. PITT said : If Jesus was God He was always God, both before and after the Incarnation. It is inconceivable that He should be God without knowing it. The Jesus presented to us in this paper is one who only differed from other men in that He was sinless. He “did not bring with Him the knowledge and understanding He had with His Father in Glory” (p. 139). Then what did He bring ? Apparently nothing ! His Godhood was merely knowledge acquired from outside sources. It was by degrees He came to know that He was God. This was not the manifestation of God in the flesh. It was the training and adaptation of a sinless human being to the Office of Deity. In that case, as no man comprehended the Son but the Father, the Son did not comprehend Himself. How could He do so if it depended on His “learning like other Jewish children ?”

Jesus said, “I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven.” Who told Him that He saw that wonder ? And did He remember that He had seen it when He was told ? Jesus said “Glorify me with the glory I had with Thee before the world was.” Who taught Him that, and did He remember what the glory was when He was told about it ?

From Colonel Skinner’s paper I glean that Mary had the tremendous responsibility of telling a man that He was God, or of informing God that He was God. Truly she had been told that that Holy thing which should be born in her should be called the Son of God. “But she kept all these sayings in her heart,” and yet at twelve years old Jesus knew He was the Son of God, and Mary’s words to Him showed that she had not told Him the secret. She apparently thought He did not at that time know who He

was; for she said, "THY FATHER and I have sought Thee sorrowing," and Jesus replied, "How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be about *my Father's* business?" He knew though Mary had not told Him.

The only warrant given in this paper for the ever-developing mind of Jesus is the statement in Luke ii, 52, "that He increased in wisdom and stature"; but the R.V., in spite of its Unitarian bias, alters the word "increased" to "advanced," which is quite another thing, and does not clash with the statement in verse 40, "that the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, *filled* with wisdom."

After careful and repeated reading of the essay, I find no difference on the main point between Colonel Skinner's view and the Kenosis theory. The Kenosis says Jesus emptied Himself of His knowledge, and Colonel Skinner says He did not know.

Mr. W. N. DELEIVINGNE said: I have always felt that the words we read in Phil. ii, 7, "(He) emptied Himself," have a deeper meaning than emerges from the expression used in the Authorised Version: "(He) made Himself of no reputation," and that they cannot be adequately explained by regarding them, as some do, as merely another mode of expressing the thought we find in verse 8, "He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death." They are intended to signify, I would reverently suggest, the mysterious and, to our finite minds, incomprehensible change from Our Lord's existence as God omniscient, omnipotent, co-equal, and one in glory with the Father, prior to His Incarnation, to His existence as man, born in the flesh, and in so far as He was man, subject to the limitations of the human mind and body. Indeed, one aspect of the truth set forth in that wonderful passage in Phil. ii would appear to be that Christ could not manifest Himself in the flesh without laying aside, or veiling, the full glory of the Godhead. This does not mean that, by manifesting Himself in the flesh, He divested Himself of the character and attributes of the Deity. That was impossible. By taking the form of man, however, Christ did not break or diminish His unity with the Father. "I and the Father are one"; "the Father is in Me and I in Him," He said to the Jews; and utterly beyond the reach of our understanding as it is, Our Lord, while living as man on the

earth, was absolutely one with the Father—God. And being One with the Father, He was filled with the Holy Spirit of God, for, as we read in John iii, 34, “God giveth not the Spirit by measure (unto Him).”

But while Jesus was absolutely one with the Father, His position while in the flesh, I humbly and reverently suggest, was one of dependence—I think it may even be said complete dependence—upon the Father. Again and again Our Lord, in speaking to the Jews, used such words as these: “I came not to do mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent Me;” “as My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things;” “I can of Mine own Self do nothing.” And it will be remembered that Our Lord, when about to perform that wonderful miracle, the raising of Lazarus from the dead, lifted up His eyes and said, “Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always: but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it, that they may believe that Thou didst send Me.” The use of these expressions by Our Lord has a deep significance, and is intended to reveal to us that Jesus, while maintaining unbroken communion with the Father during His life on earth, was in a position of dependence upon the Father for that wisdom and knowledge and power that manifested themselves in all His words and works. And it is in His dependence upon the Father that we should seek for light upon those difficult words regarding Our Lord’s Incarnation—“He emptied Himself.” There has been much speculation upon the meaning and import of these words, but, as was remarked by one of our members (Mr. Edwards) when Mr. Pitt read his paper on “Christ and the Scriptures,” mere human speculation on such a subject as the Incarnation is not only of no benefit, but is positively harmful to the soul.

Seeing that these words “He emptied Himself” are used in Scripture, it is not only permitted to us to seek to know their meaning, but it is our duty to give them reverent thought and attention. But the only place where we can legitimately look for light upon them is God’s Word. God, in His love to man, has given us a partial revelation of Himself (in His only-begotten Son) and we can know nothing more than what He has chosen to reveal in His Word. If we go outside that Word and resort to

speculation in the quest for further knowledge, we shall, sooner or later, fall into grievous error.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: The mysterious connection between the Divine and the human in the person of our Lord is a subject upon which I almost tremble to discourse. This is holy ground upon which, as we might well say, angels fear to tread. It belongs to things which they "desire to look into" (1 Pet. i, 12); fathomless mysteries that may well challenge their reverence and adoration, and ours too, in ages yet to come. Yet some daring mortals, like Nestorius and Arius, have presumed to meddle with them, to the confusion if not disaster of the organized Church.

Some would now suggest that Christ the Eternal Son at Bethlehem not only laid aside His throne—His glory—His very Godhead, but also his memory, when He entered into the body prepared for His Incarnation, and that He came into that body with a blank mind, *tabula rasa*, or like an ordinary babe. That He who thought and prayed concerning the glory which He had with the Father "before the world was": He who said "I and My Father are one"—"He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"; that He—the Lamb of God—the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world: the second party to the Eternal Covenant of Grace, forgot all and everything. It is suggested that this "forgotten all" came back like a dream or a revelation when at His mother's knee He knelt in prayer, or learnt at school to read a book—the Old Testament. Is it possible? For me it is absolutely unthinkable—unthinkable that He of whose Incarnation it is written, "It pleased (the Father) that in Him should all fulness dwell" (Col. i, 19) and should thus enter our sublunary life.

If we read Eph. i, ii and iii, and Col. i, and correlated passage of the New Testament, I think we shall find this to be an incredible theory. We believe in the revelation of the Trinity and Unity of the Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We cannot explain it, but we can experimentally prove its truth. The adoption, whereby we cry, "Abba, Father"; the Lord Jesus with us, and within us, the Hope of Glory; and the Holy Spirit indwelling and bringing forth the fruits of Christian experience in life and character. The difficulty with some seems to be to harmonize IMMANENCE

with local manifestations—in other words, Omnipresence with any Theophany. To such I will address myself. Shall we start with the Burning bush? God was *there*, the Omnipresent Triune God—the God of patience, speaking perhaps for hours with Moses. *There* behind the mountain alone with a hopeless shepherd, and yet, He was at the same time Omnipresent throughout the universe beyond the wings of the morning. Or turn to Sinai, all aflame with the descending Deity, proclaiming His Holy Law for a fallen race and a chosen people. The Omnipresent Deity was *there*, for more than 40 days and seen in glory by the elders of Israel (Exod. xxiv, 11), as Christ was seen upon the Mountain of Transfiguration by the disciples or by the Apostle John in Patmos. And all the time He was *reigning* in heaven and throughout boundless infinite space.

I claim the same for the manifestation of Christ for more than thirty years as the Babe of Bethlehem, the Boy of Nazareth, the Carpenter, the Son of Man—as for the 40 days and more of Sinai or the Shekinah for centuries—and in saying that, I do not forget that awful moment when for the first and only time He cried, “Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?”

From the moment of incarnation as a Babe on to His Ascension, Christ was always God, the Eternal Son, in constant intercourse with the Eternal Father and the Eternal Spirit. I rejoice to read the ancient prophecy of that wondrous Babe. “Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulders and His name shall be called WONDERFUL COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, THE PRINCE OF PEACE” (Isa. ix, 6)—a passage that is only understandable by those who, taught of God the Holy Ghost, rejoice in the appreciation of the Eternal mystery of the ever-blessed Trinity and the Holy Incarnation.

Lastly, let us think for a moment of our Lord’s Ascension. He said in parting, “Lo, I am with you always.” Although this is the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and the Son of Man is upon His Heavenly Throne, His glorified body being there, as described by the Apostle John, yet by His Omnipresence He is still *with us*. In the same way, and at the same time, He was universally Omnipresent when the body of His Incarnation was laid as a babe in a manger, or as a boy He went to the school and

the synagogue, to Jerusalem and the Temple, or as the culminating prophet of Israel as He "went about doing good." He was indeed EMMANUEL, which being interpreted is "GOD WITH US."

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: In my judgment the lecturer has failed rightly to interpret the true "Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures to our Lord Jesus Christ," which is the title of his lecture. One gladly recognizes his desire to approach this subject with reverence, and I note his assurance that he has no desire "to abate one iota of conviction of the Deity of Christ." Yet practically all the argument of the lecture tend, however unintentionally on his part, in the opposite direction, viz., toward robbing our Lord, during His earthly life, of some of His Divine attributes. He tells us Christ came "as any other new-born child," although, if we are to believe the Scriptures (Luke i, 35), He came as no other new-born child ever came! And further, the author adds, that "He was a perfectly natural child, developing along natural lines," that "He acquired such learning as was imparted to other Jewish children," and that "His intercourse with others all doubtless played their part in training His heart and mind." He even goes so far as to make the statement that "Jesus did not bring with Him, as a new-born babe, the knowledge and understanding He had with His Father in glory." And that "He had to learn from the Scriptures as other children of God do!"

Those are remarks that pain me, and the replies, which naturally spring to our minds, are these:—

1st.—The Scriptures make it clear that, throughout the whole of His earthly life, although truly man, yet Christ was ever God. For His name, Divinely given in connection with His birth, was Emmanuel—God with us (Matt. i, 23); and at the end of His earthly life, in connection with the Cross, we read that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself" (1 Cor. v, 19); while, in Acts xx, 28, we read of "the Church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood." Moreover, His claim to the great name "I AM" (John viii, 58) so frequently made, proves from His own lips; though veiled in flesh yet the Godhead was never for one moment absent.

2nd.—Does it not seem incongruous to suggest that our Lord

should have had to learn from the Scriptures, when those Scriptures were all *inspired by His own Spirit*, so that they are actually called "the Word of Christ" (Col. iii, 16).

3rd.—We recognize to the full the dual nature of our Lord, that He was perfect man and perfect God; but I suggest that the line between His Deity and Humanity is for ever veiled from our view. That ground is too sacred for human feet to tread, and those who dare to venture there, invariably lose their way, and either magnify our blessed Lord's Deity at the expense of His Humanity, or, as in the present case, they lay undue stress upon His Humanity at the expense of His Deity. When human lips venture to use the word "ignorance" in connection with our Divine Lord, as our lecturer has done, I take my stand beside the disciples of old and say: "*Now are we sure that Thou knowest all things*" (John xvi, 30), a statement which our Lord, by His very silence endorsed and approved.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: There is one Scripture which should govern any contribution made to this awful and mysterious subject of the Person of Christ, viz., "No man knoweth the Son but the Father" (Matt. xi, 27). We are only safe in so far as we keep within the bounds of revelation. All else is speculation and dangerous presumption. Colonel Skinner asks (on p. 139) "Can we doubt that His mother taught Him to fold His baby hands in prayer?" Yes, there is good reason for doubting it, as it is said, as I believe with reference to the Son of God in the Messianic Psalm xxii, 9 and 10: "But Thou art He that took Me out of the womb: Thou didst make Me hope when I was upon My mother's breasts. I was cast upon Thee from the womb. Thou art My God from My mother's belly." These words delineate a babyhood distinct from every other babyhood. There can be no question that the paper reverently sets forth the Deity of Christ. It is another matter whether other statements of the paper can logically be fitted in with what the lecturer avers.

Lieut.-Col. F. A. MOLONY said: I agree with almost every word of Colonel Skinner's paper, and consider its appearance most timely, because present-day preaching seems to ignore the very important truths which the lecture establishes. If Colonel Skinner

had had the time, he might have gone on from the talk on the Emmaus Road to show how St. Paul and other Apostles frequently used this argument from the predictions of the Old Testament. Yet I have attended a course of lectures on the Prophets, and scarcely heard these Messianic predictions alluded to. When a pious and learned D.D. was asked why these matters are neglected in our days, he replied that our grandfathers rested their arguments from prophecy on unsuitable passages, and would quote Isa. vii, 14: "Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son." Surely a distinctly unsuitable prediction to quote in argument with unbelievers! But the fact that our grandfathers chose unwisely is no reason why we should abandon the argument from Messianic predictions altogether. Blaise Pascal wrote that "the greatest of the arguments for Jesus Christ are the prophecies."

On p. 139, Colonel Skinner mentions three of the early testimonies treasured by Mary that her son Jesus was the long and generally expected Messiah. He might have added three others—namely, Elizabeth, Simeon, and Anna. In fact, Mary must have been quite convinced on the point, and the words she exchanged with her Son Jesus just before the miracle in Cana of Galilee point to the fact that she had not only told Jesus that He was the Messiah, but also pressed Him to take up Messiah's work. Yet He was content to work at the humble trade of a village carpenter till He was thirty, and then restricted Himself to teaching and healing, so that John the Baptist and others considered that His methods were not drastic enough for setting up that Kingdom which the prophets had foretold as universal. In short, He waited His Heavenly Father's time as regarded the most alluring part of the predictions—the universal Kingdom. This surely argues marvellous humility and self-restraint.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Lieut.-Col. L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S., wrote: I entirely agree with Colonel Skinner. If I understand him aright, the views he holds are precisely those which I have held for years. I believe, with the utmost conviction, in the Deity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and yet I also believe, upon Scripture warrant,

that He emptied himself of knowledge in order to become a true human child in that as in other respects. Isa. vii, 14-17, which prophesies the Virgin Birth of our Lord, also clearly anticipates His coming simplicity as a new-born human infant. Luke ii, 52, speaks of our Lord's gradual growth in wisdom, as a true human child, subject to human limitations.

Yet, from the first, our Lord was unique in being perfectly Holy—from the first He was announced as that HOLY thing which was to be born of Mary (Luke i, 35). Even from His human mother's womb, that Holy One was cast upon the Father (Ps. xxii, 9, 10). Hence He was *perfectly guided from the first*. Note the remarkable prophecy about the Christ which was given by Moses (Deut. xviii, 15-19); to whom our Lord appealed, as we read in St. John's Gospel (John v, 46). And also note the striking fulfilment of this prophecy in the case of our Lord Himself, as John also records. For no one else, either in the Old Testament or in the New, ever claimed that Moses had written of *him*; nor do we ever find, in the case of any other prophet sent by God, that remarkable insistence, which we find reiterated in the case of our Lord, upon the fact that the words which He spoke were *not His own* (human) words, but words put directly into His mouth *by the Father Himself* (John v, 19; viii, 38; xii, 49; xiv, 10, 24; xvii, 6-8, etc.). No one else, before or since our Lord, ever so cast himself upon the Father; no one else ever so spoke, constantly and habitually, the very words of the Father Himself.

Where the Kenosis theory goes wrong (I hold) is not in stressing the laying aside of His infinite and perfect knowledge by the Incarnate Christ, but in also stressing (against Scripture) the idea that the Christ's recorded statements are therefore fallible. It does not follow. Had our Lord only depended upon His own (human) resources, in the days of His humiliation, He would have been as fallible as ourselves; but that is just what He did not do. He, the long-prophesied perfect mouthpiece of the Father, spoke not His own (human) words but the words of His Father, upon whom He had cast Himself as no one else has ever done, before or since. In other words, although the orthodox Christian sometimes makes the mistake of ignoring Scripture testimony to the perfect humanity of the Babe of Bethlehem, he is always right in

regarding the recorded teachings of our Lord as being those of the Godhead Himself, and absolutely infallible.

Mr. Hoste wrote : While in full sympathy with the spirit which characterizes this paper, I fear I am unable to endorse its main thesis, which seems both speculative and misleading. I always understood that prophecy was "a lamp in a dark place" to serve as an encouragement to God's people, and ultimately as a credential of His Messiahship for the Lord Jesus, to Israel and the world ; but the reader of the paper would have us believe that it was rather to discover Jesus to Himself and to teach Him what was expected of Him in His rôle as Messiah. Of this theory I have not been able to discover in the paper any attempt at proof, but only subjective reasonings. It is put forward in the name of reverent investigation, but this may easily degenerate into irreverent speculation, "intruding into those things which we have not seen." "The things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children," but "the secret things" (such as the hidden mental processes of our Divine Saviour, to the Lord our God. The writer seems to fall into the common mistake of those who make a kind of specialty of the Humanity of Christ, of treating His Deity as a quality or title of which, however true, He could be at least temporarily bereft, whereas it was a Divine Person Who entered into manhood—"The Word was God . . . and the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us." Is it not the safer path for us to believe and adore, rather than attempt to explain the complex Person of Christ, Whom "no man knoweth save the Father?"

That certain unique conditions should exist in our Lord, even as an infant, may seem "impossible and repellent" to some minds, but to others not only natural under the supernatural conditions, but consistent with such passages as Ps. xxii, 9, 10, which could not be true of any other infant. It certainly is noticeable that our Lord as a child is said to have been "filled with wisdom," before "He increased in wisdom." As the late Dr. Handley Moule (in *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, p. 69) truly says, "the increase in wisdom no more implies stages of defective wisdom than the increase of favour with God implies stages of defective favour" (see Luke ii, 40, 52). Colonel Skinner seems no more fortunate

when he undertakes to expound special Scriptures. How he can possibly assert of Abraham's trial, in Gen. xxii, 2, that surely God blessed him "because by his obedient faith . . . *there was laid a tried foundation for the future education of God's own dear Son,*" passes my understanding. As far as I can discover, there is no hint of such a thing either in the chapter itself or in all the references to it in the New Testament. Again, one had always thought that the parting of His garments must have meant one more pang and humiliation to "the Man of Sorrows"; the lecturer assures us it afforded Him "infinite refreshment!" At any rate, our Lord's knowledge of Hebrew would have saved Him from confusing the once found word *râtzâ'*, translated "bore" in Exod. xxi, 6, with the quite distinct word *kârâh* (opened or pierced) of Ps. xl, 6, the opening or digging of the ears is explained in Heb. x as a figure of speech for preparing Him a body. The word "bore" in the lecturer's version of Ps. xl, 6, puzzles. Space permits no more. I will only ask in closing whether it would not be safer to abstain from defining the powers of Him Who remembered a past eternity, "knew all things" in the present, and read the future like a book? (John xvii, 5; xvi, 30; Matt. xxv, 31-46).

Rev. J. J. B. COLES wrote: A very interesting paper dealing with a transcendent subject. Personality is a central point in Philosophy and in Holy Scripture. The human and Divine in the Person of the Son of God is a subject which is *inscrutable*. The highest Archangel would not attempt to fathom the mystery, not even with veiled face and veiled feet. The want of reverence in the writings of the *Lux Mundi* school is sad indeed, and no member of the Modernist school of thought is altogether free from blame in this matter. On p. 142 of the lecture we read, "Of the Lord Jesus' early manhood we are told nothing." Quite so, and the silence of Holy Scripture is golden; the Holy Spirit did not lead St. Luke to write in the way the author of this paper has written.

Mr. A. G. SECRETT wrote: Colonel Skinner accepts the implication of our Lord's own words, "As My Father hath taught Me, I speak these things." The Eternal Son of God, enthroned in glory with the Father, before the Incarnation, could not be

taught; for He was omniscient. But His own statement that, in His earthly ministry, He was dependent upon the Father's teaching seems to confirm Colonel Skinner's conviction that "Jesus did not bring with Him, as a new-born babe, the knowledge and understanding He had with the Father in glory." Further confirmation is afforded by the statement in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that our High Priest "was in all points tempted like as we are," with one only qualification, "yet without sin." Could this be true if He had stood before the tempter armed with omniscience? The single qualification is significant. "Yet without sin." It was over a sinless man that the serpent had prevailed in Eden. Therefore sinlessness could not invalidate, as omniscience would have invalidated, the right of the Second Man to represent humanity.

In eternity past the Son of God had declared a war of extermination against evil. This earth is the strategic centre of the awful conflict. The Captain of our Salvation knew the dreadful price to be paid for victory. He must meet and overcome as a Man the prince of darkness. Suspending for a time His divine prerogatives of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience, He must rely only upon the mighty weapon forged by His own hand for the use of man when confronted with spiritual wickedness. That weapon is the Word of God. Thus, when the tempter would try to entice Him into a debate on the question of His divine Sonship, the Son of God declined battle on that issue, and reminded the enemy that he was dealing now with a *Man*. "It is written," He said, "*Man* shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

Colonel Skinner has earned the gratitude of many by tracing the way in which the inerrancy of every thought and utterance of God's Perfect Man was ensured, in every stage of His progress from the manger to the Cross. Through all His experiences as the Man of Sorrows, He was still Very God of Very God; and, when the days of humiliation were ended, He reassumed in His own right the divine attributes which He had laid aside for a season for our sakes, and was received again into the glory, scarred with wounds inflicted on earth. When the heavens shall open, and the crowned King of the Universe shall come forth to make an end of

sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, He will be seen to bear the name in which we reverence the Holy Scriptures; for "His name is called THE WORD OF GOD."

Mr. W. R. ROWLATT-JONES wrote: We are indeed favoured with such a thesis as this, and its unrollment is delightful. Still, where it conforms to the traditional view of the extreme poverty of the family at Nazareth, I must withhold my assent. The theory known as Kenosis is the mainstay of Modernist teaching, and for the past twelvemonth I have specially searched Holy Writ to discover any basis for it. Such basis does not appear, but in the course of my study I find to my surprise that our Saviour's acts of "making Himself of no reputation" and of "humbling Himself" appear to be connected with no inward emptying of His Divine glories and of His Divine prescience, but rather with some, otherwise unrecorded, outward stripping of His earthly possessions when He entered upon His ministry at the legal age of thirty. I am assured that the Greek of Phil. ii, 8, bears this interpretation. We have become so accustomed to the universally received teaching that the Holy Family of Nazareth was straitened in its temporal circumstances—a relic of the Dark Ages—that we seldom stop to inquire whether the passages relied upon to support this idea, may not bear another meaning. The well-known verse in Luke ii, 24, coupled with Lev. xii, 8, appears to prove the popular conception up to the hilt; but I would invite members of the Institute to ask themselves this question—"Was there any need for Joseph and Mary to present a typical lamb when in very truth, they were presenting the anti-type Himself, the very lamb of God?" however dimly they were aware of the fact.

I partly base my belief that both Joseph and Mary were in affluent circumstances on that obscure statement that "Joseph was a just man," which I take to mean both careful to observe the Levitical laws and to maintain his own rights under them; these rights included all the privileges of property under the Mosiac law of the Year of Jubilee. The fact that our Saviour's legal parent and his actual one registered their respective genealogies with the priests, whose duties included the safe-guarding of these lists, entitled them to become perpetual hereditary landlords (*see*

Ezek. xxxvi, 11). We see in Ezra ii, 62, that failure to keep these tables entailed both disgrace and poverty.

At this point my Bible searching led me into entirely new views of the social status of our Saviour's disciples, His friends, and especially of His relatives, and such texts as "Is not this the carpenter's Son?" "How hath this Man letters, having never learned?" viz. matriculated. The jibe, "He is beside Himself," and the sarcastic advice, "Physician, heal Thyself," then take on new meanings. In fact our Divine leader was no mere signpost, but when he exhorted inquirers "to sell all that they had, and give to the poor," He indicated a path of self-denial in which He had Himself led the way.

In these circumstances I record my disagreement with our lecturer's statements that the Christ's legal father "taught him a trade" and "sent him to a village school." Every Jew, however aristocratic, lived in dread of being swept into captivity; therefore every Jew must master some useful handicraft or possibly find himself regarded by his captor as a useless mouth to feed. If anyone inquires as to the actual existence of any property that might have come into our Saviour's possession, I would refer him to the hereditary home of Jesse, the habitation of Chimham (*see* Jer. xii, 17) and to the great caravanserai at Bethlehem, which appear all three to be identical. That there was "no room for Joseph and Mary in the inn" is susceptible of a fascinating (probable) explanation as well as of a striking evangelistic appeal. That all this is indeed "holy ground" should be another reason for not rejecting without due thought and further inquiry the suggestion as to the opportunities for studying the Scriptures afforded to the Nazarene by parents of comparatively easy circumstances.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

My paper of 11 pages has produced 17 pages of discussion, and space to make a full reply is not at my disposal; at most I can only deal with a few of the more important points. Some critics are frankly so hostile that it is clear no useful purpose will be served in seeking to persuade them to another view. They have a common denominator, and one must just recognize that "All men cannot

receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." The belief that our Lord brought His knowledge with Him has already been adequately disposed of in the written communication of Colonel Davies and Mr. Secrett. I will therefore examine in detail a few selected criticisms, mainly by way of illustrating how easy it is for the obvious to be overlooked by minds already made up.

On p. 148 (Rev. F. W. Pitt): "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven" (Luke x, 18). Surely this refers, not to the remote past, but to the immediate occasion when the Seventy, having returned in triumph from exercise of their commission, reported to the Master: "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through Thy Name," and Jesus approving, tells them of Satan's consternation and wrath at their unexpected flank attack (*cf.* Rev. xii, 12), but hastens to reassure them with the promise: "Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you." Jesus, it may be observed, having already had personal encounter with the prince of the power of the air, was, as we might say, up to his methods and movements.

Again, on p. 144 (same speaker): "Mary's words to Him showed that she had not told Him the secret. She apparently thought He did not at that time know who He was." On the contrary, Jesus' reply to her (Luke ii, 49): "How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" Words of serious reproof, however construed, show beyond question that *it was common knowledge between them* who He was, and what was to be His *métier*. Hitherto Mary and Joseph had known it by revelation, but already the separating truth was being translated into actual, sorrowful experience, and, as verse 50 shows, it was too much for them at the time. They had taught Him all they knew, but, with His marvellous intuition He had far outstripped His teachers (*cf.* Ps. cxix, 99). As well might Mr. Pitt argue from Mary's words, "Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing" that she thought Joseph was His father.

On p. 151 (Mr. W. C. Edwards): "It is suggested that this 'forgotten all' came back like a dream." The word "forgotten" implies faulty memory, and I have nowhere said or suggested such a thing. Rather did God the Son surrender voluntarily to what

was, even for Very God of Very God, an entirely new experience in being born into the world of a human mother, thereafter to learn, through the channels provided, and especially through the Scriptures, in communion with His Father, all that He should know to fulfil the Father's will. That His knowledge, perfect so far as it extended, was in some degree limited, is demonstrated by His own confession, in Mark xii, 32, and the efforts of some to get away from that unwelcome fact are not edifying. On the other hand, are there not, in that marvellous eighth chapter of Proverbs alone, many flash-lights of the glory that He had with the Father before the world was ?

Mr. Pitt's opening words (p. 148) : " If Jesus was God He was always God, both before and after the Incarnation," imply a unity of experience that conflicts with Scripture truth. As a fact beyond question Christ *became* in the Incarnation what He *had not hitherto been*. Moreover, in the days of His flesh, " though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect (through sufferings, Heb. ii, 10). He became the author of eternal salvation"—that which He could not have become had He not for a season been made a little lower than the angels. " Verily He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham, wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren." What He was before the Incarnation may be gathered from Phil. ii, 6 ; that which He afterwards became appears in Phil. ii, 8, 9. Antecedently He was rich ; later He became poor (2 Cor. viii, 9). In these circumstances Mr. Pitt's words would seem to be misleading.

The same may, in measure, be said of many of the remarks of Messrs. Heath, Collett, Edwards and Hoste, who, if they allow—as they assuredly do allow—that the Christ was manifest in the flesh, their remarks would seem to render untenable any coherent belief that, as a fact, the Lord was " made like unto His brethren," or that He could be tempted in any sense, much less " in all points " " like as we are, yet without sin."

733RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1., ON MONDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1930,
AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COL. 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 :—Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, Member, from Associate; and Mrs. N. F. Ruthven Smith as a Member.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. Charles Gardner, M.A., to read his paper on "How far do the Apologetics of Bacon, Butler, and Paley hold good for Present Use?"

*HOW FAR DO THE APOLOGETICS OF BACON, BUTLER
AND PALEY HOLD GOOD FOR PRESENT USE?*

By THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A.

I.

BACON is the great name of a man who was great in brain rather than in character, and it is a name that makes one realize how fallible the man of brain may be. He was three years older than Galileo. Just when Galileo was compelling men to give due weight to the neglected speculations of Copernicus, and was busy dislodging the earth from its supposed position in the centre of the universe, Bacon used his massive authority to oppose Galileo and maintain the old cosmogony.

The modern world has not yet recovered from the shock that Galileo gave the earth. We hear constantly that the new cosmogony has dislodged not only the old earth, but also the old

faith ; and those who speak thus proceed to a process of re-fashioning the faith during which the faith is diluted till it loses all shape and substance. The outlook on the universe was revolutionary. Was the faith really shattered ? Surely not. In some ways it is strengthened. For example, Christianity teaches that man is not his own centre. So long as he believed that the earth was the centre of the universe it was difficult to resist the conclusion that man was the centre of the earth, round whom all things in the universe revolved. He was a very lordly man ! Gradually the new cosmogony has been forcing man to realize that he is not his own centre. As the earth revolves round its central sun, so the Christian may say with scientific authority that man revolves round his central Sun. Is not this a vindication of the central place which the whole Scriptures accord to the Christ ?

II.

The permanent value of Bacon, apart from his superb mastery over the English language, is his exposition of the great principle of inductive reasoning in his *Novum Organum*. His attempts to apply the principle are generally failures, and his physics are almost as out of date as Aristotle's. Nor was he the first to call men back to the direct study of nature. Copernicus, whom he opposed, preceded him, and so did the fantastic Paracelsus. Both these men opposed the current fashion of reaching conclusions in science and medicine by weighing the old authorities. They turned to the immediate study of nature. Galileo enormously accelerated the process by inventing the telescope. Bacon brought the movement to a philosophic head when he taught the modern world to study nature at first hand, to amass particulars, and then by an orderly process of inductive reasoning to arrive at general principles.

Is the great method of induction of value for Christian Apologetic ? We are now in a position to say Yes, although its importance may easily be exaggerated. Professors James, Starbuck and Pratt have all respectively worked in the field of religious experience. Starbuck has concentrated on conversion, James on varieties of religious experience, Pratt on the more recondite psychological states of religious people. James, the greatest of the three, reached the conclusion that there is a large common ground to all religions ; that the same experiences are known in all ages and all countries, and that therefore they

stand for some sort of approximate Reality. This conclusion, if unsatisfactory, is not without some value. It has taught the modern world to respect religious experience, but it has also taught it to make experience the basis of the Christian life. Here I would protest. Human experience, like human tradition and human merit, may be of rich and high value, but none of them is a foundation. Human experience at its best is the experience of men and women who have fallen short of the glory of God. The experience of Christ might possibly be treated as a foundation, since it was the complete experience of a complete Man. But Christ Jesus is the Revelation to us of God, not only by His experience, but also by His words and deeds, His miracles, and by His supernatural acts of rising from the dead and ascending into heaven. And therefore we may continue to say as our forefathers said that the Christian Life and Religion is grounded, not in the experience of man, but the Revelation of God.

III.

Butler and Paley may be studied together. They were in the same movement, and took much the same standpoint. Butler stands by his famous *Analogy*. He argues that the difficulties of Revelation are not greater than the admitted difficulties to be found in nature. Huxley, in the following century, so far agreed. It was not the difficulty of the Christian doctrines, but insufficient evidence for them that deterred him. Butler's argument and Huxley's assent still deserve close consideration. Butler proceeds to build experience on Revelation; prior to Revelation he finds Natural Religion. His order is Natural Religion, Revelation, Experience.

Modernists to-day put Experience first, and having diluted Revelation and Natural Religion into one, they set the solution on experience; if by experience they meant the complete experience of the Christ, we should have no great objection. But they have changed the meaning of Revelation by making it into an unveiling of experience. By the process Revelation ceases to be supernatural, and instead of Butler's august trinity of Natural Religion, Revelation and Experience, we are practically allowed only Experience.

Butler's method enables him to retain the full force of the supernatural. He finds in Romans I a splendid testimony to Natural Religion, and on it he proceeds to build the supernatural

structure. All this, which is the strength of Butler, fell into disrepute with the naturalists of the nineteenth century. It is equally despised by the Monists to-day. But there are many signs that (*pace* the Dean of St. Paul's) the supernatural is about to be re-instated; and it is likely that with it Butler's great Apologetic will again have great value.

Turning to Paley, we immediately think of his famous watch on the heath. For many years the watch seemed to be an unanswerable argument from design for the existence of God. It was rudely shaken by Darwin's principle of Natural Selection. But Darwin's principle has, in its turn, succumbed to the passage of time. Eddington and Jeans are leading another way, and Paley, like Butler, remains standing. Not that we would state the argument from design in the same terms as Paley. The watch is immediately related to the watchmaker. We find between design in nature and God other intermediate things. But to become engrossed with the intermediates till we lose sight of God is one of the heights of modern human folly, and the substance of the old argument from design, that is, the teleological argument, remains intact.

IV.

Paley's other great argument in his *Evidences* also withstands the modern attack, even from the psychological quarter. Stated briefly, it is this. The Apostles of the Lord all forsook Him in His last hour of need. They showed themselves all too human, and even Peter, with all his protestations of faithfulness, had more care for his skin than his courage. Yet a few weeks later the same men were filled with holy boldness; they witnessed for Christ in the most difficult circumstances; they suffered for their testimony even unto death. How account for their change of heart and mind? The only answer that fits the case is that given in the Scriptures. They were witnessing to the Truth, and they were doing so in the power of the Holy Ghost, who was given to them according to the sure promise of Jesus Christ. Their preaching turned on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. If the Jews could have brought the smallest evidence that Jesus did not rise again, the witness of the disciples would have been immediately squashed.

Paley's treatment of the miraculous is less satisfactory to our changed standpoint. He argues that the Gospel is true because it was witnessed to by miracles and fulfilled prophecy. We

are less impressed by the alleged fulfilment of prophecy, because it seems to many of us that St. Matthew stretches the letter of the prophets in order to convince the Jews by setting Jesus in a framework of Jewish prophecy. We should state the matter differently from Paley, somewhat like this:—The prophets revealed fragments of the truth which was hidden from their contemporaries. This truth is more and more fully revealed till the revelation is completed by Christ. Further, the prophets at their highest were lifted out of themselves by the Holy Spirit and spoke of things that they could never have known without the supernatural aid. These things were fulfilled by Christ, and they may again be fulfilled by the individual members of His Body.

V.

The other point, that the Gospel is true because it was witnessed to by miracles, we should put the other way round. We accept the miracles because we believe the Gospel. Actually, in dealing with prophecy, Paley keeps mainly to Isaiah liii. Here he is on rock ground. Jewish commentators have given over eighty different interpretations of this wonderful chapter. It was written two-and-a-half thousand years ago. It has been attacked, twisted, explained away, misapplied. Still it stands, meaningless apart from Jesus Christ, the key to the profoundest mystery of life if, like Philip, we see its complete fulfilment in the life, death and resurrection of Our Lord. The greatest of the Old Testament prophets was certainly lifted out of himself when he penned these sublime words—words that transcend anything he could have known in his own experience. Again, under the heading of the miraculous, Paley includes healing and several other happenings, which modernists are inclined to attribute to a heightened natural process. It is impossible to decide in all instances. When Christ walked on the water, was that a supernatural walk, or an instance of levitation, of which the modern world knows something? When He calmed the sea, did He merely concentrate a process of nature into a few moments? Did He only give of His overflowing vitality to the sick? We cannot always answer these questions. But there are certain miracles of Christ that can in no way be brought under a natural category: the turning of the water into wine, the feeding of the five thousand, the raising of the dead. These were either supernatural acts or they did not happen. I conclude

that we may not always drive a sharp line between the so-called natural and supernatural acts of Christ, yet we may remain convinced that He performed certain supernatural acts since they cannot be placed under any other heading.

VI.

Again, in dealing with the miraculous, Paley groups together the miraculous acts of Christ and the supernatural events in His life, such as the Virgin-birth, the Resurrection and the Ascension. We, for the most part, have separated them. The modernist may explain the acts as a heightening of a natural process, but we cannot affirm this of the events. Hence, he takes another course. The Virgin-birth, the Resurrection and the Ascension are not true literally; they are symbols of the truth. What truth? we ask. And we are told that these doctrines set forth symbolically certain truths that man may know by experience. The first is his experience of the new birth, when he is born, not by a natural generation, but of God. The next is his experience of a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; the last is his experience of growing wings, and rising above all his sins and limitations if he remains faithful to the end. Those who treat the doctrines in this way proceed to explain the Divine Trinity as an enhancement of the trinity man finds in himself, and the whole of the Christian Faith may be treated in this way. Modernists who retain the name Christian do not, I think, follow their method to its logical conclusion. This was done in the early nineteenth century by Feuerbach. He showed the astonishing agreement between the Christian Faith and man's constitution, and he drew the conclusion that not only is man's experience the foundation of the Faith, but that he has created the faith to meet his inward need. Hence God is no longer the Alpha and Omega; Man is the Alpha, and God is dismissed.

We can admit the argument on which Feuerbach insisted, and be as logical as himself. If the Christian doctrines have this perfect correspondence with man's nature and his needs, we may argue just as cogently that that is because God is the author of our Faith. He remains the Alpha and the Omega. Between the two letters we may place as much human experience as we please. Indeed, we shall place more than the modernist, for we shall insert the experience of the dying, rising and ascending

of the Incarnate Son of God, and in so doing the natural will be raised to the supernatural, the human to the Divine.

VII.

That, of course, is to admit frankly the supernatural, and means a return to Paley, Butler and St. Thomas Aquinas. In a final criticism of their Apologetics, I suppose most of us would say that they draw too sharp a line between the natural and the supernatural. We have seen that the separating line is zigzag and has worn very thin in places. We may also insist that to draw too tight a line will involve us in an inadmissible dualism. But the solution of the difficulty does not lie in a simplified monism. The natural and supernatural are ultimately one. That will be when we are no longer girt about by time and space, but are wholly in eternity. Meanwhile let us keep our distinctions. We are to live as creatures of time and eternity, to perform our natural dues and our supernatural. If we attempt to wash out the difference, prematurely to force the unity, it will be to our loss and peril.

Paley and Butler were fully aware of the Unity that lies at the basis of all things. But by a wise recognition of the nature of things, by refusing to shut their eyes to the persistent distinctions in the universe, they were able to put forth an Apologetic which survived the naturalism of the nineteenth century, and will probably survive the pantheistic attack of our own time.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony) said: It is to be hoped that Mr. Gardner's short but interesting paper will send us back to the study of Butler and Paley. I agree heartily with our author in thinking that their apologetic will survive the pantheistic attack of our own time. We must acknowledge that they sometimes are a trifle verbose, but at other times they put a point extremely well. Take an instance from Butler. Reasoning from the passage in praise of Wisdom in the first chapter of Proverbs, he says: "And the whole passage is so equally applicable to what we experience in the present world, concerning the consequences of men's

actions, and to what religion teaches us is to be expected in another, that it may be questioned which of the two was principally intended" (*Analogy of Religion*, Part i, ch. 2). This is the argument from analogy of Natural and Revealed religion in a nutshell. Or take a case from Paley. He is talking about the now common contention that by "The Suffering Servant of Jehovah," Isaiah, in his famous 53rd chapter, intended to indicate the loyal remnant of the Jewish people. Paley writes: "The application which the Jews contend for, appears to me to labour under insuperable difficulties; in particular, it may be demanded of them to explain, in *whose* name or person, if the Jewish people be the sufferer, does the prophet speak when he says "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows" (*Evidences*, Part ii, ch. 1). Paley's question seems to be unanswerable.

Mr. Gardner reminds us, on p. 168, that Paley, in arguing from prophecy, keeps mainly to Isaiah liii. But Paley had a particular reason for this, which was that the arguments from prophecy had been "disposed in order, and distinctly explained, in Bishop Chandler's treatise on the subject." Hence it is clear that the amount of stress which Paley intends to lay on this branch of apologetics, is not to be inferred from the space which he devotes to it. If we want properly to appreciate Butler and Paley's apologetic position, we must include Chandler's excellent work with theirs.

Mr. Gardner remarked that "It seems to many of us that St. Matthew stretches the letter of the prophets in order to convince the Jews by setting Jesus in a framework of Jewish prophecy." Bishop Chandler deals with this point pretty fully. He thinks that St. Matthew's idea was rather to illustrate than to prove. Chandler has some very interesting remarks about Matt. ii, 23. Most students fail to find the saying in any prophet. Chandler holds that it is in Isa. xi, 1. Here the Hebrew word for "Branch" is *Netzer*, "which," says Chandler, "signifies, first a branch, flower, or bud, and from thence passed by translation into the proper name of a place, which was so denominated, from its fruitfulness, as much as to say, the garden, the flower of Galilee." In Syriac, *Netzer* became *Natsrath*.

Now as "The Branch" was a well-known name for the expected

Messiah, the Jew who said "Jesus of Nazareth" practically said "Jesus of the Branch," or, "Jesus the Messiah." This seems to be a thoroughly satisfactory solution of the difficulty, but I remember reading modern authors who knew nothing about it.

Permit me to give an illustration of the importance of sometimes re-reading these older apologists. Just nine years ago, you did me the honour of listening to a paper of mine on "Predictions and Expectation of the First Coming of Christ." In that paper I laid stress on the importance of proving expectation, as well as prediction and fulfilment. In so doing, I imagined that I was taking a novel line, but now I find that the same thing was done by both Butler and Chandler. Butler says, though not quite accurately, "The ancient Jews applied the prophecies to a Messiah, before His coming, in much the same manner as Christians do now." And in another passage: "This was foretold in such a manner as raised a general expectation of such a person in the nation, as appears from the New Testament, and is an acknowledged fact; an expectation of His coming at such a particular time, before anyone appeared claiming to be that person, and when there was no ground for such an expectation but from the prophecies, which expectation, therefore, must in all reason be presumed to be explanatory of these prophecies" (*Analogy of Religion*, Part ii, ch. 7).

Chandler writes: (1) "There was a general expectation of a Messiah to come at the time that our Lord Jesus Christ appeared, which was the tradition of their ancestors, from the ages before that, up to the age next to the prophets themselves; (2) to support this expectation, there were in their scriptures, express literal prophecies, that singly concerned the Messias; (3) they had also typical prophecies to the same effect, the literal meaning of which was intended to be applied to the Messias."

Butler teaches us that, if we want to prove any such matter as Christianity, the soundest method may be, first to show that it is not incredible, then to show that it is credible; and, having laid this double foundation, to proceed lastly to the direct proof. This is the principle which leads him to start with analogy. Butler writes: "By the general prevalence of propitiatory sacrifices over the heathen world, this notion, of repentance alone being sufficient to expiate guilt, appears to be contrary to the general sense of

mankind" (*Ibid.*, Part ii, ch. 5). I suppose that most of us have been tempted to fancy that the central truth of our most holy faith may have been evolved by natural processes from this universally felt intuition. It is well, therefore, for us to remember that, if mankind had not this intuition about the necessity for sacrifice, the argument from the analogy of natural and revealed religion would break down at this point. It was, however, surely a case of revelation when Abraham said, "The Lord will provide"; that is, I take it, the great sacrifice to which the lesser ones point.

Writing of the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice of Himself, Butler says, "How, and in what particular way it had this efficacy, there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain, but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it" (*Ibid.*, Part ii, ch. 5).

Here is another proof of Bishop Butler's wisdom. Bear in mind that this was written prior to 1736, when our possessions overseas consisted of fifteen colonies on the east coast of North America, a few small islands, and four trading stations in India. Butler writes: "We shall see this happy tendency of virtue, by imagining . . . a kingdom or society of men upon it, perfectly virtuous, for a succession of many ages; to which, if you please, may be given a situation advantageous for universal monarchy. In such a state public determinations would really be the result of the united wisdom of the community (*Ibid.*, Part i, ch. 3); and they would faithfully be executed by the united strength of it. . . . Add the general influence which such a kingdom would have over the face of the earth, by way of example particularly, and the reverence which would be paid it. It would plainly be superior to all others and the world must gradually come under its empire; not by means of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be just conquest, and partly by other kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it, throughout a course of ages, and claiming its protection, one after another, in successive exigencies."

I am far from contending that our government is, or has always been virtuous, but anyone who has studied history, served abroad, and read Macaulay's comparison of British and Native methods in India, will agree that the vastness of our present Empire is mainly traceable to the soundness of Butler's contention. Only one-third of our vast African Empire can be described as conquered from the

natives, and therefore open to question, all the rest came into our hands as Butler foretold.

Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, takes St. Paul's Epistles seriatim, and shows that there are obviously undesigned coincidences between them and St. Paul's other Epistles, and the Acts of the Apostles. This, and other arguments, caused Rénan, the French sceptic, to describe the four chief Epistles of St. Paul as "uncontestable and uncontested," and to state his own opinion that several other Epistles are genuine. Since then the argument has been reinforced by Sir Wm. Ramsay's researches in Asia Minor. Other defenders of the faith have built upon Paley's excellent foundation, by showing that the fact of the Resurrection of Christ can be proved from the uncontested Epistles alone.

In conclusion, I wish to resume by a simile the main subject of my remarks, which is the Messianic predictions. In the days of close fighting, combatants used to try to knock the weapons out of their opponents' hands. The argument from Messianic predictions and types was used from the days of the Apostles till we ourselves were boys, but we hardly ever hear that argument brought forward now. Can it be truthfully said that this effective weapon has been knocked from our hands? I think it would be more exact to say, that these arguments have been so cleverly belittled by Jews and other unbelievers that Christian preachers have come to look upon them as unsound, whereas they actually only need a little polishing up.

The first part of the Old Testament is full of salvation stories, the latter part of Messianic predictions; and we may well ask, "How came they there?" The Modernist Theologian explains away one and another, but Butler, Paley, and Chandler well maintained that these originated in Divine Revelation. If we look at the matter broadly and as a whole, we can but regard these older theologians as being in the right, and the sooner our preachers return to their views, the better. Our lecturer has asked the question "How far?" To that I would reply, in the case of Butler, and of Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, "Very far." But I agree that Paley's argument from miracles, though sound and valid, is better abbreviated, to make room for what has become more important matter.

The Chairman concluded by moving a hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was carried by acclamation.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS said : I have never regarded Bacon as a great Christian apologist. It is true that he has said many things that are helpful, *e.g.* that he would rather believe all the absurdities of the Koran than believe that this world made itself.

Bishop Butler was a greater man, and one to whom many of us owe much. He was born a Presbyterian, but became an Episcopalian. He lived a life of irreproachable piety amidst almost universal apostasy. Even in the Church of the 39 Articles there were *then* found few who were not more or less *tainted* with Socinianism. A preacher the other day aroused some interest in the City by declaring that the responsibility of the present irreligion should be placed upon the parsons themselves. At no period of our history could that be more truly said than in Butler's day. The parsons were then, and I fear often now, the pioneers of scepticism and infidelity. They spent time in their studies imbibing doubts, and then in their pulpits they preached unbelief instead of faith. Butler's misfortune was that he had missed that spiritual experience which we call conversion. Wesley preached the New Birth and Butler tried to prevent him preaching in his diocese. It was only a few hours before his death that he entered into the sweet assurance of salvation. In his last illness he said to his faithful chaplain : " I have tried to avoid sin, and live so as to please God, but I am still afraid to die." Pointed to the Saviour, he asked, " How can I know that He is a Saviour for me ? "

His chaplain quoted, " Him that cometh unto Me, I will in no wise cast out." " True," exclaimed the dying Bishop Butler, " I am surprised that though I have read that Scripture a thousand times over, I never felt its virtue till this moment, and now I die happy." Conversion is a glorious doubt-killing experience, and that Butler missed until long after his great work was written.

Paley stands a majestic figure in my eyes. I read *Horæ Paulinæ* with delight before I was out of my teens, but I meet many who have never opened its pages. It is never too late to mend, or begin ! Froude tells us that when he went to Oxford he found people quite satisfied with Paley. Newman shocked many by

dismissing Paley, and almost siding with Hume, and then telling them to trust the Church! I cannot follow the lecturer in saying that Darwin ever really rudely shook the famous argument of the watch. It is beyond that. I think that the most insidious attack was that of Chambers in *Vestiges of Creation*. Darwin has avowed that he brought out his theory of evolution "through the survival of the fittest," in order to get rid of Design in Creation. Grant Allen did much to popularize Darwinism. I once had correspondence with him that led to his inviting me to spend a night at Hindhead and talk things over. As I was using an argument analogous to Paley's Watch—they are endless, railways, ships, houses, etc., he said, "That is really Paley's old argument of the watch." I replied, "An argument that is sound is sound for time and eternity, and none the worse for being old." I suggested that we should take the watch, and Paley's eight points.

"Oh," he exclaimed, "I was reading a book the other day and the writer dealt with it, and proved in a couple of pages that the watch made itself." "What do you call that?" I asked. "A piece of brilliant reasoning," he replied. "Reasoning," I exclaimed, "there can be no reason in it." The conclusion being demonstrably wrong, all that goes before is so much nonsense. "Did you not feel all the time that you were being fooled?" After the "Watch argument" pray read Paley on the eye. In a recent book, *A Legal Man and the Bible*, the lawyer that wrote it speaks in the highest terms of Paley, and quotes this as unanswerable. On p. 168, line 2, we have a more serious matter. Our lecturer writes: "it seems to many of us that St. Matthew stretches the letter of the Prophets." If he were addressing a gathering composed of men like Dean Inge and Dr. Barnes, this might pass, but I can assure him that in addressing the Victoria Institute it will not. Many of us—I trust all of us—would shudder to utter the words. Was the Evangelist inspired by the Holy Spirit? or was he a deluded and mistaken reader of the Holy Prophets? I have the Berean habit of testing what I hear from ministers, according to Isa. viii, 20, "To the Law and the Prophets," and I have made a list of all the Old Testament passages I could find in the Gospel, and I strongly oppose the lecturer's suggestion. I will venture to think that the Evangelist understood the prophets and their pro-

phesies far better than I and even the lecturer. The Evangelists, I believe, used the prophecies as our Lord used them to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, and according to Luke xxiv, 45, "Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Is it too late to pray that the Lord may do the same for many so-called ministers of religion to-day; they are doing much to destroy the faith of many. The Evangelists used the Holy Scriptures as the Apostle Paul used them in Rome with the representatives of the Jews.

I must take exception to two other points. First, on p. 168, "When Christ walked on the water, was that a supernatural walk, or an instance of levitation of which the modern world knows something?" Does the modern world know of anything comparable? If so, when? Where? I have a habit of asking these questions but can never get any proper satisfaction. It happened "some when," "some where," always abroad. Just like the Mahatmas of Tibet! Go to the borders, or into, Tibet, and they know nothing about them. Thank God I have faith, but I have no credulity. Let them come and do it at high tide near London Bridge, and invite us to do what Peter did, lifeboats and crews being in attendance, of course. Are these conjuring tricks of jugglers and spiritualists to be compared with the miracles of our Blessed Lord?

Again, on the same page, the lecturer asks: "When He calmed the sea, did He *merely (sic)* concentrate a process of nature into a few moments?" What does that mean? A storm that takes hours to calm down He calmed in a second, "merely a concentration of the process of nature!" Words fail me for comment upon such a sentence.

In conclusion, will the lecturer kindly tell me how I may find these people who can perform levitations that I may arrange for a demonstration at London Bridge at an early date.

Lieut.-Col. SKINNER said: The lecturer has given us a veritable feast of good things this afternoon, and my present feeling is one of desire to go home and digest it. Two questions arise, however, on which more light seems desirable, and perhaps may be forthcoming. One has already been alluded to, with mention made

of the prophecy of "Rachel weeping for her children." But are not all prophecies, or most at any rate, capable of two or more fulfilments? Witness the classic instance of our Lord's reference to John the Baptist as Elijah, though Elijah's return as forerunner was then, and is still, future.

Again, with regard to the words in John x, 18, "I have power to lay it (my life) down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father." Is not the reference here less, if at all, to His physical death and resurrection than to His life with the Father in the Glory? Was it not as though Jesus, having voluntarily surrendered that life in order to become man, such was the perfection of understanding between Father and Son, that the Divine command or commission left Him entirely free to return up where He was before at any stage of the journey, should He elect to do so; that He was at any time free, either to go forward to Calvary, or to refrain from going and, with perfect propriety return to the bosom of the Father? Not that there was any likelihood of His exercising his prerogative, any more than of His calling for twelve legions of angels to deliver Him; but my thought is that here there is no necessary reference to His resurrection, and I incline to think that, having surrendered Himself fully to the death of the Cross, it was by the power of God through the Holy Spirit that He was raised from the dead, rather than by a supernatural act on His own part. Perhaps the lecturer would consider this; but we are deeply indebted to him for his paper, so reassuring with regard to old defenders of the faith.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Rev. J. J. B. COLES writes: The apologetic of Paley and Butler is of far greater value than the writings of Modernists, and will survive their downgrade movement. Holy Scripture is an impregnable rock.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The Author, in reply, said that with his deafness he was unable to catch a great many of the remarks that were made on his paper; and therefore he would deal only with two points that had been raised. First, St. Matthew's use of the Old Testament prophecies,

and the special prophecy in Jer. xxxi, 15-17. The whole passage read: "Thus saith the Lord, A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rahel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not . . . they shall come again from the land of the enemy . . . thy children shall come again to their own border." Rahel or Rachel, of course, stands for the whole people. Rachel weeps because her children, men and women with their families, have been carried into captivity. But she is to hope, because God will bring them back again to their own border. Now St. Matthew says that this prophecy was fulfilled in the massacre of the Innocents, and he shows that he had what is often called the Rabbinical mind. The modern mind is far different, and it cannot accept this kind of exegesis, and therefore it is no longer of any avail to use it for an apologetic of Christianity. Another line of defence must be found. The other point about levitation. The lecturer would not for a moment compare levitation and other happenings with the works that our Lord did "by the finger of God." Levitation is, if you like, a vulgar occurrence. But it occurs. A modern might argue that it is no more wonderful for Christ to walk on the sea than for Homes' body to float out of one window and float in at another. Therefore, an appeal to such a miracle has no weight to-day. Christians to-day believe in the miracles of Christ because they first believe in Him. The last speaker said that he had never seen a case of levitation. That was very likely. It would be necessary for him to frequent séances, and he would certainly give offence to his Christian friends.

734TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 14TH, 1930,

AT 4.30 P.M.

WILLIAM C. EDWARDS, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

After the Minutes of the previous Meeting had been read and signed, the CHAIRMAN announced the decease of Mr. Martin H. F. Sutton, a Trustee of the Institute, whose family was so well known and so long associated with the work of the Victoria Institute. Those present were asked to stand as a sign of respect to the deceased.

The HON. SECRETARY then announced the following elections:—The Rev. Pierre Bernard Hill, A.B., D.D., as a Member, and A. J. Vereker, Esq., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Lt.-Col. A. H. C. Kenney-Herbert to read his paper on "The Last Days of Our Lord's Ministry."

THE LAST DAYS OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

By LIEUT.-COLONEL A. H. C. KENNEY-HERBERT.

IN October last the Council invited me to read a paper on "The Last Days of Our Lord's Ministry," *dealing with the dates, days, and hours*. I accepted the invitation with diffidence, for the chronologic aspect, vital as it is, does not interest the majority of Bible students; on the other hand, every detail affords, to those who are interested, ground for contentious argument.

The reconstruction of this culminating week of our Lord's life is obstructed by the debris of the past—questionable interpretations, conflicting traditions, rabbinical customs, the hearsay evidence of Josephus, etc. To clear the site needs a revaluation of the human records, and a reconsideration of axioms more

suiting to the Bible class than to the debates of a philosophical society. I trust that you will bear with me in this.

In fact, our study will fall naturally into four sections:—

- (1) The inaccuracy of ordinary history.
- (2) The axioms which control the right handling of revelation.
- (3) The spiritual clues of the Paschal Lamb and the Wave Offering.
- (4) The story of the last days of our Lord's ministry in dated narrative.

After acceptance I was offered the choice of three dates, and happened to notice that one of them would be the 14th of the month Abib, or Nisan, by the Mosaic reckoning of Exod. xii. To-day, if my conclusions be correct, is the anniversary of the sacrifice of Christ our passover, who died for us on the 3rd April, A.D. 33, just 1897 soli-lunar years ago.

If my conclusions be correct, it is surprising that there can be any doubt about so important an event, which had been foreordained from before the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. i, 20, and foreshadowed in type fifteen hundred years before it actually took place. The word "foreordained" implies a plan, and a carefully dated type implies that a time scheme is an essential factor of the plan. Surely God meant us to understand the things which He has revealed, and how can we measure His facts until the central fact has been properly marked off in the scheme of time?

Nevertheless the doubt is there, see the XIth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. 3, p. 891, in the article which deals with this subject. Its concluding paragraph contains the following words (my italics): "the various dates and intervals to the *approximate* determination of which this article has been devoted, do not claim separately more than a *tentative and probable* value."

1.—THE INACCURACY OF ORDINARY HISTORY.

It can be shown that the Bible contains a complete chain of time-measured facts from the creation of Adam to the Pentecost following the Crucifixion. This fact implies that God has provided for the insufficiency and inaccuracy of the available

human data, and has, therefore, given us a revealed chronology ; and the fact that this chronology ceases at the Crucifixion further implies that, from this point onwards, we must turn to ordinary secular history. But unless we can connect the Bible dating with our modern dating, not approximately but exactly, we shall not be able to place the days in which we live in their true time relationship to God's chronology. The date of the Crucifixion should furnish such a point of contact, for it may be determined with the accuracy of a known new moon. The article quoted above proves that human records, human research, and human intelligence cannot tell us what we need to know.

But it may be argued that the Bible itself has supplied two points of synchronization :—

1. "The fourth year of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, king of Judah, which was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon." (Jer. xxv, 1.)
2. "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius . . . Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age." (Luke iii, 1, 23.)

Therefore if the accepted history be really accurate, either of these points would serve and the other would be superfluous.

Now the prophecy of the seventy weeks of Dan. ix is an essential link in the chain of revealed chronology, but if we interpret it in the light of Isa. xlv, 26-28, which to the impartial mind would seem to be the reasonable thing to do, we find that the revealed interval between these two points of time is much shorter than the same period as measured by accepted history and the Royal Canon of Ptolemy. Moreover no interpretation can be placed on the prophecy which would make up the deficiency.

As there is nothing superfluous in revealed truth, I suggest that God has given us these two synchronizations, not to help us to construct a chronology with additional data from human records, but to prove to us that these records are inaccurate, and the effort to combine the exact and the inexact will only produce a misfit. To do so is as though we inserted into the delicate mechanism of a perfect chronometer some of the roughly stamped wheels of a common clock. Again, it may be urged that although the two synchronizations in combination have but proved the inaccuracy of the accepted history of that

epoch, nevertheless the later point should suffice. Unfortunately the value of this connection has been somewhat discounted, for it has been suggested that the fifteenth year of Tiberius of the text is not reckoned from that emperor's accession, in A.D. 14, but from some earlier date, probably A.D. 12, when the consuls passed a law that he should govern the provinces jointly with Augustus.

As history has proved a broken reed, we can only turn to revelation.

2.—THE AXIOMS OF THE BIBLE CLASS.

There are certain axioms which every teacher of the Bible seeks to impress upon the members of the class. Probably all of us in this gathering in principle accept these axioms, but unfortunately we often disregard them in our own private studies. Will you bear with me if I remind you of them, for I feel sure that they will make all the difference between success or failure when we search His Word :—

1. Revelation is God's gift to teach us necessary things which could never be found out by the unaided intellect of man. (1 Cor. ii, 11.)
2. Every word of this revelation is Spirit-given. (2 Tim. iii, 16.)
3. Every word has been purified to God's satisfaction. (Ps. xii, 6.)
4. God honours His Word even more than His Name. (Ps. cxxxviii, 2.)
5. Being complete, there is not a word too much or too little.
6. Therefore God means all that He has said, exactly as He said it, within the purest meaning of the words.
7. Therefore anything which God has not said is not necessary.
8. Therefore, also, no two passages can disagree—if they apparently do, then either our translation or interpretation or application is at fault.
9. We need not depend on any man ; He alone can guide us into all truth. (John xvi, 16.)
10. It is *almost* a corollary that God has safeguarded the text which He has put into our hands—if so we may

abide by the *Textus Receptus*, and simplify the matter by rejecting all critical readings. I think that this statement can be proved by numerics. But I would not press this point.

It is indicative of the great apostasy of the last days that these axioms should be regarded as childishy out of date. But it is to the child-faith that God grants the illumination which He may withhold from the wisdom and prudence of the trained investigator. I am being forced to believe that our advance in true spiritual knowledge is to be measured more by what we have consented to unlearn than by the new truths we may have been directly taught.

It is surprising how the strict application of these axioms will remove all the difficulties which the research of centuries has accumulated for our discouragement.

For instance, as we have already said, revealed chronology ceases at the Pentecost following the Crucifixion. If axiom 1 is true, the implication is that up to this point revelation was necessary; but from this point onwards it is no longer necessary in this particular; therefore we shall find the histories available sufficiently accurate for any reasonable requirements.

Again from axiom 6 we may conclude that when God says new moon He means new moon, not in the astronomic, but in the commonly accepted sense of the term. The root meaning of *chodesh*, as a rule translated "month," is to make new, hence "new moon," and all the subsequent days belonged to that new moon, and were known as the second to the new moon, the third to the new moon, etc., until the next new moon was seen, when the count began again.

This arrangement is a tangible embodiment of the spiritual need for watchfulness—and, as the new moon was the occasion of a special offering (Num. xxviii, 11), this watchfulness was combined with prayer and worship, inculcating our Lord's own command, "Watch and Pray."

Although God was providing for the needs of a small community occupying a limited territory, nevertheless the same system is in force in Mohammedan countries to-day. *What is* affords proof of what was, of perhaps what always was, in the unchanging East.

If we know the year, it is not a difficult matter to calculate the time of any true new moon, either past or future, with sufficient accuracy to determine the Julian date of the sunset at

which it would first become visible. If we know the year and this date, we can easily find out the week-day, thus every accurately recorded new moon becomes an exact synchronization between revealed chronology and modern dating, once the true connection has been found. If we would shirk the labour of the arithmetic involved, Grattan Guinness has published tables of new moons for over 3,500 years; and these tables can serve as ready reckoners.

In spite of the fact that the present confirms the past, and ignoring the usefulness and accuracy of this simple arrangement of regulating dates by the visible new moon, there are students who would persuade us that in reality the time records of the Bible must be read in the light of some unrecorded cycle-calendar. After the Jewish nation was scattered all over the world, a calendar was devised to regulate the observance of the sacred feasts, but there is no hint that any such cycle was in use before the dispersion, nor was it necessary.

Axiom 7 will settle this point. If the Bible datings refer to a calendar, they mean nothing without the key—the full detailed calendar itself; therefore God would have supplied the key. As He has not done so, we can only take His words at their simple face value.

We must not forget that a cycle based on human calculations encourages reliance on human wisdom, and defeats the spiritual lesson, as well as the scientific accuracy, of the system which God's Word has adopted, for no calendar can be compiled to show the real dates of the visible new moon; sooner or later error arises. Therefore these calendars, invented to help us, introduce an element of inaccuracy, for any particular calendar moon might be in error some few days. This point has a very important bearing on our subject.

Another advantage accruing from a logical adherence to our axioms is that we need no longer be exercised by the disagreements of the standard authorities. Having no need that any should teach us, we may put them on one side and begin the search on our own account, forgetting, as far as may be, the problems which they have created for our confusion. Good concordances and dictionaries are all we need. It may be that we shall discover after weeks of labour what we might have learned in a few hours' reading; but books which really help are few, while those which mislead are many.

We have nothing to learn from rabbinical custom and

tradition. We can reject the false scents of history such as Phlegon and his impossible eclipse of the sun at full moon. We can ignore the nice calculations necessary to prove whether the facts of Herod's illness can be fitted into the period between an eclipse of the moon and the passover of a month later. His journey to Callirrhoe, his treatment there, his hurried return to Jerusalem to execute his son Antipater, and his own death five days later.

God's silence on these things rules them out of court; true or untrue, their evidence is of no value to us.

3.—CHRIST OUR PASSOVER: THE FIRSTFRUIT CHRIST.

Having narrowed the issue, the problem is simple. We shall recognize no authority outside Revelation, and we shall take its words at their face value, in their most ordinary meaning. If we do this, we shall find a straightforward and consistent solution.

The clue lies in two spiritual truths—"Christ our Passover" (1 Cor. v, 7), and "The firstfruit Christ" (1 Cor. xv, 20, 23). If these are true, they are true to the smallest detail, with that minuteness of accuracy which marks the difference between the mind and ways of God and the mind and ways of man. This means that if we set the law of the types side by side with the gospel account of the fulfilment of the types, we shall find the true meaning of the one and the true facts of the other. If there is any doubtful point in the law, the fulfilment will put the doubt at rest. If the story can be read in two ways, the law should show which of the two was the better reading. At the outset we must remind ourselves that the day began at sunset. Lev. xxiii, 32, will substantiate this. As a consequence, a Bible date is best represented by a double date in our phraseology.

We will take the evidence of the law first.

1. The lamb, and therefore the Lord, must die on the 14th of the 1st month, called Abib or Nisan (Exod. xii, 6). We note that this is a *fixed lunar date*, which would fall on a *different week-day* according to the year.

2. On this day at even the seven days of unleavened bread were to be observed, ending on the 21st day at even. Between these two dates there was bound to be a sabbath. On the day

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER: THE FIRSTFRUIT CHRIST.

Moses.	Prophecy in Type.	Nisan.		Facts of Fulfilment.	Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
		9th		Arrival Bethany—six (inclusive) days before Passover.	xii, 1
Exod. xii, 3	In the 10th of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb.	10th	Sun. 6 p.m.	Triumphal Entry. The Lamb of God offered. Knew not the day of visitation. Who is this? <i>Jesus of Nazareth</i> . Looked round Temple—eventide goes to Bethany.	xxi, 1-9 xxi, 10-11	xi, 1-10 xi, 11	xix, 29-38 xix, 39-44	xii, 12-15
		11th	Mon. 6 p.m.	Morrow curses fig tree. Cleanses Temple. At even leaves city for Bethany. xxi, 12-13 xxi, 17	xi, 12-14 xi, 15 xi, 19 xix, 45-46
Exod. xii, 6	And ye shall keep it up until the 14th day of the same month.	12th	Tues. 6 p.m.	Morning fig tree withered away. By what authority? The Judge sums up in Questions and Parables. Sentence pronounced on Jerusalem . . . until. Prophetic history of the interval . . . until . . .	xxi, 19-20 xxi, 23 xxi, 24 xxiii, 35 xxiii, 36-39 xxiv, xxv	xi, 20-26 xi, 27 xi, 29 xii, 44 xiii xx, 1 xxi, 4 xiii, 35-39 xxi, 5-36
		13th	Wed. 6 p.m.	After 2 days (inclusive), 13th and 14th, the Son of the Man is betrayed to be crucified. Priests decide not to arrest Him on the feast day, that is, 15th. Supper at Simon's House. Judas agrees to betray Him.	xxvi, 1 xxvi, 3-5 xxvi, 6-13 xxvi, 14-16	xiv, 1 xiv, 2 xiv, 3-9 xiv, 10-11	xxii, 1 xxii, 2 xxii, 3-6 xii, 2-8
Exod. xii, 6 Exod. xii, 15-18	And the whole assembly shall kill it. } At even. Ye shall put away leaven }	14th	Thurs. 6 p.m. Thursday.	The day of unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed. 6 p.m. Two disciples sent to prepare supper. 9 p.m. ? At even the supper—1 Cor. xi, 23-26. Not the feast of passover. After supper to Mt. Olives and Gethsemane . . . Midnight ? The Arrest. Dawn ? Rejected by the assembly. 9 a.m. ? Crucified. <i>Jesus of Nazareth</i> . Noon—3 p.m. Darkness. 3 p.m. It is finished. "CHRIST OUR PASSOVER IS SACRIFICED FOR US." 3 p.m.—6 p.m. The burial. Those who buried Him defiled.	xxvi, 17 xxvi, 17-19 xxvi, 20-29 xxvi, 30-46 xxvi, 47 xxvii, 22-26 xxvii, 27-44 xxvii, 45 xxvii, 50 xxvii, 57-61	xiv, 12 xiv, 12-16 xiv, 17-31 xiv, 32-42 xiv, 43 xv, 13-15 xv, 25 xv, 33 xv, 37 xv, 43-47	xxii, 7 xxii, 8-13 xxii, 14-38 xxii, 39-46 xxii, 47 xxiii, 13-24 xxiii, 33 xxiii, 44 xxiii, 46 xxiii, 50-55 xiii, 1 xiv, xvii. xviii, 3 xix, 14-16 xix, 18 xix, 30 xix, 38-42
Gen. ii, 2 Exod. xii, 8 Exod. xii, 11 Exod. xii, 14 Exod. xii, 16	God rested the 7th day. Shall eat the flesh in <i>that night</i> . It (the lamb, Rev. xiii, 8) the Lord's Passover } This day shall be unto you a feast for ever. } It is a holy convocation.	15th	Friday. 6 p.m.	The sabbath—The grave—God rested the seventh day. } The paschal supper. } A high day. A holy convocation—The 1st day of the Feast. From 6 p.m. onwards. The True Paschal Supper. The Feast, or 1st day unleavened bread. Therefore an arrest, trial and crucifixion on this day would be a legal impossibility. The women rested this day according to the commandment (Sabbath). They set a watch (not of "you") of Roman Soldiers. xxvii, 62-66 xxiii, 56	xix, 31
Lev. xxiii, 10	On the morrow after the Sabbath. . To be accepted for you. . . . A sheaf of the firstfruits. . . .	16th	Sat. 6 p.m.	Jesus was risen early the first day of the week. "Now is Christ risen . . . and become the firstfruits"—1 Cor. xv, 20.	xxviii, 1 xxviii, 6	xvi, 1 xvi, 6	xxiv, 1 xxiv, 6	xx, 1 xx, 17
		24th	Sun. 6 p.m.	After 8 days. . . Thomas saith, MY LORD AND MY GOD. At the Supper on Sunday night.	xx, 26-28

following this sabbath, the law ordained the offering of the Wave Sheaf of the Firstfruits. We note that this is a *fixed week-day*, which would fall on a *different lunar date* according to the year (Exod. xii, 18; Lev. xxiii, 10, etc.).

If the 14th Nisan happened to fall on the day *before* the sabbath, then the 15th Nisan was the sabbath, and the Wave Sheaf would be offered next day, on the 16th Nisan. This was the shortest possible interval between the two events—three inclusive days. But if the 14th Nisan fell on a sabbath (and there was nothing in the law to prevent it doing so), then the sabbath in that week would fall on the last day of unleavened bread, and the day following would be “the day of the Wave Offering.” In this case the inclusive interval between the two events would be nine days.

3. We note, then, that the inclusive interval might be anything from three to nine days according to the week-day of the 14th Nisan.

Given a lunar date, a week-day, and the inclusive interval, we have a reliable astronomical observation, from which we can fix the possible years with accuracy.

The law has supplied two of the necessary facts—we must turn to the Gospels for the third. The Spirit has recognized the importance of this third fact, and has given it to us in nine different texts, in words which need no interpretation.

“The Son of Man must suffer, and rise again the third day.” It can be shown that this phrase must be understood inclusively, and that any part of a day counted as a whole day. This method of reckoning is commonly used in the Old and New Testaments. This being so, as the Lord was our Wave Offering, to fulfil the law He had to rise on “the morrow after the sabbath,” *i.e.* on the first day of the week.

Mark xvi, 9, will corroborate this: “Now having risen early on the first day of the week.” This is confirmed by Matt. xxviii, 1, translated in the light of Mark xvi, 1; Luke xxiv, 1; and John xx, 1.

As He rose again on the day *after* the sabbath, and as the inclusive interval was three days, He must have died on the day *before* the sabbath. Again, Mark xv, 42, verifies these deductions. “It was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath” (*prosabbaton*), and Luke confirms that “that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on” (Luke xxiii, 54).

If we may understand God's words in their simplicity, then

the Bible authorizes us to believe that our Lord died on the 14th Nisan, the sixth day of the week, and that He rose from the dead early on the first day of the week. As the year of the Crucifixion fell within the period of Pilate's term of office, a connection with history authorized by Luke iii, 1, the astronomic data fix the year as either A.D. 29 or A.D. 33.

When God measures time by the life or reign of a man, the official birthday or the official accession is the datum-point. This is the consistent usage of Scripture, and when it is departed from, as in the overlapping of joint-reigning, the fact is indicated. There is no indication that the fifteenth year of the hegemony of Tiberius is an exception to the rule. Augustus died on the 19th August, A.D. 14. Therefore Tiberius' fifteenth year began in August, A.D. 28, and ended in August, A.D. 29. In this year our Lord was baptized. Now the date of the Crucifixion, supported by the greater weight of authority, is A.D. 29, but we must reject it as inconsistent with the facts of the ministry, for after His baptism, John records three passovers, and possibly a fourth (John v, 1). This shuts us up to the alternative date, *viz.* A.D. 33.

I conclude, therefore, that the Lord died on the 14th Nisan, A.D. 33. The lunar tables show us that this day was the 2/3 April (Julian reckoning). If this conclusion be correct, the Spirit has so dated the Crucifixion that this event serves as a perfect connection, easily calculated and easily verified, between sacred and profane history.

These two ordinances, of the slaughter of the lamb and of unleavened bread, date the day of Matt. xxvi, 17, "the first day of unleavened bread"; of Mark xiv, 12, who adds "when they killed the passover"; and of Luke xxii, 7, "the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed." No day in the gospel story is so fully described from its commencement on Thursday at sunset, up to the following afternoon at 3 o'clock, when the Lord yielded up His Spirit (Matt. xxvii, 46; Mark xv, 34-37; Luke xxiii, 44-46).

His death at about 3 p.m. decides the meaning of the phrase "between the evenings" (Exod. xii, 6). (*See also* Deut. xvi, 6). Obviously it was impossible for the priests to kill all the lambs for a nation's passover at the same moment, therefore the law allowed from 3 p.m. to sunset. If the solution is as simple as we have suggested, why is it that this all-important date is still a debatable point?

In the first place, many students of God's chronology have sought to supply from profane history the apparent gaps in the sacred record. In so doing they have brought themselves into condemnation: "they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they shewed difference between the clean and the unclean" (Ezek. xxii, 26). Consequently they have been led out of the true path by statements of doubtful accuracy, such as those found in Josephus and in the writings of the Fathers.

In the second place, they have overlooked the warning of the Lord, "making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition" (Matt. xv, 6, and Mark vii, 8-13), and have sought in rabbinical custom the true interpretation of the law. "Let them alone; they be blind leaders of the blind."

Most chronologists have accepted without question the rabbinical custom which reckoned the 15th Nisan to be a sabbath extraordinary, whether it fell on a true seventh day or not. By so doing they have deprived themselves of one of the factors essential to the astronomical solution of the problem, for according to this custom the Wave Sheaf would always be offered on the 16th Nisan in all years alike.

This paper is intended to be constructive, not argumentative, but the point is so important that we must turn to revelation to decide it for us. What saith the law?

The word *Shabbath* occurs 110 times: 96 times it refers to the seventh day of the week; 3 times to God's only sabbath extraordinary, the day of atonement; 11 times to the seventh year (the sabbath of the land), and never to any other feast.

The two other feasts of the seventh month were *Shabbathon*, days of rest, but not *Shabbath*.

Shabbathon is a kindred word, used 11 times. The student of number will note the *elevens*.

Sabbath (96 + 3)	99 times.
Sabbatic year	11 times.
Shabbathon	11 times.

Total .. 121 = 11 × 11.

No feast of the first month was either *Shabbath* or *Shabbathon*. The feasts of the Lord embody prophecy in type. All feasts were Holy Convocations. The difference between Holy Con-

vocation and Sabbath was the amount of work permitted. In Holy Convocations only servile work was forbidden. The feasts of the first month have a personal application; in this aspect they typify the only basis of the true Christian life, and the holiness which should follow. I take it that our labour should consist of the co-operation of a loving heart of gratitude. Servile work is not what the Father wants, and is therefore forbidden (John xv, 15).

The Wave Offering and Pentecost have a connected significance which does not concern us now.

The feasts of the seventh day, the seventh month, and the seventh year represent in the one aspect the millennial rest, in the other, the anticipation of that rest which the believer may enjoy now, when he ceases from his own work (Heb. iv, 10). But the seventh day and the Day of Atonement picture to us our enjoyment of God's work on our behalf, in which we had no hand whatever. On these days all work of any kind whatever was forbidden. Any such work would spoil the picture. I submit that the law did not ordain that the 15th Nisan be observed as a sabbath extraordinary, and that custom has erred spiritually in appointing an observance which God did not direct.

We must now justify our interpretation of *tē tritē hēmera*, the third day. Souter, in his pocket dictionary of the colloquial Greek of the New Testament, under *tritos* says *tē tritē hēmera* means the third day "according to the ancient method of reckoning . . . *the day after to-morrow*" (my italics). Luke xiii, 32, confirms this: "Behold I cast out devils, and do cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the day following (*tē tritē*) I am perfected."

In nine texts the Resurrection is placed on the third day (Matt. xvi, 21; xvii, 23; xx, 19; Mark ix, 31; x, 34; Luke ix, 22; xviii, 33; xxiv, 7; 1 Cor. xv, 4). But Mark viii, 31, says, "After three days." In Hebrew usage (1 Kings xii, 5, 12) this means after the third day had begun. So the Pharisees understood it. "Sir, we remember that this deceiver said while he was yet alive, 'After three days I will rise again.' Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day." Had they understood these words as we would understand them, they would have asked for a guard up to the end of the fourth day.

We ought to notice that Matt. xii, 40, has confused the issue (Prov. xxv, 2), for this text is generally interpreted to cover

the period from the Crucifixion to the Resurrection. Now, as the day began at sunset, three days and three nights are parts of four days: day—night—day—night—day—night. Therefore this interpretation cannot be correct, *for if it were, it would contradict the nine texts we have enumerated*, statements so plainly worded that their meaning cannot be questioned. The probable interpretation of Matt. xii, 40, is not within the scope of this paper.

4.—THE STORY OF THE LAST WEEK.

The 9th Nisan (Saturday-Sunday): The 1st day of the week.

John xii, 1, supplies a note of time not found elsewhere. "Six days before the passover." This apparently simple expression needs comment. The Bible calls the killing of the lamb "keeping the passover," or simply "the passover." Eating the lamb was called "the feast of the passover" (John xiii, 1; xviii, 28). We have shown that the Crucifixion was on the sixth day of the week; as time is reckoned inclusively, these six days carry us back to the 9th Nisan, the first day of the week.

On this day our Lord passed through Jericho on His way to Bethany. As He neared Jerusalem (Luke xix, 11) He spake a parable which sets the keynote of the week. He was going to a far country, there to receive a kingdom (a heavenly kingdom), and when He had received it, He would return. "But His citizens" (of the earthly kingdom) "hated Him, and sent a message after Him—saying, We will not have this man to reign over us." The type foretold that "the whole assembly shall kill it at even" (Exod. xii, 6).

Toward the end of this day He reached Bethany, and lodged there on the nights of the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th of Nisan, probably in the home of Martha. John then tells us of the supper at Simon's house. We might assume that it took place that evening but for Matthew and Mark, who both place the event on Wednesday evening. The three accounts could hardly apply to two different suppers. Some might call this a discrepancy. We are so impressed with the necessity of relating facts in their time-sequence that we assume that God must tell His story as we would have told it. But if we search the Scriptures under the guidance of the Spirit, I think we shall find that God, in His revelation, groups facts. If there is no stress laid on the time-sequence, then He has some other sequence

of thought in mind. The time-note, if necessary, will be found elsewhere, as in this case. John had told us of the sorrow which had fallen on the house of Martha and Mary, and of the raising of Lazarus. He carries the story on to its logical conclusion without breaking the thread of the narrative. "The chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death, because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus" (John xii, 10, 11).

This told, the account goes back to the time-note of xii, 1, and then tells of what happened next day.

The 10th Nisan (Sunday-Monday) : The 2nd day of the week.

But this detail of the supper is not the only apparent discrepancy. They arise naturally if a series of events, recorded by four different writers, are first dissected and then grouped by each from their own point of view. Yet it is not difficult to present the facts in chronologic sequence, once we recognize that the Spirit has furnished us with the necessary time-sequence in the Gospel of Mark.

I would suggest that this Gospel be regarded as the skeleton which may be clothed with the detail found in Matthew, who is concerned with the universal Kingdom of the Heavens, one day to become the Kingdom of God, when Christ is King; with the detail found in Luke, who is concerned with the throne of this earth to be vested in the Son of *the Man*, at His coming again; and with the detail found in John, who is concerned to prove that this Jesus is the very Son of God, into whom believing, we receive His life.

Bearing this in mind, it will suffice if we record the events as placed in their time-order by Mark. On this 10th Nisan, the second day of the week, the Lord having slept at Bethany, presented Himself at the Temple. He was there accepted of the Father to be the fulfilment of the Paschal lamb. This lamb was to be kept four days. This detail was fulfilled exactly. In spite of their urgent hatred, the authorities could not act until their hour came. The Lord was immune during the four days, the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th Nisan. On the 13th the plot was hatched—"not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people"—but there was to be no delay, so on the 14th the blow fell.

"And Jesus entered into . . . the Temple, and when He had

looked round about upon all things, and now eventide was come, he went to Bethany with the disciples" (Mark xi, 11). So ended the 10th Nisan.

The 11th Nisan (Monday-Tuesday) : The 3rd day of the week.

Having slept at Bethany the Monday night, on the Tuesday He went into Jerusalem. As He neared the city He cursed the fig-tree, which was to bring forth no fruit until the end of the age. We can see that this very fig-tree is now putting forth leaves. It is the sign He gave us; our redemption is drawing nigh.

When he arrived at the Temple He cleansed it for the last time. There is a last time in the long-suffering of God, for on this afternoon he called it "My house," yet within twenty-four hours He had repudiated it—"Your house is left unto you desolate." Empty, swept and garnished, ready for the occupation of devils. "And the last state of that man was worse than the first; even so shall it be unto this wicked generation" (Matt. xii, 45). "And when even was come, He went out of the city" (Mark xi, 19).

The 12th Nisan (Tuesday-Wednesday) : The 4th day of the week.

Having slept the night of Tuesday at Bethany, He returned to Jerusalem. This day was the climax in the history of Israel. They had refused the kingdom of the Heavens and its law set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. In refusing the greater, they had thrown away the less, their own earthly kingdom.

We can now realize that the time had come for the hidden things of Deut. xxix, 29, to be more fully revealed, for the law had not brought them to Christ (Gal. iii, 24). "Israel after the flesh" was to be cast away, that "Israel after the Spirit" might be brought in. The decree was to run until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in.

In various parables the Judge justifies the impending doom. In warning to us, He sums up the mockery of righteousness, consequent upon the withdrawal of the Spirit, when man is left to his own resources, even when those resources include promise and covenant and the guidance of the infallible Word. This done He closed His public ministry. "*Ye would not*" . . . "*Ye shall not see Me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord.*" "Your house is left unto you desolate." In these words our Lord fulfilled the

threat of 2 Chron. vii, 20 ; cancelling the promise of 2 Chron. vii, 12, and formally repudiating the place which God had chosen to put His Name there.

From that moment, until He comes again, there was no longer any "house of sacrifice" where the requirements of the ceremonial law could be observed (Deut. xii, 10-14), and in consequence the passovers, the burnt-offerings, and the sin-offerings of the law could no longer be acceptable in His sight.

As He left the Temple, He warned His disciples of the coming events, carrying the immediate future through the days of vengeance down to the end of the age. But it is outside the scope of this paper to attempt to harmonize these three accounts. Suffice it to say, they constitute the key which unlocks the Revelation, and also, as far as may be, the Book of Daniel.

The 13th Nisan (Wednesday-Thursday) : The 5th day of the week.

On the Wednesday evening the supper was given in Simon's house. Only one mind dimly foresaw the impending death, and, doubtless urged to do so by the Spirit of Love, anointed the Lord's body for burial.

Of the daylight hours of this 13th Nisan the Scripture is silent. It must have been a time of preparation in communion with His Father, and in meditation over the Scriptures which foretold His sufferings.

The 14th Nisan (Thursday-Friday) : The 6th day of the week.

This day is fully described. At or about sunset the Lord sent two of His disciples to prepare the passover. The question whether He intended the supper which followed to be His official observance of the Mosaic passover, or whether He regarded it as the institution of "the passover" of the new covenant, is one which does not affect the date of His Crucifixion nor of the sequence of events in this final week of His life. Space also forbids reference to other minor points in the four accounts of this week which some have found to be points of difficulty. I would refer you to "A Combined Analysis of the Four Gospels," by A. G. Secrett (Thynne and Jarvis)—it will be found suggestive.

We can pass on to 3 p.m. of the Friday. God's secret, hidden from all creation, was revealed at last. Too late, the

rulers of this age discovered that they had overreached themselves, and had forfeited all their powers. Had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. If Satan holds his throne to-day, it is the tenure of a usurper, waiting until the stronger than he shall claim all the fruits of the victory of Calvary.

* * * * *

I would close by drawing your attention to the prophetic aspect of this week. We have seen that it divides into two parts, four days during which the lamb was held up, and three days, one of suffering, one of rest and one of resurrection. From the promise of Gen. iii, 15, to Calvary was four of God's days of one thousand years each. As man was created on the sixth day, so God deemed it to be spiritually right that man should be reconciled to Him on the sixth day. Man's number is 6, man's day is the sixth day. Man's day is not yet over (1 Cor. iv, 3), it has lasted nearly 2,000 years. How can this be explained?

At the Crucifixion the material gives place to the spiritual. "Israel after the flesh" makes way for "Israel after the Spirit." God's revelation of measured time ceases—to be strictly accurate at the Pentecost following. The period needed for the development of the Church which is His Body is unrevealed, for God has retained all times and seasons within His own power. We cannot penetrate this secret, but if we would know our place in time, we can connect our accepted history with revealed chronology at the Crucifixion point. There is no other synchronization accurate enough.

Man's day has been long drawn out in God's longsuffering (2 Pet. iii, 9). But it will end when He finishes the mystery, in the days of the seventh trumpet, when "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ." After a brief period of wrath poured out, the Lord will bring in His seventh day of millennial rest. There remains the final resurrection morning. The eighth day of the old reckoning, but the first of the new, when Christ, having put down every enemy, will hand over the kingdom to His Father, that God may be all in all.

It is to the glory of God to conceal a matter (Prov. xxv, 2). The very simplicity of the truth often hides God's thoughts from our mentality. Can we say, "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes?"

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. W. C. Edwards) said : Our lecturer has given us a delightful paper. One may well envy his facile pen and wonderful grasp of a subject which he has made his own. Although I agree with most of it, I cannot see my way to give up the dates A.D. 26 for A.D. 29. Luke iii, 1, 2, is, I think, one of the most wonderfully dated passages in all history. You have seven contemporaneous persons mentioned. We have yet to be sure from what date the *hegemonia* ("reign") of Tiberius is to be reckoned, whether from the death of Augustus or the date (uncertain, I believe) when he became his father-in-law's colleague and the recognized heir to the Imperial Government. We may hope some day to learn something of Lysanias, mentioned by Luke. This part of our Lord's ministry is more fully reported than any other, and this by all four of the Evangelists. On the third day of the week, which we call Tuesday, we have the following : Our Lord is in the Temple walking in the Porches ; the Scribes and Pharisees and their spies have conspired for His death, and are seeking to catch Him in His words. One of their questions is that of the tribute money ; sitting in the Temple, He sees the widow give her two mites : the Greeks come to Him, and a voice from heaven speaks ; He discoursed upon the grain of wheat falling into the ground, and dying it does not abide alone ; He speaks of David's Son ; of the Resurrection ; and the great Commandment. Further, He denounces the Pharisees ; He gave the parables of the labourers ; of the two sons ; of the wicked husbandmen ; of the marriage of the king's son ; the wedding garment ; and a final discourse on the coming doom and the consummation of the age.

What a day of labour ! Multiply this day with those since His baptism. What a trying, super-human ministry it was ! On scrutinizing a chart that I had made, I was almost electrified to find that possibly our Lord's earthly ministry was exactly twelve hundred and ninety days—thus from *Nitzabim* Sabbath to the New Year, say five days, *plus* three hundred and fifty-four, *plus* three hundred and fifty-three, and one embolismic year (if then known) of three hundred and eighty-five days ; and from Tishri 1 to Nisan 15, a hundred and

ninety-three days. In other words, 1,290 days out of about twelve thousand of His entire life.

At the call of the Chairman, the Colonel was thanked for his interesting and learned paper.

MR. G. WILSON HEATH said: With what the paper states as to a "reevaluation of human records and reconsideration of axioms," I am in full agreement. I also agree that "an advance in true spiritual knowledge is to be measured more by what we may have consented to unlearn than by the new truths we may have been directly taught."

From p. 186 and onwards, I am compelled to dissent, somewhat. It is not my intention to discuss the year of our Lord's crucifixion; I believe A.D. 29 or 30 to be fairly correct. In Lev. xxiii, 1-8, we have the record of the weekly and annual feasts, or "appointed seasons" of Jehovah. 1st.—The seventh day of each week set apart as a Sabbath of rest and "holy convocation." 2nd.—The fourteenth day of the first month Abib, later called Nisan, when the passover lambs were killed and the passover feast prepared, called "preparation" (Matt. xxvii, 62; Mark xv, 42; Luke xxiii, 54; John xix, 14, 31, 42). 3rd.—The fifteenth day of the same month Abib, the first day of the seven days of "unleavened bread," which also was a *Sabbath*, an "holy convocation," in which no laborious work was to be done. 4th.—The last, or the seventh day of the feast of "unleavened bread," the twenty-first of this month (Abib or Nisan) which was also set apart as a Sabbath or "holy convocation."

Thus, as the paper indicates, there would, of necessity, be two Sabbaths in the beginning of the seven days of the feast, and there might also be two at the end of this week of unleavened bread, the seventh day, which was also to be held as a "holy convocation" as well as the usual weekly sabbath.

Further, three fixed dates for this period are stated definitely in the Bible record. 1st.—The "passover period," commencing on the fourteenth day of the first month Nisan. A fixed date, in a fixed month, the day in the week varying, of course, from year to year. "Passover" covered the whole period of "unleavened bread," and a little before and after. 2nd.—The passover feast (the Pascha) consisting of the roasted lamb and unleavened bread,

etc., eaten at the opening, say after 6 p.m. or sunset, of the 15th Nisan, the first day of unleavened bread. 3rd.—Our Lord was crucified and slain whilst the lambs were being slain for the “Pascha” feast—type and antitype thus meeting—on the 14th Nisan “preparation,” and arose from the tomb on the “first (day) of the Sabbaths” (John xx, 1), translated in our Bibles “the first day of the week,” the day after the ordinary weekly Sabbath, that is to say, some time after 6 p.m. on our Saturday, and the day called the “first fruits” (Lev. xxiii, 16), from which 50 days, “nights and days,” were to be counted to Pentecost.”

The serious question raised in the paper is: How long was our Lord in the tomb? The “three-day” theory—quite an ancient one—adopted in the paper read to us (p. 190) I cannot accept. In the past this theory opened the way for serious error, and may easily do so again. Practically 26 hours would cover the “three-day” theory, one hour before the 15th, the whole of the 15th, and one hour (the first hour) of the 16th, or 26 hours in all. The error which crept in was, that our Lord did not actually die, that He only fainted, or fell into a kind of trance, out of which He awoke in 26 hours, and was then spirited away by His disciples.

To meet Jewish incredulity it was necessary for our Lord to be in the tomb “three nights and three days,” *i.e.*, 72 hours. The Jews had a kind of belief that the spirit had not really left the body finally until after three days. Hence “three nights and three days” were necessary to produce certainty of conviction in the mind of friend or foe. Colloquially the period would be called “three days,” exactly as the Pentecost period is called “50 days” in Lev. xxiii, 16; and it is so called again and again, “three days” or “after three days.” But one scripture to define the “days” is enough, and Matt. xii, 40, distinctly states, “For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.” In this St. Matthew states the fact prophetically; St. Luke speaks of it as a “sign” and the only “sign” given to that generation; whilst in Jonah i, 17, we have the definite historical fact stated, “Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale,” *i.e.*, 72 hours. I am old-fashioned enough to believe this, and that it typified the 72 hours that our Lord was in the tomb.

I do not agree with the paper that the six days—of course, 24-hour days—before the passover (John xii, 1) the 9th of Nisan was the 1st day of the week. As I understand, the Chagigah supper (John xiii; Luke xxii, etc.) opened the day of “preparation,” the 14th Nisan, and was the one at which our Lord instituted what we call “the Lord’s supper.” This was before the lambs were slain, and there was no roasted lamb at this supper, but unleavened bread and wine, etc. The “Pascha” feast, or passover feast, opened the 15th Nisan, and was after the lambs had been killed, roasted and prepared for it; and at that time our Lord had been hurriedly buried in the new tomb, that the feast might not be defiled. The paper we have heard read carefully differentiates between the “preparation” supper and the “Pascha Feast of Jehovah.”

Jewish calendars do not help us. The Jewish method of calculating four weeks to the month left a gap which had to be filled in by an extra month every few years; this extra month was added to the end of any selected year; confusion resulted. Further astronomy does not help us. Astronomers can easily calculate back 1900 years, of course, and they can tell the day and hour when the thin crescent of a new moon should or might be seen for a few moments above the horizon from the heights of Jerusalem, or elsewhere, but they cannot determine the conditions of the sky or state of the horizon on any particular day, and if or when first of all the new moon was actually visible and seen; and the date in the month depended on this point in those far-off days.

Therefore—1st.—Our calculations of the period must rest on what the scriptures state alone. 2nd.—On the two Sabbaths in the week of seven days of “unleavened bread.” 3rd.—On the “three nights and three days,” or 72-hour period, our Lord was in the tomb. 4th.—We have in the Scriptures three consecutive “night-day” periods, *i.e.*, “six days before passover” (John xii, 1); “seven days of unleavened bread” (Lev. xxiii, 6); “the morrow after sabbath . . . fifty days” (Lev. xxiii, 16) = Pentecost. This last period opened with our Lord’s resurrection, “the first-fruit” on “the first (day) of the weeks” (John xx, 1); this was an index-day from which we can count the three days and three nights backwards until we reach Wednesday, 6 p.m., covering the first three days of unleavened bread, to 14th Nisan, the “preparation.”

Dr. NORMAN S. DENHAM said : May I ask where in the Law it was allowed to slay the passover lambs at 3 p.m.? The time denoted by the phrase "between the two evenings" is given us precisely in Exod. xxx, 8 : "And when Aaron lighteth the lamps between the two evenings." This passage, among others, explains Exod. xii, 6. Lamps are lit at sunset, not at 3 p.m. We learn, however, that the lambs were slain in our Lord's time at about 3 p.m. and onwards, from Josephus (*Wars* VI, ix, 3), and by inference from Luke xxii, 7. It has been generally overlooked that the passover was never eaten in the evening commencing 15th Nisan, but was ordained to be slain and eaten in the night of 14th Nisan. The Jews so celebrate their passover to this day, as also do the Karaite sect and the Samaritans.

Our lecturer asks us to believe that after sunset of the 13th Nisan our Lord sent Peter and John to prepare the passover ; that they followed the man with the pitcher, came to the Upper Room and prepared the passover, and that in the evening Jesus came with the Twelve. This is unacceptable. He has to conclude that at this momentous passover, so carefully arranged by Divine prevision, there was no passover lamb upon the board, though the lamb was the essential feature of the supper.

Exod. xii, 6, commands that the lamb be kept *until* the 14th day, and then slain between the two evenings, *i.e.*, at sunset, commencing 14th Nisan. The paper omits all reference to John xiii, 1, 2 : "Now before the feast of the passover. . . supper being ended." Here John distinguishes between the feast of unleavened bread on the 15th Nisan and the Paschal supper of 14th Nisan. Connecting Luke xxii with John xiii, we see perfect harmony : our Lord and the Jews ate the supper at the right time, on the right day, 14th Nisan. John presents us with the distinguishing mark of the sabbath immediately following the crucifixion. "That sabbath day was an high day" (xix, 31). To my mind there can be no doubt that the seven days of holy convocation were sabbaths of rest, and that John is careful to differentiate between the Paschal Sabbath and the weekly sabbath. When John says that the Jews refrained from entering the judgment hall that they might eat the passover, he refers to the well-known festal offerings commanded to be eaten on the 14th Nisan (Exod. xxxiii, 15, and Deut. xvi, 17).

At p. 185 the lecturer says, "We have nothing to learn from rabbinical custom and tradition," yet he obtains his observations for the new moon wholly from Talmudic tradition, and not from the Scriptures. The calendar rules on which we are asked to rely, for all Bible dates, are really founded on the Jewish calendar, established in the 4th century A.D. by Rabbis Samuel and Hillel II. They took the length of a lunation from the computations of Hipparchus and adopted Meton's 19-year cycle. As a matter of fact, the word *chodesh* is used both for the month and for the first day of the month, showing that *chodesh* had lost its primary signification. If the lecturer is correct that "new moon" means the literal new moon, then can he explain how there were two new moons in one month in 1 Sam. xx, 17? The words *yarēach* or *lebhanah* are always used for the moon itself, and I suggest that for "new moon" we should be perfectly correct to read "new month," in the sense of "the first day of the month."

A regrettable phrase appears on p. 190, that "Matt. xii, 40, has confused the issue." It has only, and rightly, confounded tradition, the sole authority for a Friday crucifixion. Far otherwise; it has made assurance doubly sure that Christ expired at about 3 p.m. on the Wednesday, was buried at sunset of the same day, and rose again near sunset on Saturday, the 17th Nisan, as the first day of the week drew on (*see* Matt. xxviii, 1, and Luke xxiii, 54). Our Lord did not say He would be dead three days and three nights, but that He would be during that time in the heart of the earth. In exact accord with His solemn sign and prophecy to the Jews, He lay in the grave precisely three days and three nights.

Mr. GEORGE BREWER said: I should like to join in thanking Col. Kenney-Herbert for his very interesting and instructive paper, and especially for his statement that God has given us sufficient data in the Scriptures to construct a revealed chronology. With reference to Mark xvi, 9, I would suggest that this passage should read: "Now when Jesus was risen, He appeared early the first day of the week to Mary Magdalene," as I take it that the time refers, not to the rising, but to His appearance.

With regard to the statement that Matt. xii, 40, has "confused the issue," I should say that the actual wording of this passage has

made the meaning very explicit: that "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so the Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If three days only had been stated, we might have concluded that a period of one day and part of two nights only was intended; but the emphatic and precise way in which our Lord's own words are recorded renders it impossible for them to mean anything less than three whole days of twenty-four hours each—that is a period of seventy-two hours during which His body was to remain in the tomb.

This necessitates the conclusion that 14th Nisan in that year fell on the fourth day of the week, from sunset, Tuesday, to sunset, Wednesday, during which the passover was kept by our Lord and His Apostles; the Lord's Supper instituted; His betrayal, mock trial, crucifixion and burial taking place during these twenty-four hours. This date is confirmed by the Hebrew Calendar Cycle, and corresponds with our Wednesday, April 12th, A.D. 30.

The other events then follow in orderly sequence, the 5th day being the Feast of Unleavened Bread, a holy convocation, upon which no work could be done; the 6th, the day when the women prepared spices and ointment; the 7th, or regular sabbath, when they "rested according to the commandment"; the Resurrection taking place at the close of the day, and exactly seventy-two hours from the time of burial, this being the 17th of Nisan, the anniversary of the day upon which the ark rested on Mount Ararat.

Lt.-Colonel A. G. SHORTT said: It is difficult to agree with Col. Kenney-Herbert's view, expressed in the table attached to his lecture, that the Last Supper was not the Passover. I think the accounts, in all the Synoptic Gospels at least, are so clear that no more need be said.

The Colonel's attitude to secular evidence is, I think, unjustified. I do not think we can afford to neglect *any* light which can be thrown on Scripture. And really, as regards the subject of the lecture, I submit it is unnecessary, for it can now, within the last few years, be shown that his main dates are verified abundantly. Confusion has arisen from the persistent habit of ignoring Luke as a witness, and accepting Josephus at his face value.

But the evidence of coins is clear, that the 15th year of Tiberius

was the year A.D. 28-29, beginning September; and, not only can it be no other, but it was an official Roman method of reckoning used throughout Syria. The coins referred to were minted at Antioch. On the other hand, Josephus' date of 4 B.C. for Herod's death conflicts with every other piece of evidence, whether in Scripture or out of it. It can be shown by critical analysis of his own writings that Herod did not die in 4 B.C., or even 3 B.C., and that he was probably alive in A.D. 2, or 3, or 4.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: I think we are much indebted to the lecturer for thus boldly stating the ten "axioms" on p. 183, which are so despised in certain obscurantist quarters, that some of us hardly like to state them so fearlessly, though we believe them, except the tenth, for my part. I think all that is meant by the words "Matt. xii, 40, confuse the issue" is that the "nescience" of the ordinary English reader as to the Hebrew idiom confuses the issue. It is as though some ancient Hebrew *redivivus* came across the phrase—"a week-end." Not knowing the British idiom, he would insist on its excluding every day but Saturday. His ignorance would "confuse the issue." Such a passage as I Kings, xii, 5—"Depart yet for three days" and v, 12, "As the King had appointed, saying 'come to me again the third day,'" illustrate the Hebrew idiom. See also Esther iv, 16, "Neither eat nor drink three days, night or day" and v, 1, "It came to pass on the third day."

I confess I find a great difficulty in accepting the lecturer's suggestion on p. 194, that possibly our Lord did not intend the passover He observed to be "His official observance of the Mosaic passover." The question of the disciples, as recorded in Mark, was (not "When," but) "Where wilt Thou that we prepare the passover?" As pious Jews they, of course, knew the correct day for the passover. What would have been their astonishment had the Lord predated the observance? There is no hint of such a thing in the text, and it seems to me unthinkable that such a change was ever contemplated. How could our Lord have used such words as "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer?"

It is said that when the passover fell on the Sabbath, as on this occasion, there was a difference of opinion between the Sadducees and the Pharisees: the former stuck to the exact directions of the

Law, whereas the latter did so on the Thursday to avoid possible infringement of the Sabbath by work involved. If that be so, the Lord may have adopted the custom of the Pharisees in keeping the feast on the Thursday, but in any case it would be the true passover. (See *Encyclop. Brit.*, 11th edition.)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Brig.-General HARRY BIDDULPH wrote: On p. 188 the lecturer states, "Tiberius' fifteenth year began in August, A.D. 28," and from this conclusion he is led irresistibly to date the Crucifixion in A.D. 33. It must be remembered, however, that Tiberius was joint Emperor with Augustus for nearly three years before the latter's death, and the reckoning is more likely to start from the earlier and *de facto* date. Sir William Ramsay, in his book *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* dates the fifteenth year of Tiberius as being most likely A.D. 25; and he says, further, that the recorded statement of the Jews to our Lord, that the Temple had been forty-six years in building, would indicate the date of the passover in question as A.D. 26. Further, Lt.-Colonel Mackinlay, in his book *The Magi*, gives very cogent arguments from Scripture that the date of the Nativity was 8 B.C., and this date Sir William Ramsay was disposed to accept as correct, although previously he had suggested the date 6 B.C. Moreover, 8 B.C. agrees with Tertullian's statement as to the date of the Nativity. These dates, combined with record that our Lord was about 30 years old shortly before He began His ministry, take us up to A.D. 29 as being the date of the Crucifixion.

With regard to the actual day of the Crucifixion: Sir Robert Anderson, in *The Bible and Modern Criticism*, discusses this point in some fullness, and his arguments (derived from the Scriptures, and which harmonize John xviii, 28, with the Synoptists) appear to me to be valid, and to prove that the Lord "was crucified on a Friday, and that it was on the first day of the feast of the passover, viz., on the 15th Nisan." Consequently, the Resurrection was on the 17th Nisan (*c.f.* Gen. viii, 4). See chap. xviii of Sir Robert Anderson's book for the argument.

A minor point is the phrase "after eight days" (John xx, 26). Surely this is an idiomatic phrase meaning "one week later," and not what we English would call eight days later, as shown on the lecturer's chart.

Mr. L. W. KERN wrote: I am glad to be able to endorse the 8th axiom of the lecturer, viz., that "no two (Scriptural) passages can disagree"; but I fear that he does not himself abide by it, for although "the probable interpretation of Matt. xii, 40, is not within the scope of this paper" (p. 191) [and here again I agree], the specific statement of our Lord is highly relevant. For myself I feel that Matt. xii, 40, gives the true key to the correct chronology of the last week. Seeing that even in the Bible the term "day" is of a dual meaning, representing either the period of light or the complete cycle of darkness and light (Gen. i, 5, contains it in both senses), I would concentrate investigation upon the "three nights," which are less ambiguous, and which must find fulfilment if our Lord's prediction was true. As regards the Resurrection, I submit that the keyword is "toward" in Matt. xxviii, 1, which signifies approach and not arrival. In other words, our Lord was already risen prior to sunset on Saturday evening, as, otherwise, the women could not have found an empty grave "in the end of (R.V. late on) the sabbath." The glorious fact, however, is that He *did* rise.

Major R. B. WITHERS, R.A., wrote: The real point at issue is the meaning of the word "sabbath." In the Old Testament it occurs in both singular and plural (thirty-one times plural). In the New Testament it also occurs similarly; but although it is twenty-four or twenty-five times in the plural, it is never once so translated. In Matthew it is five times in the plural (Matt. xii, 1, 10, 12, 28; verse 1, twice), and the last two occurrences are a glaring example of traditional mistranslation. The verse reads, literally ". . . Now it is the evening of the sabbaths. At the lighting up into one of the sabbaths. . ."

The Jewish day is from evening to evening, so the end of the sabbath would be evening. "The first day of the week" is entirely wrong; the words "first," "day," and "week" are absent. The phrase is *mian sabbatón* simply; in English "one of the sabbaths." Every occurrence of this (Matt. xxviii, 1; Mark xvi, 2:

Luke xxiv, 1 ; John xx, 1, 19 ; Acts xx, 7 ; and 1 Cor. xvi, 2) refers to one of the seven special sabbaths from first-fruits to Pentecost (Lev. xxiii, 15). The "first sabbath" (Mark xvi, 9) was the first of these seven, the Resurrection sabbath. Here the Greek word is *protē*, of which "first" is the correct equivalent. One of the seven sabbaths must sometimes coincide with a weekly sabbath. Such a double sabbath is called "the day of the sabbaths" (Luke iv, 16 ; Acts xiii, 14 ; xvi, 13). At other times it will come between two weekly sabbaths, and so be an "intervening sabbath" (Acts xiii, 42). The previous sabbath was "the day of the sabbaths" (Acts xiii, 14). This coincidence could only be possible on one occasion, the Day of Atonement (Acts xiii, 14) followed by the festival of Ingathering (Lev. xxiii, 38) five days later (Acts xiii, 42).

Where two sabbaths are on consecutive days, they have an evening in common, "the evening of the sabbaths" (Matt. xxviii, 1). This is the only occurrence and is the key to the problem. The sentence, "Now it is the evening of the sabbaths," clearly belongs to the previous verse, and marks the division in the account between the events of two *consecutive* sabbaths. Our time-table thus becomes simple and clear, and runs as follows :—Thursday, 14th Nisan—The first of unleavened bread ; Friday, 15th Nisan—The great sabbath, the first day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread ; Saturday, 16th Nisan—A weekly sabbath.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

I have to thank Brig.-General Biddulph for pointing out that the second par. on p. 195 is badly worded. I intended to suggest that six, being man's number, is markedly reflected in his history. Many spiritual events can be traced to the sixth day of the week. Probably the duration of "man's day" is limited to six days (of 1,000 years each). Four of such days had expired at the Crucifixion ; the fifth and sixth days have nearly run out.

I must also thank Mr. Hoste for correcting the quotation from Souter's dictionary. It should read "on the day after to-morrow." His suggestion, that the lamb might be slain at any time between the two sunsets which marked the beginning and ending of the 14th

Nisan, would seem to me to be negated by the wording of Deut. xvi, 6. Compare this passage with the time notes of the death of Ahab and the dismissal of the army (1 Kings xxii, 35, 36).

The discussion has mainly been occupied with the interpretation of Matt. xii, 40, and with the meaning of the last Supper. I submit that Matt. xii, 40, may not be isolated from the context, and that the whole passage was prophetic, and was fulfilled when He cleansed the House for the last time, and then left it "desolate" twenty-four hours later. Space forbids the elaboration of this point.

But the true significance of this passage and of the last Supper must be in the spiritual rather than in the natural order of things (1 Cor. ii, 11). Obviously, therefore, we cannot expect to convince others on these points. In any case they do not affect the date of the Crucifixion. May I re-state the case simply :—

Our Lord died on the afternoon of the day when the lamb *must* be slain. Note the reference of Luke xxii, 7, is to "Law" not "Custom." This was the 14th Nisan.

That 14th Nisan was "prosabbaton," *i.e.*, the day before the Sabbath—the Sixth day of the week.

As our wave offering the Lord was due to rise again on the first day of the week. All the gospels endorse this fact. The inclusive interval was, therefore, three days. The Holy Spirit agrees in nine different texts, expressed in the simplest possible language.

Dare we reject His evidence in order to suit an interpretation of Matt. xii, 40, which is not necessarily the real significance of the passage ?

I think we ought to be grateful to Col. Shortt for telling us that there are coins extant which were minted at Antioch, and current in Syria, which by their double dating show that in Antioch (where Luke lived) Tiberius' reign was counted from the end of August A.D. 14. Though without this corroboration the simplest meaning of Luke iii, 1, should suffice for those who have no personal axe to grind.

CHRIST OUR PASSOVER: THE FIRSTFRUIT CHRIST.

Moses.	Prophecy in Type.	Nisan.		Facts of Fulfilment.	Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
		9th		Arrival Bethany—six (inclusive) days before Passover.	xii, 1
Exod. xii, 3	In the 10th of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb.	10th	Sun. 6 p.m.	Triumphal Entry. The Lamb of God offered. Knew not the day of visitation. Who is this? <i>Jesus of Nazareth</i> . Looked round Temple—eventide goes to Bethany.	xxi, 1-9 xxi, 10-11	xi, 1-10 xi, 11	xix, 29-38 xix, 39-44	xii, 12-15
		11th	Mon. 6 p.m.	Morrow curses fig tree. Cleanses Temple. At even leaves city for Bethany. xxi, 12-13 xxi, 17	xi, 12-14 xi, 15 xi, 19 xix, 45-46
Exod. xii, 6	And ye shall keep it up until the 14th day of the same month.	12th	Tues. 6 p.m.	Morning fig tree withered away. By what authority? The Judge sums up in Questions and Parables. Sentence pronounced on Jerusalem . . . until. Prophetic history of the interval . . . until . . .	xxi, 19-20 xxi, 23 xxi, 24 xxiii, 35 xxiii, 36-39 xxiv, xxv	xi, 20-26 xi, 27 xi, 29 xii, 44 xiii xx, 1 xxi, 4 xiii, 35-39 xxi, 5-36
		13th	Wed. 6 p.m.	After 2 days (inclusive), 13th and 14th, the Son of the Man is betrayed to be crucified. Priests decide not to arrest Him on the feast day, that is, 15th. Supper at Simon's House. Judas agrees to betray Him.	xxvi, 1 xxvi, 3-5 xxvi, 6-13 xxvi, 14-16	xiv, 1 xiv, 2 xiv, 3-9 xiv, 10-11	xxii, 1 xxii, 2 xxii, 3-6 xii, 2-8
Exod. xii, 6 Exod. xii, 15-18	And the whole assembly shall kill it. } At even. Ye shall put away leaven }	14th	Thurs. 6 p.m. Thursday.	The day of unleavened bread when the Passover must be killed. 6 p.m. Two disciples sent to prepare supper. 9 p.m. ? At even the supper—1 Cor. xi, 23-26. Not the feast of passover. After supper to Mt. Olives and Gethsemane . . . Midnight ? The Arrest. Dawn ? Rejected by the assembly. 9 a.m. ? Crucified. <i>Jesus of Nazareth</i> . Noon—3 p.m. Darkness. 3 p.m. It is finished. "CHRIST OUR PASSOVER IS SACRIFICED FOR US." 3 p.m.—6 p.m. The burial. Those who buried Him defiled.	xxvi, 17 xxvi, 17-19 xxvi, 20-29 xxvi, 30-46 xxvi, 47 xxvii, 22-26 xxvii, 27-44 xxvii, 45 xxvii, 50 xxvii, 57-61	xiv, 12 xiv, 12-16 xiv, 17-31 xiv, 32-42 xiv, 43 xv, 13-15 xv, 25 xv, 33 xv, 37 xv, 43-47	xxii, 7 xxii, 8-13 xxii, 14-38 xxii, 39-46 xxii, 47 xxiii, 13-24 xxiii, 33 xxiii, 44 xxiii, 46 xxiii, 50-55 xiii, 1 xiv, xvii. xviii, 3 xix, 14-16 xix, 18 xix, 30 xix, 38-42
Gen. ii, 2 Exod. xii, 8 Exod. xii, 11 Exod. xii, 14 Exod. xii, 16	God rested the 7th day. Shall eat the flesh in <i>that night</i> . } It (the lamb, Rev. xiii, 8) the Lord's Passover } This day shall be unto you a feast for ever. } It is a holy convocation. }	15th	Friday. 6 p.m.	The sabbath—The grave—God rested the seventh day. } The paschal supper. } A high day. A holy convocation—The 1st day of the Feast. } From 6 p.m. onwards. The True Paschal Supper. The Feast, or 1st day unleavened bread. Therefore an arrest, trial and crucifixion on this day would be a legal impossibility. The women rested this day according to the commandment (Sabbath). They set a watch (not of "you") of Roman Soldiers. xxvii, 62-66 xxiii, 56	xix, 31
Lev. xxiii, 10	On the morrow after the Sabbath. . To be accepted for you. . . . A sheaf of the firstfruits. . . .	16th	Sat. 6 p.m.	Jesus was risen early the first day of the week. "Now is Christ risen . . . and become the firstfruits"—1 Cor. xv, 20.	xxviii, 1 xxviii, 6	xvi, 1 xvi, 6	xxiv, 1 xxiv, 6	xx, 1 xx, 17
		24th	Sun. 6 p.m.	After 8 days. . . Thomas saith, MY LORD AND MY GOD. At the Supper on Sunday night.	xx, 26-28

735TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1930,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., to read his paper on "The Concept of Evolution in the New Psychology."

*THE CONCEPT OF EVOLUTION IN THE
NEW PSYCHOLOGY.*

By THE REV. HAROLD C. MORTON, B.A., PH.D.

TECHNICALLY the "New Psychology" should be the Psychology of the Unconscious. The Old Psychology confined itself to Consciousness. It had a comfortable doctrine of "unconscious cerebration"; but in reality it dealt with nothing save the conscious processes of the mind. Both these words require emphasis. The Psychology of forty years ago dealt with the mind; it would not have regarded behaviour as coming within its scope; and it dealt with the conscious processes of the mind. "Unconscious mind" it would have regarded as a contradiction in terms. Not so the New Psychology. The New is not by any means careful to confine its scope to the mind. It is often not certain that there is an entity called "the mind" at all. But it is quite certain that the processes we call "mental" are quite as often unconscious as conscious--and

indeed is persuaded that the unconscious mental processes are at the very lowest quite as important and influential as the conscious ones. Consequently the New Psychology has been declared technically to be the Psychology of the Unconscious.

Nevertheless, I am not going to confine myself to this definition of the New Psychology. Such a definition *omits* far too much. It omits Comparative Psychology, which has satisfied its exponents of the immense area of common ground between Man and the animal creation. It omits Social Psychology, which has assigned a great part of our concepts of morals to the herd instinct and the necessities of the life of the herd. It omits that ripe fruit of the whole modern psychological movement—Behaviourism, which has in some ways far more right to assume to itself the title "New Psychology." It is the summit of the movement which might be called the physiologizing of Psychology—that process of observation which has detected, or tried to detect, the physical counterpart of every mental movement, and has steadily resolved all mental processes into nerve processes, accompanied by the mysterious thing we call "consciousness." It has almost made Psychology into a branch of Biology. This certainly is very new Psychology! The Psychologists of forty years ago would certainly not have recognized it as Psychology at all.

The Old Psychology has not any very clear bearing upon practical affairs. We studied it laboriously—sensations, precepts, concepts; cognition, emotion, volition. It was a fine mental exercise; it demanded close concentration upon mental processes and keen discriminating observation of our own states of consciousness. But apart from the Laws of Association—upon the one hand Similarity and Contrast, upon the other Contiguity—it did not aid us in the problems of life. The Laws of Association, which the Old Psychology taught such professors of the art of Memorizing as Loissette and Pelman, have certainly been of practical importance. But much of the rest of the old Psychology was as a dream when one awaketh to the student emerging from the classroom to the business and the world of affairs. The New Psychology has less and less love of the practice of introspection, cares more for the outward than the inward, believes behaviour to be of more importance than supposed mental processes, declares remembering to be simple but the secret of forgetting to be more difficult and important, and aims at practical results. One writer has declared it to be

“ as practically useful as a telephone or motor in conducting the affairs of life ” (*Psycho-Analysis for Normal People*, Coster, p. 14).

It is important to pause and realize in what senses the New *really* has more bearing upon life than the Old Psychology. It is in ways that Miss Coster does not envisage at all that it bids fair (or foul) to influence human affairs. In the general view the practical importance of the New Psychology lies in two special directions. The first is indicated by the word we hear so often, “Complexes,” and the second by Psycho-Analysis. By a complex the New Psychology means a bundle of ideas which my personal experience has deeply associated with some subject in my mind. The association must be so deep that it arises inevitably and without effort on my part; and the ideas called up must be deeply suffused with emotion. A bundle of ideas, suffused with emotion, and tightly wrapped around a special topic in my mind—that is a Complex. On all sides people are talking, and sometimes correctly, about complexes. The “mind” is really a mass of complexes. Practically everything which has a place in our life becomes wrapped up with a bundle of ideas suffused with emotion, inevitably called up without effort on our part. Freud’s discovery, upon which has been built up the “Psychology of the Unconscious,” was that some of these complexes are suffused with painful emotion. The painful character of these ideas consists mainly in their incompatibility with the moral or social standards which dominate our Consciousness, *e.g.* War-neuroses are often caused by the conflict between the instinct of self-protection in danger and the fear which accompanies that instinct, and our social view of such self-protection and fear as shameful. Freud held that such “pain-complexes” tend to be “repressed” or driven under into the Unconscious; and not recognized by their victim, but in a disguised or symbolic form, they ascend into Consciousness and there set up distressing conflicts of feeling. Between the Unconscious and Consciousness a barrier is set up, which acts as a censor and refuses to let the ideas of the pain-complex ascend into Consciousness unless thoroughly disguised. Sometimes in sleep the censor is off his guard and the pain-complex expresses itself in the symbolic forms of dreams. Freud by the processes of Psycho-Analysis brings up into full Consciousness the repressed complexes, and by so doing ends the distressing conflict of emotion which has disorganized life. For the Unconscious is not just a “limbo” of discarded ideas, but a dynamic region, all

whose constituents war with mighty power to make themselves felt in life. Psycho-Therapy, of which Freud and his pupils, Jung and Adler, have been the great exponents, deals with these repressed complexes whose violent but unconscious emotions derange the soul.

But those who would confine the New Psychology to the Unconscious in Freud's sense, much as the Old was the Psychology of Consciousness, quite unduly limit it. By the New Psychology it is wiser to understand "the new trend" in Psychology. The practical and very evil issues of the New Psychology are best observed when its logical goal appears in sight. The new trend results from the introduction of the concept of Evolution into the realm of Psychology. The Freudian psychology of the Unconscious is frankly evolutionary. It led Freud himself to a deterministic philosophy of life. The New Nancy School regard the Unconscious, which hampers and injures us so often, as being largely composed of inherited animal and other instincts, which our auto-suggestion counteracts. Dr. Rivers in his *Instinct and the Unconscious* advances the theory that the Unconscious is formed mainly "from instinctive reactions and experiences associated with them, which are inherited from earlier stages of evolution and are harmful to the organism in its more highly evolved form." In another place he contends that injuries to the brain result in throwing back the mind into earlier ancestral phases of mental development.

But whatever influence evolutionary speculation has upon the theory of the Unconscious and Psycho-Analysis it is in other realms that it specially works out to a logical conclusion. Psychology turns into metaphysics and finally is resolved into Biology; that is to say, it enters upon the discussion of the source and reality of Consciousness and Innate Ideas; and having negatived the reality of everything in the realm of the Spirit finally contents itself with a mainly biological statement of the processes of human life. In other words, Psychology has steadily become materialistic and anti-theist. Under the urge of evolutionary excitement it has allowed itself to be turned from an examination of the processes of the mind into an extreme anti-spiritual philosophy.

Herbert Spencer in this sense of the "new trend" was the father of the New Psychology. It is the fashion to say that "Spencer is obsolete": but those who say it merely reveal that they have not traced the development of the new trend. Spencer

set himself to trace origins, and to analyse Consciousness. How do our innate ideas arise? *e.g.* the idea of Right, the "thou shalt" of morals? Grappling with this problem on utilitarian lines the concept of Evolution came to Spencer as the solution. The question of innate ideas was, of course, psychological; and the conflict between the empiricists ("All our knowledge is derived from experience") and the transcendentalists ("We possess ideas which transcend experience and are innate") was decidedly turning into a victory for innate ideas. It was so difficult as to be impossible to account for innate ideas on the ground of individual experiences of utility and harmfulness, or pleasure and pain. Then Evolution offered the empiricists a way out. We certainly have innate ideas, they agreed, but these innate ideas are the outcome of ancestral experience. "Innate ideas are the petrified deposits of race experience" says Baldwin (*Hist. of Philosophy*, ch. ii, p. 82). Spencer was the great protagonist of this evolutionary solution: and although his early training caused him to protest vigorously against the charge of Materialism—his mother was a class leader of the Wesleyan Church, at King Street, Derby, whilst his father became a Quaker, and Spencer went to the Friends' Meeting on the Sunday morning and the Wesleyan Church at night—there is not the least doubt that Spencer held essentially the same views which, followed to their logical conclusions, have given us the nightmare "psychology" of Behaviourism as the fine fruit of evolutionary thinking. The position of Spencer was this:—

Evolution offered the student an entirely new standpoint. Its great principle of the continuity of phenomena, applied to the problems of intelligence showed that all absolute distinctions, here as elsewhere, were mere subjective illusions. Between mind in its highest development and mind in its first dim awakenings no boundary could anywhere be set; and the complex intellect of the modern adult, so far from being treated as a thing unique and apart, had thus henceforth to be regarded as the production of the compounding and recompounding of simpler and still simpler elements . . . the principle of continuity further warns us against any attempt to fix a barrier between physiological and psychological phenomena. The manifestations of physical and mental activity have also their unity of composition.*—(W. H. Hudson, *The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer*, p. 105.)

* Spencer says: "Between the automatic actions of the lowest creatures and the highest conscious actions of the human race a series of actions displayed by the various tribes of the animal kingdom may be so placed as to render it impossible to say of any one step in the series, Here Intelligence begins."—(*Principles of Psychology*.)

Essentially this position of Spencer goes the whole way of the materialistic interpretation of life. He fought shy of the logical conclusions of his position; he even, in later life, wrote with capital letters about "that Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed"—Capital I, Capital E's—whilst the New Psychology has no acquaintance with the Quaker Meeting House or the Wesleyan Class Meeting, and feels no such scruples as Spencer had. But Spencer, in this attitude of his, is the forerunner of all the tribe of "theistic evolutionists" and Christian New Psychologists, who try to blend absolute incompatibles into one discordant system of thought. The main differences between Spencer and the New Psychology, as so far developed, are these—that the New Psychology is not prepared to recognize innate ideas in the mind but prefers inherited nerve correlations, predisposing consciousness, or making the way smooth for it, to run along certain predetermined lines of thought; that the logical New Psychologists really regard thought as a form of organic physical movement (nonsensical as that sounds); and that the New Psychology is not prepared to recognize the existence of that intangible and invisible entity we call Soul, or Consciousness in the sense of Personality. But Spencer is the forerunner of those who follow the "new trend," the pathfinder of the evolutionary army, and the father of the New Psychology.

Upon three resultants which proceed from the concept of Evolution in the New Psychology I propose to dwell, namely these:—That the New Psychology is inevitably Determinist in character; that Consciousness is not a Controller but a mere Spectator; and that Personality is an illusion. I shall not be deterred because many exponents of New Psychology would not go to these lengths and would even protest against my argument. It would be a thing of little value to the Philosophical Society that we should merely record universal agreements; it is more important to understand principles and forecast the inevitable goal.

I.—The New Psychology is determinist in character. Determinism is a psychological theory of the nature of Will.

To the New Psychologist Evolution is an axiom. All that is in Man is but a development from a complicated chemically unstable molecule called protoplasm. We have not yet mastered the secret of its manufacture. That is a triumph for the future.

But apart from this beginning all forms of life and all functions of life from the amoeba up to Man proceed. We have to regard mentality as inhering in all forms of life from the beginning. Indeed the New Psychology wants mentality to be the psychic side of matter; and few quotations are more popular with him than "Consciousness is latent in the mineral, sleeps in the plant, dreams in the animal, and wakens up in Man." In the higher animals and Man mentality reaches consciousness. Man's consciousness is a development (to give Darwin's famous "line") by means of resident forces from the consciousness of the amoeba, the sea-squirt, the amphibian, the marsupial, the hairy tailed quadruped, and the tangle of apes which preceded Man. Indeed, we must go further back than the animal and find consciousness beginning in the plant and even in the mineral. The New Psychologist is fond of pointing out that so far as observation can avail us the same processes of choice, of acceptance or rejection, can be observed in plant as in animal life, in animal life as in Man. The roots of the tree, for instance, turn away from the poor soil and deeply luxuriate in the plentiful supply of food of the old manure bed, and in similar circumstances what else or what more do we observe in animal or Man? Vitalism, seeking to present to us a new concept of freedom, finds its concept of freedom as "creative action" exemplified in the plant world; for instance, a deciduous tree in our temperate zone adapts itself to conditions by preparing in advance for the seasonal changes. It does not wait for winter frosts but sheds its leaves in autumn; nor does it wait for spring to form its buds, but gets them ready in advance. What more does animal or Man achieve by freedom? The amoeba is equally sensitive all through: but when a creature appears with some cells more sensitive than others, that is the first appearance of the critical faculty and of "control." Mentality runs up from the lowliest plant forms and the lowliest animal forms into Man, and those lowly forms of life came from the lifeless. There is no break anywhere. "The principle of continuity forbids us to attempt to fix a barrier between the physiological and the psychological"; or between the inorganic and the organic. Is the mineral free? Is there a controlling Soul in the sea-squirt? Does the deciduous tree exhibit what common sense means by "foresight"? Granted that tree roots "prefer" rich soil to builder's rubble, is that "preference" the expression of an intelligent weighing of the alternatives? Manifestly in this unbroken advance from the

mineral to Man there is no possible point at which Choice, Purpose, that intelligent weighing of alternatives which is at the heart of what we mean by Freedom, can be found. In other words, Evolution shuts the New Psychology up to Determinism : to the ceaseless action of necessity.

The Evolutionist takes care to leave us in no doubt about this. The basis of the evolutionary Concept is Continuity. No new forces ever appear or have appeared. Resident forces have controlled the whole process of development. No new element can ever enter. All the forces and all the elements which ever have been on the earth are here now ; all that are here now always have been on the earth. Continuity is King. Evolution absolutely bars out God. From the days of Empedocles, who showed how adaptation arises by chance and not design, to Prof. H. F. Osborn who says : " We may first exclude the possibility that Evolution acts either through supernatural or teleological interposition through an external Creative power " (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 10), Evolution has been anti-theistic, has displayed the needlessness of God, and has thrown all its weight on the side of resident forces.* Continuity shuts us up to the alternatives—Man is free if protoplasm is free ; but if protoplasm is bound by necessity so also is Man. To affirm that protoplasm is free is not to think but merely to trifle with words. The inevitable alternative is that Man, like protoplasm, is bound by necessity. There is no possible point where Freedom can enter in.

Hence with contemptuous emphasis men to-day deny human freedom. " Free will is a mere lingering chimera. No writer who respects himself can be called on any longer to treat it seriously " (Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, p. 435). A daily paper trumpets out Herr Einstein's assertion : " Everything is determined—the beginning as well as the end. It is determined for the insect as well as the star." Prof. Wildon Carr in his little book, *The Free Will Problem*, concludes that the Determinist wins the battle of argument, and that Freedom can only be maintained to-day in the sense that Creative Evolution gives it, viz. by submerging the individual in the mysterious reality which is behind and underneath all things, which has not yet

* Compare Prof. Leuba's statement : " In religious lives, accessible to psychological investigation, nothing requiring the admission of super-human influences has been found."—(*A Psychological Study of Religion*, p. 272.)

fully expressed itself but is in process of expression, and by identifying Freedom with the Universal Life Principle itself.

This vitalistic conception of Freedom does not really help us. It is not the Freedom of which all men are conscious. The only thing free is the universal Life Principle itself, and we are swept along in the effort of its self-expression. Moreover, the concept of Creative Evolution makes no difference to the essential "necessity" of Evolution. Every process remains just what Emergent Evolution conceives it. Spencer took for granted Matter and Motion; Prof. J. B. Watson asks instead for Physics and Chemistry. The difference is a trifle; out of those non-personal beginnings the evolutionary process at last produces Man—"How noble in reason! In apprehension how like a God!" That is still the claim. It makes no manner of difference to the position that Bergson asks us to believe that the universal Life Principle is thus realizing itself. Evolutionary beginnings and endings remain the same; its processes are not altered; they still depend on resident forces, and forbid any barrier or boundary between the mineral and Man.

From Necessity Freedom cannot come. Prof. William James says, "By their fruits, not by their roots, shall ye know them," apparently on this occasion wishing his readers to believe that with a necessitarian ancestry Man has somehow attained to Freedom and that we need not trouble about the ancestry. We are asked to believe that at a certain stage in the combination of non-personal elements, Personality emerges, and in spite of its roots is not an illusion but is real. But Jesus of Nazareth went on to say that fig fruits do not grow on thorn roots. You cannot get the vine's fruits from the thistle's roots. Fruits *come from* roots, and different kinds of roots bear different kinds of fruits. Take, for example, what Mr. H. C. Miller says about prayer (*The New Psychology and the Preacher*, p. 67). It is useless, he says, to pray for fine weather; but if a child prays for fine weather on its birthday and the day turns out fine the child's idea that the weather has been determined by its prayer is "a purely ego-centric impulse, expressing itself in a phantasy mechanism, whereby it attributed the fine weather to its own prayers." Is it not clear that if prayer *derives* from "ego-centric impulses expressing themselves in phantasy," that derivation proves its worthlessness; but if prayer *derives* from "God-centric impulses, expressing themselves in realities of the divine promise and power," that derivation proves its worth? Roots

determine fruits. It is not possible to reach Personal Freedom by infinite combinations of necessitarian elements, whether those combinations are directed by "the universal Life Principle," or by the old "resident forces."

The Theistic Evolutionists (including many of the religious New Psychologists) who combine free theistic religious concepts with necessitarian anti-theistic evolutionary concepts, are the most illogical and impossible of all thinkers. They accept the concept of Evolution, and are baffled by the contradiction between the findings of religion and consciousness and the "necessity" of Evolution. But, instead of rejecting Evolution and preserving the consistency of their thinking, they thrust into Evolution the idea of an intervening God who breathes into some humanoid animal a free spirit. Evolution utterly rejects the idea; and nowhere, either in the Bible, or in the rocks, or in the laboratory, has God hinted at such a combination. Gen. ii, 7, cannot possibly be translated other than "God made man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, so that man became a living creature." There is no hint here of the implantation into a humanoid animal of a Free Self-Conscious Personality, turning the animal into Man. The same Hebrew phrase, *nephesh chayyah*, is found ten times in the Old Testament and only here is it proposed to give it a peculiar meaning which allows the Theistic Evolutionist to combine contradictories, viz. Evolution and Theism. Gen. i, 30, attributes *nephesh chayyah* to "creeping things"; Gen. ix, 10, to "fowl, cattle, and every beast of the earth"; Lev. ii, 46, speaks of "every *nephesh chayyah* that moveth in the waters." That ardent New Psychologist, Dean Bennett, in *A Soul in the Making*, pens wild statements such as "Every human embryo, prior to birth, goes rapidly through the stages of beast, bird, fish and perhaps vegetable too, and after birth retains vestiges and remnants of them all"—and all this to support a Christian appeal! The muddle-headedness of it all is so astounding that anyone with a logical sense feels himself bludgeoned into silence. The best apology for the Theist who insists upon perversely thrusting the concept of Evolution into his Theism would be good Bishop Blougram's view—

Some think Creation's meant to show God forth :

I say it's meant to hide Him all it can.

At all events, Evolution's brilliant success in hiding Him

seems to me quite beyond dispute. It gives God no chance of intervention.

II.—The New Psychology belittles Consciousness. “Unconscious Mind” is one of its fundamental concepts; “the great discovery of New Psychology is unconscious motive” (Miller); and psychical processes go on at least as well without Consciousness as with it. Consciousness, in fact, is just a spectator, not a controller, of our life.

It is only possible to touch upon this belittling of Consciousness. That the mind sometimes functions subconsciously is, of course, a teaching of the Old Psychology. There it was called the Subconscious, and such a phrase as “unconscious mind” would not have been tolerated. To the New Psychology, with its dream of consciousness latent in the mineral, sleeping in the plant, etc., unconscious mind presents no difficulty. The Freudian exponents say that the Unconscious mind is the factory of which the public sees and knows nothing. It only sees the products in the shop window, and the shop window is consciousness. We are conscious only of the results of unconscious mind processes, viz. the thoughts, emotions, motives, purposes thrust up into consciousness. These were made without our knowledge; and there is also a great deal in the Unconscious which never rises into consciousness, but yet influences our life. Psychical processes go on just as well without consciousness, and work more powerfully than with it. This view is indeed a very thorough belittling of consciousness.

And it accords with the inevitable and growing view that consciousness is a mere Spectator, a mere awareness. Even those New Psychologists who still illogically hold that each one of us is a spiritual entity called a Soul can only regard consciousness as a mirror in which some part of our life is mirrored. It is not a controller; the New Psychology is determinist and has no place for free personality. Our Personality at best is a spectator, who watches what happens without any power to influence it, and receives from the Unconscious—the dynamic underworld—what the Unconscious is pleased to send. Man is the creature of Necessity and consciousness not the controller of things as they should be but the mirror of things as they are. If there is such a thing as Intelligence without Will, we may still be intelligent beings;

but it is intelligence robbed of its glory. The concept of Evolution makes it inevitable that at best we are intelligent spectators of a life which it is not within our power to control.

III. The Concept of Evolution reaches its fine flower in the "psychology" of Behaviourism. It is there reaching its full logical expression. Behaviourism has its exponents everywhere, and is very popular in America: but its special claim upon attention is that it is the logical development of Evolution.

"Unconscious Mind" seems to most of us a contradiction in terms, inasmuch as mind in our experience is always conscious. The real concept of the New Psychology in this matter presumably is that nerve processes and correlations which have no reflection in consciousness none the less influence mightily nerve correlations which have such reflection. Put into physiological rather than psychological terms unconscious mind is comparatively intelligible.

Such an explanation opens the door for that delightfully logical "psychology" called Behaviourism—which is in reality the denial of Psychology and a development of Biology. Prof. McDougall expresses surprise at the rapid spread of Behaviourism; but when Evolution has been with us for millenniums why be surprised that some people have seen its logical outcome? Prof. J. B. Watson, its famous American exponent, calls it "the modern note in Psychology, now rapidly forging to the front." He regards it as a return to early common sense:—

Early Psychology was behavioristic—grew up around the notion that if you place a certain thing before an individual or group of individuals, the individual or group will *act*, will *do* something . . . The keynote is, Given a certain object or situation, what will the individual do when confronted by it? (*The Battle of Behaviorism*, pp. 8 and 9.)

For what we call "Soul"—the very subject of Psychology—Behaviourism has no use. Soul is a religious concept, about as important as the nurse's bogey who grabs naughty little children in the dark. "No one has ever touched a soul, or has seen one in a test-tube, or has in any way come into relationship with it as he has with the other objects of his daily experience." Wundt's students boasted that in the first psychical laboratory Psychology had become a science without a soul. But Watson

is not satisfied with that, because they substituted "consciousness" for "soul." But what is "consciousness"? "It has never been seen, touched, smelled, tasted, or moved. To say that Psychology is the description and explanation of states of consciousness is absurd, because consciousness is only an assumption as a basis for "sensations" and their ghosts the "images," and "emotions," and "volitions," and "all the rest." Behaviourists refuse to work with intangibles.

The Behaviorist puts the human organism in front of him and says, What can it *do*? When does it start to do these things? If it does not do these things by reason of its original nature, what can it be taught to do? What methods shall Society use in teaching it to do these things? . . . With this as subject, Psychology connects up immediately with life.—(*Ibid.*)

The Behaviourist, as a true logical evolutionist, finds nothing required to explain behaviour except the laws of physics and chemistry. He sweeps on one side all such ideas as Cause, Purpose, Will, Deliberation, Choice, Desire, Incentive, Motive, Responsibility, Sin, Guilt, and Consciousness in the sense of controlling Intelligence. He will not even admit Thought. How the unanchored human mind swings! Hegel declared, "Thought is the only Being." Prof. Watson says, "Thought is behaviour: it is motor organization; just like playing tennis or golf or any other form of muscular activity." It is just the reflection in consciousness of muscular action—either of talking, or it may be of movements of the hands, or sometimes of the viscera. "Thinking is merely talking, but talking with concealed musculature." And along with all the concepts which involve choice and assume Personality (which has never appeared in a test-tube!) it seems clear that all moral concepts must go—such as Justice, Honour, Purity, Love—though Truth in the pragmatic sense perhaps may survive.*

It is, of course, easy to see how Behaviourism gets rid of Deliberation, Choise, Responsibility, Sin, Guilt, and so forth;

* Presumably this accounts for the vile movement in some American Universities, where questionnaires have been issued by professors to students of both sexes, asking the most intimate questions concerning their views and practices as to the relationships of the sexes. When the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri disciplined the offending professors, the Association of University Professors, a national organization, strongly protested, affirming "the offense" to be "trivial, if any." This seems to indicate what we may look for when Evolution works out yet more widely into Behaviourism.

not so easy to see how it dissolves Cause away into nothingness; or finds itself able to deny the existence of Thought. Take Deliberation and Choice. All mental processes are really physical processes, mirrored in consciousness (for even Behaviourism cannot get rid of the mystery of "awareness")—"electrotonic, atomic, or molecular movements," someone says. Memory, always present in Deliberation, is to be accounted for by traces left by previous movements in the brain. Many stimuli are all acting upon the deliberator's organism; no one stimulus has the field to itself, or such force as to result in immediate action; and Deliberation is the period during which the various stimuli, uncoordinated, remain balanced against one another; whilst Choice is the resultant when the response, inevitable however long hindered, actually begins its effective movement. Of all this we have awareness; but we need nothing to explain behaviour save the ordinary laws of physics and chemistry, and there is neither scientific evidence nor need for any "vitalistic" ideas.

This is plain enough to those who realize that to Behaviourism Psychology is Biology. But the idea of Cause is more ingeniously explained away. Prof. Watson shows the illusory character of the idea of Cause thus: Stimulus A calls out Response R, and we say A is the cause of R. But if B goes along with A, very soon B calls out R as easily as A does. So, too, if C, D, E are with A. It is thus clear that there is no inherent or sacred connection between one thing and another. Suppose A is a loud noise, and R the fear manifested by a child that hears it. But if we frown when the loud noise occurs very soon our frown awakens R; or if we produce a red balloon, or a dog appears along with the noise, very soon the balloon or the dog will "cause" the fear in the child. The original response "fear" to stimulus "loud noise" is an inherited nerve co-ordination. All the rest is a matter of "conditioning," *i.e.* training, and the idea of Cause vanishes. Similarly the idea of Thought as a process directed by Intelligence is resolved into a complex series of movements, of lips, etc., shaping words, of hands whose movements often replace words, and even movements of internal organs of the body. The only possible answer to our indignant and incredulous question, How then is it that we have the idea that "we" are "thinking"? is that all these movements, all recalling objects of experience, are mirrored in consciousness so that there is the appearance of "thought."

What clever trifling ! It gives the willing dupe a glass through which he will "see men as trees walking"—with just as much purposiveness and personal intelligence as a tree or any other organism, and no more. What ingenious and arrant nonsense ! The clear deliverances of the universal consciousness of Man are set aside : Soul, Consciousness as directing Intelligence, Personality, is denied : to the Behaviourist Soul is a mere illusion, a faint shadow which haunts the background of mentality, a mist which for some people clouds the mirror of consciousness.* So he denies its existence and elaborates a Psychology without a Psyche—a Psychology which reminds us of G. H. Lewes' words about metaphysicians, viz., "a race mad with logic and feeding on chimeras." The soul has never been seen or smelt, touched or tasted ; therefore there *is* no soul ! It is simply a shadow. Yet it makes all the difference between reason and unreason, between a spiritual and a mechanistic interpretation of life !

A little more, and how much it is !

A little less, and how far away !

In conclusion, there are three points which I desire briefly to stress. First, the Freudian concept of the Unconscious and Psycho-Analysis might have been devised without any hypothesis of Evolution. That hypothesis colours it in various ways, as the writings, *e.g.*, of Dr. Rivers reveal. But for the rest the New Psychology—as necessitarian in character, sadly belittling Consciousness, and finding in Behaviourism its destined fruit—is the inevitable outcome of the concept of Evolution. That is a fact which many advocates of a Christian interpretation of life have not really faced. From failure of logic, or from too great plasticity of mind, they have failed to deal with the situation. Theistic Evolutionists are spiritual believers, trifling with an implacably hostile theory. Religious New Psychologists in the name of religion lead their devotees a long way towards irreligion. In both cases the defenders of Mansoul have invited Diabolus to come inside, and the New Psychology shows that the only possible result is that Diabolus will set about destroying the city.

* Prof. Russell quotes William James, who calls Consciousness "the faint rumour left behind by the disappearing Soul upon the air of philosophy" ; says "the stream of thinking" is really "the stream of breathing" ; and substitutes "I breathe" for "I think."

It would be wise for religious people to face the issue. Dr. Rivers says somewhere that in after years we pay a very heavy price for "suppressing" unpleasant "complexes" into the Unconscious. From that deep dynamic region they mightily derange our life afterwards, and our only hope is that the Psycho-Analyst may correct our mistake. Evolution to great numbers of people is the centre of a great number of painful ideas, a "pain-complex." To grasp its meaning and realize its effects means time, effort, and then much bitter conflict. So they shirk the issue and repress it into the Unconscious, thereby storing up even worse things against the time to come. Evolution inevitably spells Determinism, the denial of Personality, and the mechanistic interpretation of all life alike. From the lowest life up to Man himself it is one ordered progression, resulting from resident forces, with no external power which ever intervenes. There is no escape here from the coils of Necessity; no gap through which Personality can enter; no need of anything save physics and chemistry; no logical psychological outcome except Behaviourism. Prof. McDougall scoffs at Behaviourism—yet he holds to Evolution! He admits that *the* problem of philosophy is "Mechanism or Purpose—Which?"—and Behaviourism is simply a school which answers "Mechanism," and then proceeds to account for all illusions of Thought, Personality, and Freedom on the mechanistic basis to which Evolution shuts it up.

Secondly, those who trifle with Evolution need to realize that all arguments against Behaviourism are really arguments against Evolution. Evolution has no scientific standing-ground. Last year, *e.g.*, at the British Association in Cape Town, Prof. D. M. S. Watson, President of the Zoological Section, said that while it is extremely difficult even to test the theory of Natural Selection he thought it was likely to be accepted *because there is no alternative explanation of Evolution*; and went on to say:—

The theory of Evolution itself is a theory universally accepted not because it could be proved to be true but *because the only alternative, Special Creation, is clearly incredible.*

No more need be said to show that it has no scientific standing. It is a philosophy—and a philosophy leading to impossible conclusions which demonstrate its falsity. It leads to Behaviourism, and the arguments against Behaviourism include the following:—

(a) That to deny Personality, directing Consciousness, Freedom, Choice, Desire, Responsibility, is flatly to con-

tradict the universal consciousness of Mankind. The one sure ground of belief is that consciousness. Of the immediate deliverances of consciousness we are certain. Those who adduce reasons for doubting consciousness, themselves depend upon the very consciousness they doubt. Moreover, the doubts are the culmination of long sophisticated processes of thinking. After much effort Man's mind is able to conceive the idea of Determinism. But at once, when the strain of thought is over, like a relaxed bow the mind returns to the unforced consciousness of its natural freedom.

(b) That language itself—words such as Motive, Incentive, Purpose, Desire, Responsibility—have no meaning on this basis. Then, how did the very ideas come into existence? If it be answered, "Illusion," then whence the illusion?

(c) That Behaviourism flies in the face of Life. We *know* what a difference desires make to action; what a Law Court thinks of motive; what a difference there is between accident and purpose.

(d) That physical and chemical processes cannot explain the abysmal differences between the engine which men have made and the extraordinary capacities of the men who made it.

(e) Prof. McDougall advances the pragmatic argument that to adopt a philosophy which robs "incentive" of its meaning would be ruin in practical affairs.

(f) Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, in his *Dædalus* says that modern physics admits that Matter taken by itself is unintelligible. Physics is so beaten by its problems that it is calling in mind to help it and to supply it with concepts of Matter, Time, Space, to enable it to understand the world. Mighty arguments! Fatal to Behaviourism! And therefore fatal also to Evolution.

Thirdly, it may well make us tremble to contemplate that this grossly materialistic Psychology will probably be given to hundreds of thousands of University students in the years immediately before us; that it will fit in all too harmoniously with the lower impulses of human nature; and that all the mighty urge of Logic will predispose everyone who accepts Evolution to accept Behaviourism also. If it is the task of Philosophy—and it is—to guard the springs from poison, the Philosophical Society has a great task before it.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (the Rev. C. Gardner) said: I wish to express my hearty thanks to Dr. Morton, and warm appreciation of his paper, in which he has manfully grappled with a very difficult subject. When I say that there are fifty points in his paper with which I do not agree, I want it to be understood that fundamentally I believe that he and I are agreed. He has covered a long space of years, and reviewing those same years and the facts, I find that I read them differently from Dr. Morton.

First of all, the lecturer refers to the psychology of the Unconscious as wholly modern, and says that forty years ago "Unconscious mind" would have been regarded as a contradiction in terms. But already Hartmann had published, in 1869, his *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, and earlier in the same year had appeared Browning's *Ring and the Book*, in which all turns on the unconscious influence of Pompilia. Still earlier, in 1861, George Eliot had published *Silas Marner* in which the unconscious influence of a little child gently draws Silas into fellowship with his neighbours again. It is here, I think, that we should look for the roots of the modern movement.

Dr. Morton rightly criticizes the doctrine of evolution as expounded by Herbert Spencer, but he is the father only of one party of the modern evolutionists. If evolution is a mechanical process, which negates will and choice, then of course we cannot accept it as an hypothesis. Charles Darwin's theory was mechanical, and for a decade or two it paralyzed all thinking Europe. The early plays of Ibsen show, not only the Doll in the House, but the men, too, to be merely puppets. But deliverance came largely through a pregnant phrase of Schopenhauer—"the denial of the will to live." Nietzsche, a pupil of Schopenhauer, repudiated his master, and after passing through a phase of Positivism, dropped the first part of Schopenhauer's phrase, and affirmed the will to live as a coercive power higher even than logic. Very soon the new evolutionists dropped the mechanical part of evolution, and, instead, saw in it a mysterious life-process dependent on will and choice.

Evolution was thus presented in the pages of Samuel Butler and later in Bergson, and it is the accepted view of those who call themselves Christian. George Eliot, though at one time much associated

with Herbert Spencer, yet drew no mechanical conclusion. In *Daniel Deronda*, published in 1876, her chief character, Mordecai, says that the denial of choice is the blasphemy of the time. "Shall man, whose soul is set in the royalty of discernment and resolve, deny his rank and say, I am an onlooker, ask no choice and purpose of me? . . . Let us contradict the blasphemy, and help to will our better future and the better future of the world."

For my own part, I do not see how logic vindicates the freedom of will and choice. Nevertheless I am entirely convinced that we have the God-given powers, and I constantly remind myself that life is greater than logic. There are many things resolvable in life that remain at a deadlock in logic; and if I am aware that in Christ Jesus I have eternal life, I shall not be deterred by logic, but shall look elsewhere for a solution of perplexities.

I understand that Dr. Morton repudiates evolution altogether. But if evolution is synonymous with development and growth, I see no need to reject it, since in this modified form it leaves us with the freedom of will and choice.

MR. AVARY H. FORBES said: In his very able and learned paper Dr. Morton calls the New Psychology "clever trifling"; I agree that it is "trifling" without the "clever." It abounds with a stock of brand-new words for which there is no occasion whatever; for they all have their equivalents in last century's dictionaries. Let us look at some of them: *Behaviourism, Complexes, Psycho-therapy, Determinist, Egocentric, Concept, Humanoid, Awareness, Musculature*, etc. What is there in any of these words that expresses a new idea? They introduce real confusion when they are used (as they often are) to do duty, sometimes for one older word and sometimes for another. The word "Concept," for instance, is used sometimes for idea, sometimes for notion, sometimes for belief, or theory, or doctrine; and the reader has to pick out for himself the meaning intended; for now, as formerly, "New Presbyter is but old Priest, writ large."

All this shows merely the bankruptcy of originality. After reading a course of metaphysics, one realizes the aphorism—"If you hear two men arguing and one doesn't know what he is talking about, and the other knows still less, that's metaphysics." The different "schools" differ from each other *toto cælo*; and even members of the

same school contradict each other largely. Sir William Hamilton—one of the most acute and original of our philosophers—differs from Reid, Stewart, and other members of his own school, *in eighteen points*, over *one* faculty of the mind—Perception !

I cannot find that the New Psychology has thrown a single new ray of light on any of the problems of the mind. The phenomena of the unconscious mind and of subconsciousness are as old as the Garden of Eden. The ancient Persians played with the subject ; so did the very early Greeks, as we see in Æsop's fable of the cat turned into a damsel. The whole case of the New Psychologist is that of an Evolutionist turned into a fanatic of materialism. With him all life is physical—consciousness, thought, sensation, emotion—are all physical, merely. "I think means I breathe" ; "no need of anything save physics and chemistry." "Ingenious and arrant nonsense," Dr. Morton calls it. I would say—"arrant nonsense, but far from ingenious." It is materialism run mad. There is quite as much sense in Mrs. Eddy's dictum that there is no such thing as pain ; it is only imagination.

When I meet a fanatic of that kind, I fling Berkeley at him, and then he has not a leg to stand on. Yet I suspect that, though the new psychologists may have read Berkeley, very few, if any of them, have really assimilated Idealism. For Berkeley proved by inexorable logic that the only thing of which we have *direct* knowledge is conscious feeling. Of no *physical* things have we any but indirect, inferential knowledge—which, indeed, has no right to be called knowledge. Descartes had expressed this fact in his well-known formula, *cogito, ergo sum* : but it ought to have been, *sentio, ergo sum* : for feeling comes before thought. The net result of Idealism is that we have no immediate knowledge of "matter" or of anything material—not even of our own bodies. Hence, the existence of chemicals, and retorts, the whole paraphernalia of the laboratory, the fossils of the museum—skulls, bones, teeth, etc.—an inference only.

"Berkeley," said J. S. Mill, "has proved conclusively what no man in his senses can believe." And Bain remarks that "all the ingenuity of a century and a-half has failed to see a way out of the contradiction exposed by Berkeley." Therefore, until the New Psychologist can demonstrate the existence of matter, he is living in the clouds and building castles in the air.

All this deification of the material is the vice of philosophy as applied to Evolution : for the *moral* differences between man and the ape are a thousand-fold *more important* than any physical similarities ; and they disprove heredity far more conclusively than the physical resemblances may seem to assert it. And yet this line of argument is almost entirely ignored by both scientists and philosophers.

In January, 1928, a discussion appeared in *The Times* between men of science, on the subject of cruelty ; and it was admitted that pure cruelty—" taking pleasure in inflicting pain "—was peculiar to the human race, and was not to be found amongst the lower animals : the cat with a mouse being no exception. Take the fiendish cruelties of Soviet Russia, the ghastly tortures of the Inquisition in Spain, the Netherlands, Piedmont, etc., and the perennial ferocities of the cannibal savages ; how can these be inherited from any of the harmless, frugivorous ape tribes ? By parity of reasoning, we see that the worst carnal vices can likewise not have been inherited from the lower animals ; for there is no trace of such vices amongst them.

This argument holds good also of the highest virtues. Is there any trace in the lower animals of the religious instinct, of awe, of worship, of reverence, or of any spiritual feeling—to say nothing of the " joy unspeakable, and full of Glory," which among men is confined to the devoted followers of the Lord Jesus Christ ?

Until these chasms are bridged, it is idle to talk of physical parallels.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : The paper is of unusual interest. There is without doubt a great deal of nonsense talked by some modern psychologists. This is demonstrable by comparison of their contradictory theories. Some speak with ignorance and arrogance as though their fathers were unreflective and unobservant of mental processes. From my study of psychology I conclude that a man is far too complex in the whole range of his personality to be compassed by the methods and rules of psychologists. There are mysterious depths of our being which psychologists vaguely call " the unconscious." The only safety for a man who professes to be a Christian is to place his whole being under the government of the Spirit of God.

I do not apprehend that the best minds in psychology go anything

like the lengths in Determinism which Dr. Morton avers. In an interesting book recently issued entitled *Psychology's Defence of the Faith*, Dr. D. Yellowlees says: "When big things are at stake, when spiritual issues are concerned, when it is not a matter of choosing a number in a game, but choosing this day whom ye will serve, it is quite another story. You cannot even then discount the effect of previous choices, the relative values which a man's past history will inevitably place on the consideration for or against his present choice, but there is more in it than that and well we know it." And again, "There is a sense in which Psychological Determinism is true and important, and we do well to remember it, for our simplest habits and ways of thinking depend upon it, but there is no Determinism which can finally fetter the creative mind and will of man."

This last sentence is important. Every man knows that he can choose any one of a hundred or more courses, and can prove that he is capable of following any or all of these courses by doing them successively, by his own conscious choice of order, or at the bidding of someone else in any order.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said: In common with most of the special sciences, Psychology has made rapid progress in our own day; in fact, the stream of fresh data is now so great that even the professional psychologist can hardly keep abreast of it. Historically the science has remained the same, but the new methods and new knowledge acquired have suggested the popular phrase "The New Psychology."

These advances have inevitably made more acute such persistent problems as the relation between mind and matter and the freedom of the will. But Dr. Morton's title calls attention rather to the use which psychologists have made of the hypothesis of Evolution. Every scientist must employ hypothesis in seeking to arrange and explain the facts which he discovers. The evolutionary hypothesis has been found to furnish a fruitful system of classification. If it can be shown to involve mechanistic conclusions, contradictory alike of Christianity and of the most immediate avouchments of consciousness, it becomes the task of the Christian philosopher to produce an alternative explanation of the progressive orderliness which is such a marked characteristic of the phenomena.

Dr. Morton is to be congratulated upon placing this particular issue before the Institute for the first time. To ignore the issues which have been created by the new facts is worse than futile. Let us face them in quietness and confidence, for "all His works shall yet praise Him."

Lieut.-Col. F. A. MOLONY said: I fear that what our learned lecturer has said at the end about University students being taught a grossly materialistic Psychology is only too true, because I have seen at Cambridge a Psychology syllabus, from which it was clear that they profess to be able to give a psychological explanation of Conversion, that most wonderful of all the wonderful acts of God.

Psychology may be useful, but some psychologists are not pleasant people to live with. For one thing, they are always pushing psychological answers at one when one wants straight answers. And these psychological answers are often grossly inaccurate. How can it be otherwise, when the attention of the answerer is being directed as to how best to produce the psychological effect desired? But as regards the root question, are we automata or free agents? I think it is best to consider a concrete case. Take David Livingstone. As a boy he turned from boyish delights, and set himself to learn Latin. Later, he started to explore Africa, though it meant parting from his beloved family, working with natives in a way which was very unpopular in South Africa, learning to take astronomical observations, though he had had but little training in mathematics, and also braving many sufferings and quite appalling risks. Later, he persevered, though his work had brought about the death of his wife, and of the missionaries who had answered his call. Further, Government withdrew support, and the explorer had many other grave disappointments.

Now did that man drift from the source of Heredity down the stream of Environment and the river of Determinism? No! he worked against the stream all the time; and surely the motive force was either his own good Will, or the Guidance and Grace of God—or both.

But if either explanation be correct, then Deterministic Philosophy and Necessitarianism must be rejected.

Mr. G. WILSON HEATH: As I listened to Dr. Morton's eloquence

I conjured up imaginary danger pits all around me, and I longed to find some way of escape, not only for myself, but for the young life of this and other lands. I judge Dr. Morton's case is proved up to the hilt, and I am helped to this judgment by the Chairman's remarks.

May I ask the lecturer two questions? (1) What are we to do individually or collectively to escape from this inferno ourselves? (2) How can we sound the tocsin that others may be warned ere it is too late? The warning, I judge, should be in such clear and definite language that "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."

Lieut.-Col. L. M. DAVIES: I heartily agree with all that Dr. Morton says. His paper is the more welcome to me because it emphasizes a point which I have tried to bring out in papers read before the Institute, namely, that the modern dogma of *Continuity* lies behind every form of Bible-denying thought to-day. Last year I declared that our latest Psychology, styled *Behaviourism*, is ultimately founded upon belief in *Continuity* (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lxi, p. 219); and, in his able paper, Dr. Morton proves the fact in detail, tracing *Behaviourism* logically back to its origin in that same principle of *Continuity* which was the basis of Herbert Spencer's philosophy.

Evolution is a philosophy, not a science; and it is a philosophy founded, as Huxley showed, upon belief in *Continuity*. Now *Continuity* implies *Determinism*—*Determinism* by resident forces—which is the most degrading of all beliefs, for it removes both the idea of credit for resisting our lower impulses, and the idea of guilt for yielding to them. Even the most degraded races of mankind have, in times past, been to some degree controlled by a sense of responsibility due to their instinctive recognition of the *fact of choice*; but, as Dr. Morton shows, all such sense of responsibility is now being rapidly removed by the New Psychology, deduced from the idea of "*Continuity*." Thus the ancient Bible prophecy is being fulfilled in every detail. We are, in this twentieth century, in a fair way to find ourselves surrounded by "scoffers, *walking after their own lusts*," who appeal to the long-foretold dogma that "all things CONTINUE as from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. iii, 3, 4).

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Dr. MORTON, replying on the discussion, said: I am much obliged to all who have taken part for speaking so kindly of the paper. It is quite true, as the Chairman has said, that the Psychology of the Unconscious held a large place considerably more than forty years ago; but forty years ago Psychology was dealing mainly with the Conscious Mind and its processes. I am very glad to note that the Chairman only spoke of accepting Evolution as an hypothesis. I put in the earnest plea that we must not allow a mere hypothesis to colour our thinking and interfere with the certainties of life. I could not admit that Bergson's vitalistic concept makes any difference to the inevitable Determinism of Evolution, inasmuch as it alters nothing in the evolutionary processes but merely assumes that the Universal Life Principle is expressing itself in these processes; but *we* are swept along in the effort of its self-expression. My argument is that Evolution is inevitably necessitarian, and therefore cannot possibly be accepted by those who are conscious of freedom.

I am sure it will never do to define Evolution as "development and growth." Everybody, of course, believes in these; but Evolution is a *very particular kind* of development—namely it is *transformism*; the transmutation of species. It is essential to keep this fact absolutely clear.

I quite agree with Mr. Avary Forbes that the New Psychologist in rejecting Personality and admitting only the existence of matter is faced with a problem that he cannot solve. He rejects the immediate "findings" of consciousness and therefore ought to reject the existence of matter unless he can prove that existence, which he cannot do. I agree with him also that it is quite impossible to find any step by which either the worst vices or the highest virtues have passed from the lower creation to Man.

I think Mr. Ruoff has got, in his volume *A Psychologist's Defence of the Faith*, an illustration of theistic evolution if his quotation is typical. I feel bound to urge again that to attempt to combine Evolution, which is essentially anti-theistic, with the Theism taught in the Bible is to combine absolute incompatibles. Mr. Leslie desires me to say how I should explain the progress made by modern

Psychology if Evolution, which has guided that progress, is false. But my reply would be that much modern Psychology is independent of Evolution. I said, for example, that I thought Psycho-Analysis might have been devised without any evolutionary hypothesis at all ; that I think is also true of Comparative Psychology, and, I think, even also of much Social Psychology. Where Evolution has mainly influenced thought is in the Psychology of Behaviourism, and I should not admit that Behaviourism represents any progress at all.

I am very glad that Colonel Molony emphasizes that Man is consciously a free agent and often works against the stream of heredity, and environment, and all the forces of Determinism. There is nothing that we are *certain* of except the things which are matter of immediate consciousness. These things we *know*. I am glad he and Mr. Wilson Heath both sound the note of alarm. I agree with Mr. Heath that it is difficult for any of us to free our minds to-day from this obsession of the modern mind—Evolution. Yet I am quite sure that for our own protection we must steadily refuse to think in evolutionary terms ; and in answer to his second question I am more and more deeply impressed with the need for educational enterprise. We have not in Great Britain one single Fundamentalist University. We need to follow the example of the non-Conformists of 250 years ago, who, when they were turned out of the Universities, started their own Colleges all over the country. Sound thinkers ought to claim “ a local habitation and a name ” in University life.

I am encouraged by Colonel Davies' agreement that the dogma of *Continuity* logically must result in the nightmare Psychology of Behaviourism. What a tragedy it is that the modern mind is in the grip of this false dogma, which is forcing it on over the precipice and into the abyss.

736TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 12TH, 1930,

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 following elections :—Dr. Mary R. Fleming, Life Associate (from Associate) and Joseph Cecil Fromow as an Associate.

Dr. THIRTLE then introduced Prof. J. Garstang, D.Sc., F.S.A., to deliver his lecture on "Joshua and the Higher Critics," from a written précis with lantern slides, which he described from personal knowledge.

JOSHUA AND THE HIGHER CRITICS.

By PROFESSOR J. GARSTANG, D.Sc., F.S.A.

THE conscientious inquirer to-day cannot ignore the results of Textual Criticism, to which, during the last two generations, some of the highest scholarship and learning has been devoted ; nor can he, on the imperfect evidence hitherto available, dismiss Bible narrative in general as devoid of historical foundation. Neither attitude is justified by the tendencies of modern research. The Homeric poems describing the Trojan War provide apt illustration. Criticism at one time tended to strip these of all reality, but the recovery of the Hittite records and their decipherment have established a background of Achæan activities in Asia Minor, fully accordant with the historical setting of the poems. Palestine since the War has witnessed an unparalleled activity in archæological investigation, and the results throw light in particular upon the period of Joshua and the Judges.

The historic sites and walled cities which the lecturer had the privilege of repeatedly visiting while excavation was in progress, during the seven years that he directed the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem, and the Department of Antiquities in Palestine, impressed him deeply with a sense of material reality underlying the historical narrative in the Books named. The impression, however, eluded definition, and he has devoted a number of years to a further study of the matter.

The received text of the Bible contains, as all know, numerous discrepancies, of which examples can be found in the opening chapters of the Book of Judges. Thus, the first verse makes it appear that the events subsequently narrated came to pass after the death of Joshua; but the death and burial of Joshua are described in the second chapter (verses 8, 9), as occurring after those events. Another illustration appears in the allusion to the capture of Jerusalem (i, 8), which is in disagreement with verse 21, and contradicts the statement of Joshua xv, 63. Thus:

Joshua xv, 63.—As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out (J).

Judges i, 8.—And the children of Judah fought against Jerusalem and took it and smote it with the edge of the sword (P).

Discrepancies of this kind and other textual difficulties have led scholars to examine closely the literary and grammatical structure of the text, which is found to be a composite production, and the growth of centuries. The original nucleus of the Book is found to comprise two independent strains of tradition, which are believed to have been set down in writing during the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. and in part welded together during the seventh century B.C. The symbols used to denote these elements in the text are J, E, and JE respectively. These old documents were grouped, amplified, and explained from a national and religious standpoint, in the sixth century B.C. by the Deuteronomistic School (D), under which the Bible began to take connected form. Then ensued the Exile, during and after which the Book was further supplemented and edited from the point of view of the organized priesthood (P), in the light of more recent political developments. Thus the Old Testament did not gain its final form until about the second century B.C. Even so, no

surviving Hebrew version of the text can be attributed to an earlier date than the end of the first millennium A.D. Earlier copies exist of the Greek rendering, known from the circumstances of its translation as the Septuagint (abbreviated as LXX), which was begun at Alexandria about the middle of the third century B.C., and may thus preserve the original form or meaning of various passages better than the Massoretic or standard Hebrew text.

Finding that some of the passages ascribed to the later hands evoked big archæological problems, the lecturer decided to examine separately, in the first instance, the archæology of the earliest documents: the result was so full of promise that Sir Charles Marston, on being informed, made it possible for the lecturer to return to Palestine in 1928 to test this clue upon the spot. Every identified site mentioned in the oldest sources (J, E, and JE) of the Books of Joshua and Judges was revisited, while three selected cities, Jericho, Ai, and Hazor, were examined more deeply with the spade. The impression now became positive. No radical flaw was found at all in the topography and archæology of those documents. It must not be supposed that the lecturer necessarily rejects the later elements D. and P. as unhistorical; on the contrary, each is found to enfold information derived from earlier sources; but their precise historical value and relevance is a more complex question, involving also a wide and searching archæological investigation. He simply lays them aside for the time being, and deals with those elements which may be rightly claimed as the foundation of the Bible narrative.

* * * * *

The subject-matter of the Book of Joshua may be divided broadly into two parts: (i) the attempt of the Israelites under Joshua to gain a footing in Canaan by force of arms; (ii) the settlement of the tribes. Confining attention entirely to the old sources J and E, it will be appreciated that the attempt to force an entry was not attended by permanent success, whereas the subsequent settlement was effected for the most part without the use of arms, a fact which seems to reflect a radical change in the political conditions. The Book of Judges contains, for the most part, only a series of fragmentary records. Stories of local episodes have survived, while prolonged years of rest are devoid of incident. But it is apparent that, during the long period which it covers, the union of the tribes was often in jeopardy.

Now and again the silence is relieved by an account of some national effort, like the great rally of Deborah, until under Gideon the need for the king or common leader began to find definite expression. Two factors are evidently necessary for a proper understanding of these Books—for Joshua a fixed date on which to base the history of Israel in Canaan; for the Judges an historical background, such as Egypt can most fittingly supply, seeing that the land was for centuries under Egyptian suzerainty.

All the cities mentioned in the early documents of Joshua and Judges i to v which can be identified, like Gezer, Megiddo, Bethshean, and Hazor, flourished during the Bronze Age, and occupied for the most part the great strategic positions of the land. Moreover, the names of not fewer than twenty-four cities of the Canaanites in the age of Joshua are identical with those mentioned in the annals of the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty in particular the records of the hundred years between the conquests of Thothmes III and the decline of the Empire under Akhenaten, 1475–1375 B.C. In some cases, the accordance extends clearly to their strategical importance. Thus among the cities which the Israelites could not capture, Bethshean, Megiddo, Acco, Gezer, Jerusalem, and Gaza, are found to have been organized centres of Egyptian authority. It would seem then, at first glance, that the background to the exploits of Joshua in the land of Canaan was that which is disclosed by Egyptian records of the fifteenth century B.C.

In an effort to secure some more tangible evidence on this point, preliminary excavations were undertaken on behalf of Sir Charles Marston by the lecturer in 1928 on the three sites which Joshua is stated to have destroyed, namely, Jericho, Ai, and Hazor. Each place showed traces of destruction near the middle of the Late Bronze Age, or about 1400 B.C.; and a more complete investigation of the ruined fortifications and site of Jericho, made in the spring of this year, as before, for Sir Charles Marston, has contributed a wealth of evidence in support of this conclusion. The city of Ai and the camp enclosure of Hazor were apparently abandoned from that time, while Jericho was not rebuilt for some centuries. Moreover, researches made independently by the American School of Oriental Research, on the sites of Bethel and Debir, disclosed layers of destruction, in each case, dated also in broad figures, though with less certitude, to the end of the fifteenth century B.C.

* * * * *

These conclusions are found to tally closely with the one clear indication in Biblical tradition. This is embodied in the statement that the Exodus took place 480 years before Solomon began to build his temple—that is, about 1447 B.C.—so that the date of Joshua's invasion of Canaan would fall about 1407 B.C. This tradition has generally been assigned by critics to a later source and treated with mistrust, as the round figure involved is found not to agree with the summary of details recorded in the received text of the Book of Judges ; but by omitting the details assigned by Criticism to the later hand of P, it is found that the discrepancies disappear. The record is obviously derived, then, from the old tradition which pervades both Books.

All the available archæological and literary evidence, therefore, points toward the same date in the middle of the Late Bronze Age, about 1400 B.C., as the starting-point of the history of Israel in Canaan. Upon this basis the historical details and topographical allusions in the old sources of the Book of Joshua are found, on examination, to accord with the material results of investigation : while the fragmentary picture of Israel's position under the Judges is found to fit adequately into the frame provided by Egyptian chronology, and to correspond closely in certain details with the record of Egyptian relations with the Land of Canaan. There is, then, no reason to doubt but that the traditions embodied in the old documentary sources (J and E) of both Books were founded upon fact. It is also made clear that the passages which Criticism has found to be the earliest (and labelled J.E. and JE) have, in fact, this distinction, that they are practically free from textual discrepancies and archæological anachronisms. The archæology of the later documents (D and P) is a more complex study, involving further years of active research.

In conclusion, the lecturer passed a tribute to the scientific interest and generous enthusiasm of Sir Charles Marston, which have made possible these later investigations, including not only the visitation of the sites involved in these researches, but also the excavations at Hazor, Ai, and, most recently, Jericho.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Thirtle) said : It affords me much pleasure to call for the thanks of the meeting to Professor Garstang for the lecture delivered in our hearing. We have not all found ourselves

in Jericho, the place ; but we have been privileged this afternoon to make acquaintance with the material remains of the ancient city, as well as certain others, famous in Bible story. The learned Professor has come before us as an archæological expert—indeed, as one who has achieved a remarkable success in laying bare, not only the old-time Canaanite city, but also the forbidding walls by which it was surrounded—walls in regard to which a truly marvellous narrative has come down to us in the Book of Joshua.

For many years past we have been following the progress of excavations upon the site of Jericho—excavations that have been prosecuted with special vigour, and attended with rich results since Dr. Garstang assumed direction of the work. Now we seem to have reached the final chapter in the development of inquiry along really systematic lines ; and in the result we are justified in a confidence, strong and confirmed, as to the historical character of the Old Testament Book of Joshua, the book in which we have an explicit account of the conquest of Canaan by the Children of Israel.

We are profoundly grateful for the story thus unfolded. It is a story which goes a long way to discredit Higher Critical views of the Old Testament records. In regard to that method of approach to ancient documents, we have not sat in vain at the feet of Professor A. H. Sayce, President Melvin G. Kyle, and Sir Flinders Petrie, all of whom have lectured before the Institute in regard to Israelitish history. Dr. Kyle, it will be remembered, gave to the world, a few years ago, an important book entitled “The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticisms ;” and we of the Victoria Institute have heard Dr. Garstang with special avidity and confidence because convinced that the work of the axe and spade is more to be trusted than are the views, at once confused and conflicting, of arm-chair theorists.

Though at the outset, in generous spirit, our lecturer invoked a measure of consideration for the Higher Critics, at length he was compelled, as we have heard this afternoon, to throw them over in regard to the Book of Joshua. We have heard him say, with reference to the tradition (or history) of Joshua’s invasion of Canaan, something like this—“By omitting the details assigned by Critics to the later hand of P. (otherwise the ‘P. document’), it is found that discrepancies in the text disappear. The record as we have it

is obviously derived from the old tradition which pervades both books (Joshua and Judges). In this matter, the Critics have fallen into error."

In like manner, Dr. Kyle, in the book which I have named, wrote in anticipation of the results now achieved. Here are his words: "Will it not seem to most people that the failure of the excavations to confirm the P. document, considering all the circumstances and facts, discredits the Critical partition which produced the P. document, rather than the complete narrative in Joshua from which this part of the P. document is extracted. Excavations in Palestine confirm the narrative of the conquest as it stands in the Bible."

Again and again, in the course of years, we have met with instances of confusion introduced into Oriental history by means of Western misunderstanding being, so to say, "read in"; and the Book of Joshua, equally with other writings, has suffered from just such treatment. Not in vain, then, and not too soon, has the excavator gone abroad, and we particularly welcome the work of Dr. Garstang, with results that are at once rectifying and decisive.

For one thing, the results developed are such as encourage us, all the time, to meet with suspicion the demands of a criticism conceived upon what are largely Occidental lines and impressions. For another thing, such results justify as a settled principle the exercise of reverent patience in dealing with difficulties encountered in the text of the Old Testament. If, as a fact, the ancient writings are worthy of study by intelligent men and women, then antecedently we do well, all the time, to apply ourselves with care to the text itself before devising measures for discrediting the same, and employing such epithets as "myth" and "legend" in the description of sacred Books.

Again, I thank the Professor for his address, at once instructive and lucid, and ask that the vote may be accorded with acclamation: which was done.

737TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 26TH, 1930,
AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., LL.M., F.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections:—The Rev. F. E. Marsh, D.D., as a Member, from Associate; and Daniel G. Skeate, Esq., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Mr. Israel Cohen, General Secretary of the Zionist Organization, to read his paper on "The Jews under the Palestine Mandate."

THE JEWS UNDER THE PALESTINE MANDATE.

By ISRAEL COHEN.

I.

IN any attempt to review the position of the Jewish people under the Palestine Mandate, the Report of the Commission appointed by the British Government to inquire into the riots of August, 1929, must obviously take a large place, for of all the reports on Palestine that have been written since the country came under British control that Report, from various points of view, is the most important. It is the latest and longest of a number of official reports; it was occasioned by a terrible outbreak of lawlessness and bloodshed which signalized and stained the close of eleven years of British rule; it contains the fullest examination that has been made on behalf of the Government into the practical working of the Mandate; and it embodies a series of conclusions

and recommendations based on the evidence of 130 witnesses—official and unofficial—given at 47 sittings lasting over a period of two months. It is not only the most important Report, but also the most provocative and unsatisfactory—provocative, because it goes far beyond the terms of reference set to its authors and deals with several important matters which they were not competent to handle; and unsatisfactory because, despite the investigation that took place with the aid of counsel representing the Jews, the Arabs, and the Government, it fails to fix any definite responsibility for the outrages, and betrays a remarkable degree of bias. But before we can properly appreciate the findings of the Report or criticize its recommendations, it is necessary to survey—or, at least, to summarize—the position of the Jews in Palestine as it was up to the eve of the unfortunate outbreak.

Two salient facts must be borne in mind: one is that the resettlement of the Jews in Palestine is not the return of individual Jews in a haphazard and unorganized manner, but a national movement that is systematically endeavouring to realize an ideal that was fervently cherished for hundreds of years; the other is that this national movement is officially recognized and approved in a document that constitutes an international guarantee in regard to various agreed measures to be taken for its furtherance. The Jewish national movement had been in existence long before the War, and a considerable number of Jewish settlements, established in the face of great difficulties, had already attained a certain measure of success. But in the course of the War, when all the small nations were clamouring and fighting for the recognition of their independence and the right of self-determination, the Jewish nation likewise put forward its claim; but, unlike all other nations, the Jews could not engage in a united struggle, since they were dispersed among all the nations and were consequently obliged to fight in opposing camps. Nevertheless, the British Government recognized the claim of the Jewish people to re-establish its National Home, more especially as such a recognition was calculated to subserve the interests of the Allies at a critical stage of the War by reason of the effect which it might be expected to produce among the Jews in America and other countries, whose sympathy was of no small value. Hence the issue on November 2nd, 1917, of the Balfour Declaration, which not only expressed the Government's approval of the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, but promised that the Government would use their best endeavours to facilitate the

achievement of this object. This Declaration was endorsed by several of the Allied Governments and was re-affirmed at the Conference of San Remo in April, 1920, which conferred the Mandate for Palestine upon Great Britain. The Mandate, be it remembered, was not forced upon Great Britain; on the contrary, it was claimed; and the claim, whilst primarily inspired by political considerations, was strengthened by the fact that the British Government had taken the lead in espousing the cause of the Jewish people, that a British Military Administration was set up in Jerusalem as soon as the Turks were driven northward, and last, not least, that England had not only shown her sympathy with Jewish national aspirations by the offer to the Zionist Organization in 1903 of an autonomous territory in British East Africa, but had, as far back as the middle of the nineteenth century, officially instructed her consuls in Palestine to befriend in every possible way those Jews who had no kind of European protection. The Balfour Declaration was embodied in the preamble of the Mandate, which also stated that "recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their National Home in that country," and the Mandate, as approved by the Council of the League of Nations on the 24th of July, 1922, contained a number of articles setting forth the specific obligations of the Mandatory in reference to various political, administrative, religious, and economic matters pertaining to the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

II.

From the very outset there was a lack of harmony in regard to the question of the Jewish National Home between the Government in London and their authorized representatives in Jerusalem. In London, Viscount Cecil, a member of the Cabinet, declared at a great demonstration on December 2nd, 1927: "Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judea for the Jews," and two years later Sir Herbert Samuel likewise, at a public meeting, stated that "the policy propounded before the Peace Conference" was one whereby "with the minimum of delay the country may become a purely self-governing Commonwealth under the auspices of an established Jewish majority." But in Palestine the Military Administration

had different views : from the very moment of its establishment it set its face against Zionist aspirations and made no secret of its anti-Jewish attitude, even though Jewish battalions had fought in the Army of redemption under General Allenby and received distinguished mention.

Early in 1918 " Arab leaders in Palestine and Egypt were eager to come to terms with Zionists on the basis of mutual concessions,"* but as soon as they realized that the military authorities were hostile to the Jews and favourably disposed towards themselves, they refrained from such a move and began to develop an anti-Jewish agitation. So marked had the hostility of the Military Administration become by the middle of 1919, that Lord (then Mr.) Balfour despatched a detailed instruction to remind them of the Government's policy and of their duty. The instruction stated that " the American and French Governments were equally pledged to support the establishment in Palestine of the Jewish National Home, that this should be emphasized to the Arab leaders at every opportunity, that the matter was a *chose jugée*, and that continued agitation would be useless and detrimental." Lord Balfour's note produced a little, but only temporary improvement ; the Arabs were officially allowed to hold anti-Zionist demonstrations in Jerusalem and Jaffa in the spring of 1920 ; and the result was a three days' attack by the Arabs upon the Jews in Jerusalem, in which six Jews and six Arabs were killed. The alarm aroused by this riot (of which not the least astonishing feature was the arrest and imprisonment of the organizers and members of the Jewish Self-Defence) brought the existence of the Military Administration to an early end. On July 1st, 1920, a Civil Administration was set up under Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner.

The advent of a Jewish High Commissioner ushered in a period of hope in regard to the policy of the Jewish National Home, but unfortunately this did not lead to a period of fulfilment. So far as the development of the country was concerned, remarkable improvement was made, especially in the spheres of administration, agricultural development, town-planning, road-building, education, and hygiene ; but as for a practical recognition of the policy of the Jewish National Home on the part of the Adminis-

* Political Report of the Executive of the Zionist Organization to the 12th Zionist Congress, 1921, p. 51.

tration in general, there was only a slight and ephemeral improvement. Unfortunately most of the officials of the Military Administration were retained, and as their spirit underwent no change, there were no influences to check the agitation among the Arabs. The discontent in the Arab community, which was artificially fostered and limited in extent, expressed itself, first, in a clamour for the abrogation of the Balfour Declaration, and then in May, 1921, in the more violent form of attacks upon the Jews in Jaffa and neighbouring Jewish colonies, in which the total casualties amounted to 95 killed—48 Arabs and 47 Jews—and 219 wounded, of whom 73 were Arabs and 146 Jews. The immediate result of this second outbreak of savagery was a temporary stoppage of Jewish immigration, which dealt a severe blow at Jewish hopes. But a much more serious consequence followed, largely as the outcome of the agitation carried on by an Arab Delegation that came to London to vindicate the conduct of the rioters. This was the issue by the British Government of a statement of policy, known as the Churchill White Paper, in which the Jewish National Home was defined as “the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and pride.” This definition was far removed from Viscount Cecil’s “*Judea for the Jews*” and from all the other early optimistic glosses on the Balfour Declaration. Its publication evoked a feeling of disappointment and disillusion among all sections of the Jewish people, but the Zionist Organization—recognized in the Mandate as “public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine”—had no alternative but to accept it.

III.

Thereafter there was peace in the land, and the troops were gradually withdrawn, only a small Air Force being left. The Arab leaders continued to agitate and to pass resolutions demanding the annulment of the Balfour Declaration; they rejected the proposals that were made by the Palestine Administration successively for the creation of a Legislative Council, of a reconstituted Advisory Council, and finally of an Arab Agency analogous to the

Jewish Agency ; and as they were unable to arouse sufficient enthusiasm among their people in their political agitation, and were, moreover, divided among themselves, they gradually ceased from troubling. The interest of the people in general and of the Jews in particular become concentrated upon social and economic developments. The Zionist Organization devoted itself with increased energy to the prosecution of its work which had been interrupted or, rather, temporarily retarded, and every endeavour was made to further the creation of the Jewish National Home in every possible direction. The progress that was achieved during the next few years was such as to arouse the admiration of all impartial observers. The National Home was not yet established, but its foundations were certainly well laid. The position as it was at the time of the next outbreak—the riots of 1929—may be summarized as follows :—

The Jewish population of Palestine had been trebled since the beginning of the British Administration, having grown from 55,000 to 160,000, largely through the influx of new settlers and to a smaller extent through natural increase. The immigrants had been drawn from all parts of the world, mainly from Eastern and Central Europe, but also from lands as varied and remote from one another as Siberia and South Africa, Argentine and Persia, England and the United States. They were mostly young and robust, both men and women, all animated by a fervid enthusiasm, and a good proportion consisting of students who had broken off their academic career to assume the more laborious toil of rebuilding their ancestral home. They had all been previously examined at home as to their physical fitness and capacity before receiving immigration permits—for there were hundreds of thousands clamouring for such permits, which were strictly limited by the Government to a certain number each year—and many of them, especially those from Russia, underwent the severest privations on the way. These pioneers engaged in all manner of hard work—breaking stones, making roads and railways, building bridges, erecting houses and factories, weeding the soil, draining marshes, reafforesting the bared hills, boring wells, installing telegraph and telephone connections, and attending to every other initial requisite in the development of a long-neglected country.

In the field of agricultural development there were added to the 40 old Jewish settlements 60 new ones in all parts of the country, the majority being situated in the Vale of Jezreel and

stretching almost continuously from Haifa to near Beisan. The land for these settlements had all to be bought by the Jewish National Fund (the land-purchasing agency of the Zionist Organization), for the provision of the Mandate that Jews are to be settled upon State and waste lands remained a dead letter. The kinds of farming comprised fruit-growing, cereal cultivation, dairying, vegiculture, and tobacco-planting, and the methods were in accordance with the most advanced scientific principles, the farmers having the benefit of guidance from the Agricultural Experiment Station at Tel-Aviv, which experts have pronounced to be one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world. Not only were developments made in the country but also in the towns. New residential quarters were built in the suburbs of Jerusalem, Haifa, and Tiberias, whilst the Jewish township of Tel-Aviv, which had only 2,000 inhabitants in 1914, now boasted of 40,000. Factories, mills, and workshops had sprung up all over the country, industrial development was furthered by an extensive electrification scheme, including power stations at Jaffa, Haifa, and Tiberias, and the promotion of commerce was facilitated by the credits supplied by the Anglo-Palestine Company, the General Mortgage Bank, and other Jewish financial institutions.

In the domain of social welfare and cultural work, considerable progress had also been achieved. A complete medical service had been organized, with hospitals, clinics, and infant-welfare centres. The Zionist educational organization, with over 222 schools of all grades and 20,000 pupils, embraced 80 per cent. of all the Jewish schools and 70 per cent. of the Jewish school-children, and the language of instruction was Hebrew, which had been adapted to all the requirements of modern thought and scientific progress and had indeed become the ordinary medium of intercourse in Jewish life. Advanced technical training was provided at the Haifa Technical Institute, and the crowning feature of Jewish education consisted of the Hebrew University, which comprised not only the principal scientific departments of such an establishment, but also institutes of Jewish Studies and Oriental studies and a library with 200,000 volumes. Moreover, the muses were also cultivated with zest: Hebrew drama and opera were regular features of social life; there were concerts galore; artists, painters, and sculptors had begun to give expression to the inspiration derived from the new Judea; and the production and publication of books had grown into a busy industry.

IV.

The driving and directing force in the development of the Jewish National Home was the Zionist Organization, which raised about £750,000 a year by means of voluntary contributions from Jews in all parts of the world in order to pay for the land which it acquired and for the various social, economic, and cultural activities in which it was engaged. Other and smaller bodies, as well as private individuals, also participated in this task of civilization, and the total amount of money which they are all estimated to have brought into the country is the imposing figure of about £40,000,000. The Government benefited very largely by this influx of capital—so much so, indeed, that they were able to pay off Palestine's share in the Ottoman Debt, to refund to the British Treasury the expenditure incurred by the previous Military Administration on various works, to make large investments in railways, telegraph, telephones, and other public works, and yet to have a surplus balance at the end of 1928 of over £500,000. The Jews, although forming only 20 per cent. of the total population, contributed 42 per cent. of the Government's revenue. On the other hand, the Government contributed very little to the furtherance of the Jewish National Home. Their financial support was confined to a grant for the Jewish schools, which rose slowly from £2,000 to £20,000 a year (although the expenditure on the Zionist schools alone amounted to over £150,000), whilst £116,000 a year was expended on Arab education. Besides, the Arabs benefited in an even greater degree from the Government revenue through their disproportionately larger employment on public works and use of the Government medical and agricultural services. Not only did the Jews receive such niggardly financial support, but they were hampered and thwarted in their endeavours in which they were entitled to receive the Government's active support. Immigration—even of persons of means—was subjected to the most rigorous and vexatious control, so that only the most pertinacious succeeded in getting through the complicated mesh of regulations, and having the privilege of paying a landing-tax of one pound for entering their National Home.

The article of the Mandate which imposed upon the Administration the duty of encouraging the close settlement of Jews on State and waste lands not required for public purposes was ignored, whilst a large area (over 100,000 acres) of land at Beisan was

allotted to a number of Arab squatters on a part of it, who could neither pay the requisite fees nor undertake the cultivation of their plots, and who thereupon offered their surplus land at enhanced prices to the Jews, who had repeatedly to petition the Government for permission to buy. Moreover, several Jewish officials in the senior service were squeezed out, and certain departments, such as that of Public Health, severely barred all Jewish employees. The Mandate recognized the holy days of the various communities in Palestine as "legal days of rest for the members of such communities," but Jewish employees on the railways found it difficult to secure their Sabbath rest without loss of pay. The Mandate declared Hebrew to be one of the three official languages, but in practice it received scant respect from the authorities in their relations with the Jewish people, Hebrew telegrams, for instance, not being accepted even for internal transmission.

The explanation of this policy of the Government was to be sought in the attitude of a number of the higher officials who made no secret of their antipathy and even hostility to the policy of the Balfour Declaration, which they were appointed to carry out. Lest it be said that there is no justification for such a charge, it should suffice to refer to the articles contributed by several ex-officials of the Palestine Government to such journals as the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Fortnightly Review* and others between 1922 and 1925, in which they scathingly attacked the Balfour Declaration and the ideals and activities of the Zionists. A typically pernicious outburst appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* (July, 1925), in which the writer, scoffing profusely not only at the Jewish people but also at his former employer, the British Government, wrote: "International Jewry and British crankiness are the forces, which, combining together, were able to impose upon the League of Nations outward responsibility for that iniquitous document known as the Mandate for Palestine."* But despite the indignation conveyed in this sentence, penned after the writer had left the Secretariat of the Palestine Government, it did not prevent him shortly afterwards from applying for and receiving a more important post in another department. Whether he still considers the Mandate, which he is paid to assist in administering, as an "iniquitous document," he may not now say. Proof of the antipathy of a number of the

* *England in Palestine*, by E. T. Richmond.

higher officials at the present day can be obtained in Palestine even by the superficial inquirer.

V.

Such then, in brief outline, was the general position at the time when the third and most brutal attack by the Arabs upon the Jews took place, in 1929. That attack was connected in more than one way with the Wailing Wall, the remnant of the ancient Temple, before which Jews had wept and prayed for many centuries for the restoration of their former national glories. On the Day of Atonement, in 1928, a temporary canvas screen had been placed against the Wall to divide the male from the female worshippers in accordance with strict orthodox practice. The screen had been used ten days before, on the Jewish New Year, without any objection being raised by the authorities. But on the second occasion the Assistant District Commissioner, in response to a complaint made by a number of threatening Arabs that the screen constituted a departure from what was termed the *status quo*, insisted that it should be removed, and as his order was not obeyed because its execution would have involved an infringement of the most sacred day in the Jewish year, he had the screen forcibly taken away by police officials in the midst of the solemn service, causing indignation and alarm to all the worshippers, and even injury to some. Had the Government official possessed even the least regard for Jewish religious sentiment—not to speak of tact—he could have warded off the threats of the Arabs, and allowed the screen to remain until the end of the service. His conduct betrayed not only his antagonism to the Jews, but his timidity before the Arabs, and the latter were not slow to take advantage of the fact.

From that day the Arabs, under the leadership of the Mufti of Jerusalem, began to take a keener interest than before in the Wailing Wall, claiming for the pavement in front of it a sanctity which their own disgraceful treatment of it belied, and devising various steps which were calculated to annoy the Jews at prayer. They had a door made in a building near the Wall, so that the blind alley, as the place before the Wall had hitherto been, was changed into a thoroughfare; they had a new building constructed on the northern end of the Wall; they stationed a muezzin on the roof of a neighbouring house who called to prayer five times a day so as to disturb the Jewish worshippers; and they instituted,

in a garden near the Wall, a ceremony known as the "Zikr," which consisted in a cacophonous performance. Simultaneously with these innovations the Arabs engaged in an inflammatory propaganda, in which they accused the Jews of designs not merely upon the Wailing Wall but upon the Mosque of Omar itself. The agitation was organized by a Society for the Protection of the Moslem Holy Places, which prompted the formation of a Pro-Wailing Wall Committee, but whilst the Moslem Society was formed and controlled by the Mufti and the Arab Executive in general, the Wailing Wall Committee was discountenanced by the Zionist Executive. The motive of the Mufti was to mobilize on a religious issue the public opinion of the Moslems which he had been unable to arouse on purely political grounds, and at the same time to secure for himself the united support of all sections in the retention of his office as President of the Supreme Moslem Council, to which he had been appointed only for a limited number of years. Passions began to gather strength. On August 15th, 1929—the Fast of Ab, which commemorates the destruction of the Temple—a group of Jewish youths, under a heavy police escort, held a demonstration at the Wall, for which they had official permission, and dispersed peacefully; on the following day a very much larger crowd of Arabs, but with a much smaller police escort, also engaged in a demonstration at the same place, and likewise with official permission, but before they dispersed they destroyed a table, burned prayer books and petitions, and attacked and tore the clothes of the Jewish beadle. Seven days later, on August 23rd, there broke out that orgy of murder and savagery, which lasted seven days, and which shocked the conscience of the world. The Jewish victims numbered 133 killed and 339 wounded, and six Jewish colonies were destroyed, whilst of the Arabs—largely as the result of firing by the military and police—116 were killed and 232 wounded. The British Government sent out a Commission of Inquiry into what were euphemistically called disturbances, and after five and a-half months the Commission presented a voluminous report. Let us now consider this Report.

VI.

The Commission was set two specific tasks: to ascertain the immediate causes of the outbreak and to recommend steps that should be taken to prevent a recurrence. Lord Passfield announced that the "inquiry was limited to the immediate urgency" and

was "not to extend to considerations of major policy." Nevertheless the Commission, soon after opening the inquiry, began to take evidence from the Arabs that had no bearing at all upon the causes of the outbreak, but touched the very core of the policy of the Jewish National Home. The Prime Minister, on December 23rd, stated in the House of Commons that major questions affecting the future administration of the Palestine Mandate were "clearly outside the terms of reference of the Shaw Commission, and cannot be made part of its Report." Nevertheless, those major questions do form a large and significant part of the Report, and the Commissioners pronounce judgment and make recommendation on questions of land, immigration, constitutional reform, and interpretations of the Mandate, for which they were not qualified either by training or experience. That they exceeded their terms of reference was doubtless due in some measure to the weakness of the Arab case, and to the astute manœuvring of the Arab leaders to throw them off the scent. Realizing the difficulty of disproving that they had been the oppressors, the Arab leaders sought to divert attention from the bloodshed and robbery to their alleged economic grievances and political aspirations. The acts of murder and plunder could not be denied, for the courts of law were occupied with them and were administering punishment. But in order to minimize their gravity, harrowing stories were told of the eviction from their agricultural holdings of Arab tenants who were said to have been converted into a landless proletariat in order to make room for the alleged excessive immigration of "alien Jews" from Eastern Europe.

The Commission, we read, found that the outbreak in Jerusalem "was from the beginning an attack by Arabs on Jews, for which no excuse in the form of earlier murders by Jews has been established." But was the outbreak premeditated and who was responsible? The Commissioners found that the outbreak was not premeditated, although their own narrative of the events should have led them to the opposite conclusion. They tell us that in many districts there was incitement, and that in some cases those who incited were members of the Moslem hierarchy; that agitators were touring the country in the third week in August, and were summoning the people of certain districts to Jerusalem; that a letter was delivered on August 22nd to the head men of Kabalan, a village near Nablus, saying that fighting would take place on the 23rd between the Jews and Moslems and that "all who are of the Moslem religion should come to Jerusalem to

help"; that Musa Kazim, Chairman of the Palestine Arab Executive, was found in Jaffa on August 16th inspecting the printing of anti-Jewish pamphlets; that Sheikh Taleb Markha, a member of the Palestine Arab Executive, was sentenced to imprisonment for inciting to conduct that was offensive to persons of another religion; that Subhi Bey al Khadra, another member of the Executive, was engaged in suspicious movements from August 24th to 27th; and that rumours had been spread among the Arab workmen employed in the Jewish orange groves at Petach Tikvah, as well as in other centres, that the Jews intended to attack the Mosque of Aqsa on August 23rd. And yet they conclude that the attack was not premeditated. There were other facts revealed in the evidence pointing to premeditation, to which the Commission, strangely enough, make no reference, namely, that the people of Jaffa had been summoned to the Jaffa Mosque for the 23rd, that a demonstration had been organized for Luddon that date, and that the fellaheen who streamed into Jerusalem on the morning of the 23rd were armed, not only with sticks and clubs, but also with knives, daggers, and firearms, that they were unusually numerous, that there were no women among them, and that their general demeanour was truculent.

The majority of the Commission apportion "a share in the responsibility for the disturbances" to the Mufti for the part that he took in the formation of societies for the defence of the Moslem Holy Places, as this movement became "a not unimportant factor in the events which led to the outbreak"; they have little doubt that some of the constituents who elected the Arab Executive carried out propaganda calculated to incite the more ignorant Arabs, and think it probable that "individual members of the Arab Executive further exacerbated racial feeling after the disturbances had begun"; and they blame both Mufti and Executive for failure during the week preceding the riots to make an attempt to control their followers. They make no reference to the inclusion of the Mufti—Haj Amin Husseini—in the "black list," of the police, dated August 23rd, which was published in the Palestine press, and they shirk the delicate task of fixing responsibility for the outrages. Mr. Harry Snell, who contributes a long Note of Reservations, in which he dissociates himself from the general attitude of his colleagues towards the Palestine problem, as well as from some of their criticisms and conclusions, attributes to the Mufti "a greater share in the responsibility for the disturbance than is attributed to him in the Report," and finds it

“difficult to believe that the actions of individual members of the Executive were unknown to that body, or, indeed, that those individuals were acting in a purely personal capacity.” He also rejects the conclusions of the majority “acquitting the Moslem religious authorities of all but the slightest blame for the innovations introduced in the neighbourhood of the Wailing Wall.”

VII.

Having found that there was no premeditation, the Commission dealt leniently with the question of the responsibility of the Palestine Administration, but their conclusions are so discreetly worded as to suggest that they did not feel quite at ease on this point. They say that “it would have been a reasonable precaution if Mr. Luke had mobilized the troops within his jurisdiction at some convenient place in Palestine some time during the days which immediately preceded the disturbances,” and they observe that the Government should have suspended the newspapers that published exciting and intemperate articles, but they do not blame the Government for failing to take these steps. On the other hand, they find nothing wrong in the Government disarming British Jews, although the Government were unable to afford the Jews adequate protection, and they delicately refrain from mentioning that several of the Jews disarmed had served in the War, and that some of them had held the King’s commission. Mr. Snell dissents from the majority, and blames the Government “for not having issued an official communiqué denying that the Jews had designs on the Moslem Holy Places.” But, although the majority seek to exonerate the Government, they point out that the Arab Police proved unreliable and that the Intelligence Service proved inadequate. Now since both Police and Intelligence Service are arms of the Government, it follows that a Government which does not maintain them on a level of efficiency calls for blame. Reading between the lines of the laboured defence of the Administration, and in the light of the criticism supplied by Mr. Snell, one cannot help concluding that, had the Government displayed a greater measure of courage, judgment, and foresight, the terrible catastrophe of last August might have been averted. It was probably out of regard for the feelings of the Government that the Commissioners refrain from mentioning that during the early days of the riots one of the cries most in use among the Arabs was “The Govern-

ment is with us!" and also that in the closing speech on the Jewish side at the Inquiry, Sir Boyd Merriman complained of the antagonistic attitude adopted by the Government counsel towards the Jewish witnesses in contrast to the leniency shown in the cross-examination of the Arab witnesses.

In dealing with the causes of the outbreak, the majority of the Commissioners say that the fundamental cause was "the Arab feeling of animosity and hostility towards the Jews consequent upon the disappointment of their political and national aspirations and fear for their economic future." If that were the case why was there no outbreak between 1921 and 1929? The fact is that during this period there were increasing instances of co-operation and fraternization between Jews and Arabs; over 4,000 Arabs were employed by Jews in the colonies and the towns, over 10,000 Arabs were treated in Jewish hospitals in a single year, and Arabs attended Jewish technical classes and the Hebrew University Library. Besides that, not all Arabs are animated by a feeling of hostility towards the Jews, was proved in several cases during the riots themselves, as many Arabs declined to take part in the attacks, and even protected Jews who were exposed to danger. Mr. Snell is very much nearer the truth when he declares that "many of the immediate causes of the riots . . . were of a temporary rather than of a fundamental character, and were due to fears and antipathies which . . . the Moslem and Arab leaders awakened and fostered for political needs." The majority of the Commission include among the immediate causes—in addition to the incidents in connection with the Wailing Wall, incendiary propaganda and exciting press articles—"the enlargement of the Jewish Agency." It is doubtful whether any of the murderers of Hebron and Safed, where half of the Jewish victims were killed, ever heard of the Jewish Agency and its enlargement. A more powerful motive was the primitive lust for loot, which is not mentioned; and a sinister factor, to which also no reference is made, was the part played by Communist agitators, one of whom, Hamdi el-Husseini, had been trained in Moscow.

VIII.

The Report makes a number of recommendations, some of which are urgently necessary, arising immediately out of the troubles themselves, whilst the others have little or nothing to

do with them. Two of the recommendations—namely, the appointment of a Special Commission to determine the rights and claims in connection with the Wailing Wall and the re-organization of the police—were promptly acted upon by the British Government. Others—such as the determining of the most suitable form of garrison, the improvement of the Intelligence Service, and the exercise of efficient control over the press, are likewise of great importance and should receive earnest consideration. But as for the other main recommendations—those in regard to issuing a statement of policy and to the immigration and land questions—they were clearly beyond the Commissioners' terms of reference. These matters were brought within the scope of the Inquiry by the Arabs for the purpose of improving their case, and the Commissioners fell in with their design, whereupon Lord Balfour, Mr. Lloyd George, and General Smuts—the three then surviving members of the War Cabinet responsible for the issue of the Balfour Declaration—addressed a letter to *The Times*, pointing out the limited terms of reference of the Shaw Commission, and suggesting that when they had reported they should be supplemented by a searching inquiry into the major questions of policy and administration. "Our pledge is unequivocal," wrote the members of the War Cabinet, "but in order to fulfil it in the letter and the spirit, a considerable readjustment of the administrative machinery is desirable." Instead of adopting this suggestion the British Government have preferred to despatch a special commissioner, Sir John Hope Simpson, to Palestine to report on the question of land, immigration, and settlement, thus showing that they have been impressed by a section of the Report which they had previously declared should not form part of it.

The plea which the majority of the Shaw Commission advance in favour of a reconsideration of the immigration and land problems, on the ground that the interests of the Arabs are injured by the present policy, is not supported by any objective and convincing proofs, but is based only on a recital of complaints. If it be urged that excessive immigration was one of the causes of the riots, then the outbreak should have taken place in 1925, when there was a record influx of 33,000, and not after the two years 1927 and 1928, in which there was an excess of 2,300 emigrants over immigrants. Moreover, the rate of immigration has always been strictly controlled by the Palestine Administration, which determines the number of persons to be admitted on

the Labour Schedule every six months, after a careful examination of the absorptive capacity of the country, and the newcomers are admitted on the undertaking of the Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency that they will not fall a burden on the Administration. The latest Report testifies that "no unemployed Jew became a direct charge on public funds."* The Administration is required by Article 6 of the Mandate to "facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions." But the Government have now decided, pending the completion of Sir John Simpson's report, to stop immigration. Although the High Commissioner, with the sanction of the Colonial Office, had given permission on May 12th for the admission of another 2,300 Jewish immigrants on the Labour Schedule for the period ending with September, this permission was cancelled by the Government only two days later. This action is manifestly prompted by political considerations, since the Government would not have previously authorized the issue of new immigration certificates without being satisfied as to their economic justification, and economic conditions in Palestine are much easier at present than during the past three years. It is clearly a consequence of the recommendation of the Commission, that "until such time as some form of representative government is established . . . non-Jewish interests in Palestine should be consulted" (p. 165). The Arab Delegation has demanded a stoppage of immigration, and the Government have yielded. But this surrender constitutes a violation of the Mandate.

The Commission were much impressed by the stories of an Arab landless proletariat, said to have been caused by the Jewish purchases of land, and seem to suggest that the existence of such a class also contributed to the outbreak. If that were the case, then at least some witnesses should have been produced who could state that they belonged to this proletariat and that they owed their condition to the Jewish incursion. But not a single witness was forthcoming to testify that he represented the "landless proletariat." And equally significant is the fact that of all the Arabs accused and adjudged guilty of attacks upon Jews and Jewish property, not a single one was able to urge by way of extenuation that he had been evicted from his holding by a Jew or that he had suffered in any other way through the settlement of Jews in Palestine. The Commission state that "Palestine

* *Government Report on Palestine for 1928*, p. 116.

cannot support a larger agricultural population than it at present carries unless methods of farming undergo a radical change," but they fail to draw the moral from the evidence of the colonist, Mr. Smilansky, which they cite. Mr. Smilansky told them that " Rehoboth, which to-day supports a population of 2,500 persons, was 38 years ago a waste area occupied by about a dozen Arabs. This extraordinary improvement has been effected by the introduction of machinery for providing an ample water supply, and by utilizing water so obtained for the growing of various kinds of fruit." Clearly, what Jewish colonists have successfully accomplished with rational methods in so many parts of Palestine, they will be able to do in others too. A careful examination recently made by Dr. Arthur Ruppin, who has twenty years' experience of agricultural colonization in Palestine, has shown that at least another 50,000 Jewish families can be settled in various districts. And this estimate takes no account of the vast fertile areas in Transjordan, from which Jews are at present excluded, but which lies open to all Arabs who may not find suitable holdings west of the Jordan.

IX.

The Commission recommend the issuing of a new statement which shall contain " a definition in clear and positive terms " of the meaning which the Government attach to the passages in the Mandate providing for " the safeguarding of the rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine." It is apparently desired that the new statement should even outdo that of 1922 in the direction of whittling down. The Commission seem to ignore the fact that the Mandate was conferred upon Great Britain in order that she should carry out the pledge given in the Balfour Declaration, and that the cardinal feature of the preamble of the Mandate consists of the text of that Declaration. They do not discuss to what extent the articles of the Mandate specifically relating to the establishment of the Jewish National Home have been observed or carried out by the Palestine Administration. They are solely concerned with " the safeguarding of the rights of the non-Jewish communities," or, in other words, of the Arabs. At the beginning of their conclusions the Commission tell us that the outbreak of last August opened with an attack by Arabs on Jews—" a vicious attack accompanied by wanton destruction

of Jewish property"—and at the end they plead for the safeguarding of the rights of the aggressors. Could any judgment be more illogical? Mr. Snell expressly dissociates himself from it. The view that the majority of the Commission entertain of the primary duty of the Palestine Government is "one of holding the balance between the two parties in that country." They base this view upon the White Paper of 1922, which, according to their reading, contained "no clear direction to assist either party in the fulfilment of their aspirations." This reading is fundamentally wrong, for the White Paper did not and could not purport to rescind the several positive obligations laid down in the Mandate in connection with the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home. In the questionnaire of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations which the British Government have to answer each year, the first question still continues to be:—

"What measures have been taken to place the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the National Home of the Jewish people? What are the effects of these measures?"

But the Government, by the actions they have taken in regard to the land and immigration problems, appear to be of the opinion that it is compatible with their obligations to impede the establishment of the Jewish National Home. The suspension of immigration is a manifest breach of Article 6 of the Mandate. General Smuts, who delivered an important speech in Johannesburg a few weeks ago on the situation in Palestine, said:—

"If Palestine is to be a National Home of the Jewish people, surely the implication is an active policy of Jewish immigration. How on earth is the country to become a home of the Jewish people if there is no active policy of immigration?"

There is also the question of constitutional reform, in regard to which Mr. Henderson has made a statement to the Council of the League of Nations, that the Government were at present engaged upon an examination of "the problem of devising means, within the framework of the Mandate, of satisfying the legitimate aspirations" of the Palestine Arabs. The statement sounds ominous. Hitherto it had been thought that the forces opposed to a sympathetic interpretation and application of the articles of

the Mandate existed only in the upper spheres of the Palestine Administration. It will be a source of grave disappointment and painful disillusion to the Jewish people throughout the world if it should be found that kindred forces are also active in the Colonial Office, and that the Government of the day are too weak to resist their unfriendly counsel. It will mean that policy is dictated by pogroms, that the Government allow themselves to be deflected by threats and violence from their clear duty of carrying out the terms of the Mandate. The next few months will show whether this reading is correct, or whether the Government are resolved to honour and fulfil the pledge which they assumed after the most mature deliberation, and which they proclaimed to the world as the solemn undertaking of a great Imperial Power.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. A. W. OKE, LL.M., F.G.S., from the Chair, called for a vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was accorded with acclamation.

Mr. E. R. P. MOON, M.A., objected that the lecturer had quoted the first part of the Balfour Declaration, relating to a National Home for the Jews in Palestine, but not the second part which related to the rights of other nations and religions. As Mr. Moon was unable to read, Mr. Cohen kindly passed the copy of the Declaration to the Hon. Secretary, who read the following words which come after the first part ". . . it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine."

Mr. Moon added that he thought that the Colonial Office was harder on the Arabs than on the Jews. The lecturer had stated that the percentage of Jews in the population of Palestine was 20 per cent. on which percentage it could hardly be surprising that the Government should spend a great deal more on non-Jewish schools than on Jewish schools—regarding which the lecturer had made complaint.

Rev. Dr. MORTON fully agreed with the previous speaker that we must keep in mind the proviso concerning other races in Palestine

and the holding of the scales of justice with evenness. None the less, he felt himself deeply indebted to Mr. Cohen for the lecture. He deplored the weakness we had shown in Palestine. For example, the Mufti had been black-listed by the Police, but our Commission of Inquiry actually paid him the special honour of going in a body to his residence to receive his evidence !

Zionism, perhaps, hardly comes within the purview of a Philosophical Society, but a question that is distinctly philosophical emerges in this discussion—namely, how far can “rights of tillage” be held to inhere in those who for centuries have shown themselves incapable of tillage ? He had motored in all parts of Palestine, and spent a good deal of time tramping the country, and had observed what the Arabs called “tillage.” For the most part, the Arab watchword is “Do as little as you can, and let what must be done be done by your wife as far as possible.” Arab tillage is a mere caricature of land-cultivation.

Surely no one can question that Judea is by right the land of the Jews ? And surely also no one can question that for Great Britain to lay down the Palestine Mandate would be to ruin our reputation for the next half century. Palestine has not cost the British tax-payer anything—neither in Civil Administration, nor in Military Occupation ; and for the last two years Palestine has even made a grant in order to cover any possible cost involved by British forces being in Palestine, instead of in some other part of the Empire. To retire would be to trample British prestige in the mud.

He hoped Mr. Cohen would tell them what steps are being taken to punish perpetrators of outrage. That eminent scholar, Harold M. Wiener, was in his motor car when the Arabs surrounded the car and demanded, “Who are you ?” He folded his arms and said quietly, “I am a Jew” ; and at once they shot him dead ! Are the murderers being brought to justice ? Again, he would like to know what provision had been made for the Arabs when an estate had been bought from Arab owners by Jews and the Arab cultivators are no longer required.

Mr. S. H. WILKINSON associated himself with others in expressing warm appreciation and admiration of the paper read by Mr. Israel Cohen. Proceeding he said : Mr. Cohen has not only

presented us with a multitude of data, but has provided us with the authorities for his statements ; and it makes his paper of peculiar value that we have chapter and verse for all that has been laid before us.

I fear there is some justification for his contention that the attitude of British officials in the Palestine administration has been adverse to Jewish interests ; but this is so contrary to the reputation of British officials, who, so far as my own personal experience goes, are generally not only gentlemen, but men of honour and justice, that we are obliged to inquire what particular reason there is for the bias against Jews which seems to be the characteristic of officials of the British administration in Palestine—especially the minor officials. Nothing has been said on this point ; and I am obliged to pass on information with which some may not agree, and which will possibly be painful for some to hear.

So far as my own inquiries on this subject elicited information, it would appear that the attitude of the younger members of the Zionist organizations in Jerusalem has been so uppish, so eager prematurely to take over the reins of power and to assert themselves as masters, that it has awakened in the British officials that bias which we all regret. We must, however, remember in common fairness, that we are judging a body of men, unheard. After all, the Balfour Declaration was very cautiously drafted, and to me conveys more of the impression of a pious emotion than of a binding treaty. In any case, its interpretation is a matter of judgment ; and before we condemn British policy or British administration, we must first ascertain what have been the difficulties along the path of those who have been entrusted for the present with responsibility.

We have had before us a question which has awakened matters not only of political and administrative interest, but also of spiritual, religious and moral issues. For the carrying out of the terms of the Mandate itself I have not the slightest misgiving. The British constitution is behind it, and the honourable tradition of British governments, whatever party they represent, to carry out the undertakings of their predecessors, is certain to be observed in this case. I could sooner believe that my feet would sink beneath the floor than that any British Government would fail to discharge the obligations it has undertaken in respect of the Mandate.

Mr. W. N. DELEVINGNE said : We all as Christians desire that Palestine should once more become the national home of the Jews, and we believe, in accordance with the prophecies we find in God's Word, that the Jews scattered throughout the world will one day be brought back to Palestine and, as a nation, be re-established in the land that belonged to their forefathers. That is God's purpose for His "chosen people," and it will assuredly come to fulfilment, whatever man may do to prevent it. But we do not know when that purpose will be ready for fulfilment, and I humbly urge that we should leave God to accomplish His purpose in His own way. I listened with great interest to the first part of the lecture, and the lucid and graphic account it gave of the progress that has been made in resettling Jews in Palestine—and of the efforts put forth by the Jews to reclaim the waste places of the land—and render fruitful what before was barren and unproductive. Their achievements have been wonderful, and we have to thank the lecturer for the trouble he has taken in setting the facts before us so vividly and in presenting his view of the political situation in Palestine.

When, however, we come to his remarks upon the conduct of the Government officers responsible for the administration of the country—and upon the Report of the Commission that was appointed to inquire into the causes of the recent outbreak between the Jews and the Arabs, we are on very debatable ground, and we should hesitate, I venture to say, before expressing concurrence with the lecturer's condemnation of the Report and the strictures he has passed on the attitude of Government officials during, and subsequently to, the outbreak. It is easy to accuse officers of the Government of bias and partiality, but we have not before us the evidence upon which the conclusions of the Commission are based, and, speaking as one who has had a good many years' judicial experience in India, I would emphasize the extreme difficulty, in view of the circumstances connected with the outbreak, of apportioning responsibility for it—and the impossibility of reviewing the decisions of the Commission or disproving their soundness without a careful examination of all the evidence.

It has been asserted that Palestine belongs to the Jews by right, and that the Arabs have no right to the country, but to argue in this way is futile : we might say with equal, if not greater, force that the

English have no right to India, and should not be there. The Jews—whatever their achievements in colonizing the land, are not ready to be entrusted with the administration of the country, even as the Indians (and I say it deliberately) are not yet ready to be entrusted with the government of India. Great Britain, we may rest assured, will fulfil to the letter all the obligations it has undertaken, whether as the Mandatory Power or in pursuance of the Declaration it made that it would assist the Jews by all legitimate means to establish a national home for themselves in Palestine. But the difficulties attending this policy are great, and as a Society we should, I think, beware of adding to those difficulties by attributing bias to the officers charged with the administration—or calling in question, without full acquaintance with the facts, the impartiality of the Commission appointed by our Government to inquire into the recent disorders in Palestine.

Mr. Hoste said: We have listened with sympathetic appreciation to the able case for the defence of Zionist interests in Palestine presented to us by Mr. Cohen. I yield to no one in my sympathy for the national aspirations of the Jewish people, which will, we may be sure, be fulfilled beyond the most optimistic hopes of the Zionists, as foretold in the prophets, but only in God's time. There will clearly be room for some divergence of opinion as to whether that time has actually arrived.

Naturally the secretary of the Zionist Organization was not here to present a dispassionate account of things in Palestine under the British Mandate, though we may be sure he has tried to give us a perfectly fair account from his point of view. He writes as an advocate, not as a judge, and though we as an Institute are in no way called to pose as judges, we cannot forget that there may be another side, as the Holy Scriptures put it—"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just: but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." Personally, I find it difficult to believe that the British Government officials are prejudiced against the Jews. These latter have, as Mr. Cohen has pointed out, large sums at their disposal, part of which is doubtless available for propaganda work. In this respect they have, I have heard it stated, a decided advantage over the rival races in Palestine, which, perhaps, would lead these officials to feel an added necessity to safeguard the interest of all.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

Mr. ISRAEL COHEN replied: I wish to express my acknowledgment of the vote of thanks which you have so cordially adopted, and also my appreciation of the careful attention and friendly criticism that you have bestowed upon my paper. I shall content myself by replying briefly to the main points in the discussion. I made no reference to the rights of the non-Jewish communities in Palestine, for the simple reason that those rights have not been affected in any way. The alleged grievances of the Arabs are purely fictitious: the fact is that their position, thanks to British administration and Jewish colonization, is exceedingly better to-day socially and economically than it was before the War. A number of those who took part in the attacks upon Jews have been arrested and tried and many have been punished, but by no means all those guilty have been brought to justice, owing to the difficulty of collecting reliable evidence, whilst, on the other hand, the political ring-leaders have escaped scot-free. With regard to the Arab cultivators who have had to leave lands acquired by Jews, they have in every case been given monetary compensation to enable them to acquire a holding elsewhere, and by far the great majority have done so, whilst the remaining few have found employment in towns. My criticism of some of the officials of the Palestine Administration is based on facts and knowledge gained over several years, and ample confirmation of my views will be found in the book, *Palestine To-Day and To-morrow*, recently published by an American clergyman, the Rev. John Haynes Holmes. As for my strictures on the Report of the Shaw Commission, they form only a small part of the volume of criticism that could be directed against the mode of procedure and the findings of the Commission, and that fuller criticism is contained in a special Memorandum which the Jewish Agency for Palestine is submitting to the Permanent Mandates Commission, and which will shortly be published.

738TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JUNE 16TH, 1930,
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 Leslie M. Hopkins, Esq., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Sir Ambrose Fleming, D.Sc., F.R.S., the President, to give the Annual Address on "Creation and Modern Cosmogony."

ANNUAL ADDRESS.

CREATION AND MODERN COSMOGONY.

By SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, F.R.S. (*President*).

I.—ASTRONOMICAL PROGRESS.

IN the last 30 or 40 years or more there have been vast additions to our knowledge of the structure of the Universe of Stars, and of the nature of those celestial bodies which appear to the eye merely as points of light on our nocturnal sky. This advance has been due to various instrumental achievements and to the progress generally of physics.

In the first place, it has been the result of great improvements in the optical arts, whereby we have been able to build immense telescopes with very great space-penetrating power.

In the next place, to the employment in connection with these telescopes of the photographic dry-plate in place of the human eye.

The eye does not see more or better by prolonged gazing through a telescope, but the impression on a photographic plate is cumulative and increases with the time of exposure.

Thus, a celestial object too faint to make any impression on a plate in a few minutes or even in an hour, will, after an exposure of several hours, reveal details or objects which never have been seen, nor can be seen, by the human eye even assisted by the most powerful telescopes in the world.

Then, further advances are the consequence of the association of photography with the spectroscope. When a ray of light from a star or from the sun is passed through a prism or wedge of glass, the white light is expanded into a rainbow-coloured band called a spectrum. Under proper conditions, this is seen to be crossed by many dark or bright lines or bands. This spectrum can be recorded on a photographic plate.

We have learnt by degrees to interpret the meaning of these lines. They are primarily due to the chemical nature of the incandescent substances which are emitting the light and heat of the star. But these lines tell us more than this. They inform us whether the star is moving to us or from us, and at what rate. They tell us the temperature and pressure in the star, and also can be employed in some cases to determine the distance of the star from us.

For the sake of those not familiar with the subject, it may be mentioned that there are two types of telescope in use.

One type, called a refractor, comprises a long metal tube having at the outer end an achromatic lens which collects the light and forms an image of the star at its focus. This image is then examined by other lenses forming a sort of microscope which is called the eye-piece. The cost of making large lenses is very great, because the glass must be without the least flaw, but object glasses nearly up to 3 feet 6 inches in diameter have been made and are in use. Such are the great Lick telescope (36 inches) at California, and the Yerkes telescope (40 inches) at Chicago, U.S.A.

The other type of telescope is called a reflector and collects the light of the star by means of a large concave mirror of glass or quartz, silvered on the surface. The image of the star formed by this mirror is examined with an eye-piece as in the case of a refractor.

In both cases the tube of the telescope is attached to an axis which lies in the direction of the Poles of the heavens, and this

axis is caused to rotate by a motor or by clockwork, so that when once a star has been brought into the field of view, it is kept there by the mechanism, which, as it were, nullifies the motion of rotation of the earth. This is called an equatorial mounting.

Hence, when a celestial object is brought into the centre of the field of view or on to a photographic plate, taking the place of the eye, the equatorial motion of the telescope keeps it there for hours at a time, if necessary.

The largest reflecting telescope in the world is at present at Mount Wilson Observatory in the United States of America. The mirror is 100 inches, or 8 feet 4 inches in diameter. But another of double the size, or 200 inches diameter, is being built for this observatory. Such a telescope will have one million times the light grasping power of the unassisted human eye.

2.—ASTRONOMICAL MEASUREMENTS.

When we look at the clear sky at night from hour to hour, we notice a general movement of all the stars over from east to west, which is due to the rotation of the earth. A careful examination of the sky reveals, however, that certain stars move slowly but irregularly relatively to the general number of the stars. These are called the Planets, *i.e.*, the Wanderers. The moon, in addition, appears to move over much more quickly from west to east, in addition to that diurnal motion of which it partakes in common with all the other stars and planets.

The great bulk of the stars, however, retain their positions apparently with respect to each other and are collected in groups called the constellations. These groups, such as Orion, the Great Bear, Cassiopeia, the Square of Pegasus, Andromeda, or the Pleiades have been known to man in the arrangements familiar to us for nearly 4,000 years and appear to retain their forms unchanged from age to age. In addition to these constellations, we notice on clear moonless nights a faint cloudy streak of light which stretches right across the sky and is known to us now as the Milky Way. This extends round the southern as well as northern hemisphere. The good eye can detect as well certain faint cloudy patches in Orion and Andromeda, which are called *nebulæ*.

It is usual to denote the stars in each constellation by the

letters of the Greek alphabet. Thus, the brightest star in the constellation of Orion is called *Alpha Orionis*, otherwise named *Betelgeuse*, whilst *Beta Ursæ Majoris* is the second brightest star in the Great Bear. In addition, we distinguish stars by their difference in apparent brightness. This is called their visual magnitude and is denoted by numbers which extend from 1 to 18 or more. A star of the 1st magnitude is just 2·512, or, say, two and a-half times as bright as a star of the 2nd magnitude, and so on for succeeding magnitudes. The good human eye can detect stars up to the 6th magnitude, which are only one-hundredth part as bright as the 1st magnitude stars. Since some stars, such as *Sirius*, are even brighter than the 1st magnitude, they are denoted by negative values. Thus, the magnitude of *Sirius* is — 1·58, whilst *Aldebaran* is just about the 1st magnitude. On this scale the magnitude of the sun is — 26·72. The apparent brightness of a star depends on its absolute brightness, or as we may say, on its candle-power, and on its distance. Thus, a faint star may be faint because it has small candle-power, or else because it is very far off. It is agreed that the absolute brightness of stars shall be measured by their apparent brightness if we were to suppose them all moved to the same distance from us, viz., about 200 billion miles. This distance is called 10 *Parsecs* or 32·6 *light-years*.

3.—THE DISTANCES OF THE STARS.

The problem, therefore, of determining the distances of the stars and their absolute brightness is fundamental in questions of cosmogony.

As regards near bodies like the Moon and some planets and even the nearer stars, the method adopted is that of trigonometrical surveying. When a surveyor requires to measure the distance, say, of a church far off, he measures off on the ground a base line, and observes with his theodolite the angles between this base line and the direction of the distant object at both ends of his base line. Then a simple calculation gives him the distance of the object.

In the same way the astronomer knows from the size of the earth the straight line distance, say, between the Greenwich and the Cape of Good Hope Observatories, and then by measuring simultaneously the angles between that line and the lines

to the centre of the Moon observed at both places he can calculate the distance of the Moon. Its mean value is 238,857 miles. This method is also applicable to the planets, but the distance of even the nearest of the so-called "fixed stars" makes it necessary to employ a much longer base line.

The earth in its annual motion round the Sun changes its position in space (if we disregard for the time the motion of the Sun itself through space) by a distance of about 186 million miles. By photographic observations taken, say, at Midsummer and Midwinter, we can detect the slight displacement of some stars with this change in position of the earth. This is called the star's *parallax*. From it we can calculate the distance of that star. By this method of surveying we have been able to find the parallax and distance of many stars. This was first accomplished in 1838. The distance of about 1,400 stars has been measured in this manner which are at distances from about 4 to 100 light-years or more. The distance called a *light-year* is the distance a ray of light would travel in a straight line in one year. It is equal to 6 million million miles. But beyond that last-named distance the parallax method, even used with the enormous base line of the diameter of the earth's orbit, fails us entirely. Nevertheless, two other methods have been found for plumbing the abyssmal depths of space. One of these is adapted for the greatest possible distance. It is as follows: In the northern sky there is a constellation called *Cepheus* and the fourth brightest star in it, called *Delta Cephei*, is peculiar in that its light is variable or pulsatory. It brightens up and then slowly fades away, the whole cycle taking 5 days 8 hours. There are many stars of this kind, called short-period variables, whose time of pulsation varies from 3 to 40 days. The apparent magnitude or brightness of these Cepheids has been measured. In 1912, Miss Leavitt, employed in the Harvard Observatory, U.S.A., noticed that there is a close connection between brightness and period of certain Cepheids, the brighter stars having the longer period.

The distance of some of these Cepheids, which occur in all parts of the sky, has been measured by the parallactic method. Hence, an American astronomer, Dr. Harlow Shapley, was able to determine a relation between the absolute brightness of these Cepheids and their distance. The very important outcome of this was that when we can measure the periodic time or time of waxing and waning of the light of a Cepheid star, we can tell

its distance at once. Since many globular clusters of stars and other constellations or nebulae have variable stars of the Cepheid type mixed up with them, these become plumb lines by which we can ascertain the distances of these objects even when their real distance is measured in thousands of light-years. Thus, by this method Shapley found that a certain globular cluster of stars in the constellation of the *Centaur* is at a distance of 22,000 light-years. Whilst another similar one is ten times that distance.

Hubble used the same method to determine the distance of the great nebula in *Andromeda*, which is just visible to the eye as a small faint misty patch of light, and he found it is at the stupendous distance of 950,000 light-years. Hence, the light by which we see it at present started on its immense journey through space nearly a million years ago, long, long before there was any human life on the surface of this earth at all.

Far outside the region of those stars which compose the Milky Way, also called "our galaxy," because our sun is a member of it, there are an enormous number of globular clusters of stars and nebulae which later, as we shall presently notice, are the birthplace of stars. Sir James Jeans, who is a great authority on this subject, tells us that the Mount Wilson 100-inch telescope shows us there are about two million of these clusters or nebulae, their average distance apart being about 2 million light-years and their distance from our solar system some 140 million light-years. The imagination falters in the effort to grasp the full meaning of these gigantic numbers or the stupendous scale on which we now know the Universe of stars is constructed.

There is another method of determining star distances which depends upon the relative intensity of certain lines in their spectra, but it would require rather more time to explain it than can be afforded at present. Suffice it to say that we have now at least three methods on which we can depend to give us a fairly correct estimate of the distances of the stars. The conclusion that comes out most clearly from all these facts is that vast as are the distances which separate the stars and great as the number of them is, they populate the infinity of space very sparsely. Large as some of these stars are in size, the empty intervals which separate them are even still larger. But before we enter on any description of the general arrangement of

stars in space, it will be best to consider first what the latest astronomical researches tell us about the nature and structure of the stars themselves.

4.—THE STRUCTURE OF A STAR.

One of the most remarkable of recent discoveries is that, broadly speaking, the stars may be divided into two classes which are called respectively *giants* and *dwarfs*. The giant stars are immense masses of rarefied gas, often hundreds of millions of miles in diameter and intensely hot, yet so expanded in bulk that they are not denser in many cases than the residual air in the interior of an incandescent electric lamp bulb which we call a high vacuum. The temperature at the surface of these masses of gas may rise to 15,000° C., or 20,000° C. or more, but at the centre, owing to the enormous compression, it reaches millions of degrees. The diameters of some of these giants have been measured by an instrument called an Interferometer, and it has been shown that for such giants as *Betelgeuse* or *Antares* the size is large enough to contain even the whole orbit of the earth or more, viz., over 200 to 400 million miles. Dr. Harlow Shapley considers, however, that in some distant clusters there are giant stars of over 1,000 million miles in diameter.

On the other hand, the dwarfs are of size comparable with that of our Sun or less, and have mean densities exceeding that of water. They contain at least in their outer layers numerous metals in a state of vapour, such as iron, sodium calcium and many others.

At the centre where the temperature reaches millions of degrees, the atoms are completely stripped of all their orbital electrons and the nuclei are compressed so as to give very great density to the material, though it still retains the property of a perfect gas, in that additional compression can squeeze these nuclei even still more closely together. At a certain level the state of the material in a star is such that it sends out a great proportion of eye-affecting radiation called light, of an infinite number of wave-lengths. This level of the star is called its photosphere, and when that light is examined with a spectroscope, we find present in it rays of every colour, forming a so-called continuous spectrum. Above the photosphere, though not sharply divided from it, there lies in stars resembling our Sun in structure a

layer of metallic vapours called the reversing layer, because it absorbs some rays of light from the photosphere and causes the continuous spectrum to be crossed by a multitude of black lines. Over this reversing layer is another layer of gases mostly hydrogen and helium which give rise to the red flames or prominences seen round the Sun's edge at a total Solar Eclipse. Beyond this Chromosphere is another more tenuous garment of our Sun called the Corona ; in part formed of very fine dust. Stars such as *Arcturus*, which are like our Sun in their general structure, are called Solar stars.

It has been found convenient to classify all the varieties of stars into certain groups distinguished by the letters O, B, A, F, G, K, M, N, and even to subdivide these classes into decimal fractions, such as G1, G2, etc., which mean 1/10th, 2/10ths, etc., on the way from G to K class.

The stars of the O class are noted for certain bright lines which cross their spectrum and they are called from their discoverers Wolf-Rayet Stars. Classes B and A are very large and hot stars of a bluish or white colour, and since the star Sirius or the Dog-Star belongs to this class they are called Sirian. Their spectra are characterized by black lines due to hydrogen and helium. Stars of classes F, G, and K are yellow stars like our Sun, and of lower surface temperature than Sirian stars. Stars of class M are red stars of still lower surface temperature, in fact, only red hot, and these M stars occur both as giants and dwarfs.

Stars of the yellow or Solar class have numerous black lines, due to metallic vapours in their spectra. All those stars are in rapid motion ; some moving towards and some away from the earth. Part of that motion is due to the fact that our Sun with all his attendant planets is moving approximately at 20 miles a second, but each star apart from this common apparent motion, due to the Sun's movement, has a proper motion of its own.

The radial star velocity, that is its motion to or from the earth, can be measured by a general shift of all the lines in its observed spectrum which is produced thereby. The curious fact has emerged that the hotter and larger stars of classes B and A are moving more slowly than the cooler and smaller stars of classes G and H. There is clear evidence that great groups of stars move together, the directions of these group motions being in some cases in opposite directions.

One of the remarkable facts connected with star structure is that the stars differ not only enormously in bulk as between giants and dwarfs and also in surface temperature, but also vary greatly in luminosity or candle-power, from a mere fraction of the Sun's candle-power to 20, 50 or even 1,000 or more times that of the sun. The most luminous star is *S. Doradus*, which emits 300,000 times the light of the sun, whilst the least luminous is called *Wolf 359*, and emits only one fifty-thousandth part of the Sun's light.

Yet, notwithstanding these differences, the stars are all very nearly of the same mass or weight. The stars seem to be made out of chunks of matter, not differing very greatly in mass, but differing immensely in bulk. Some are swollen giants like great balloons of very rarefied gases, and some are very small and dense, so that as much of their material as you could put into a match-box would on our Earth weigh a ton or more.

One fact that should be mentioned is that a large proportion of the stars are double, that is, consist of two stars which revolve round their common centre of gravity.

Before discussing the general arrangement of stars in space, it is necessary to mention some important facts connected with the so-called nebulae. As soon as large telescopes began to be made it was discovered that many wisps of filmy light like the Milky Way were seen to be made up of countless millions of stars. Hence, the opinion grew up that with sufficient telescopic power all such nebulae would be revolved into stars. But that is not the case. The application of the spectroscope to the telescope by Huggins first showed that many nebulae were glowing masses of gas, because their spectra consisted of only bright lines. These nebulae exhibit themselves in all parts of the sky in different forms. There are first, the so-called planetary nebulae which are more or less spherical and often have a star at the centre. Then there are irregular masses of gas; and some of these are self-luminous and some more or less dark.

Outside of the Milky Way and far beyond the region occupied by it, we find, however, innumerable nebulae of spiral form, which are generally thought to be the birthplace of stars; not of one star, but of multitudes in a group. We are able, as it were, to trace the mode of development of their spiral nebulae stage by stage.

If a mass of gas were isolated in space without rotation, it

would assume a spherical form. If it rotates it would be compressed at the poles and stretched out at the equator into a bun or lens-shaped mass. As such a mass radiates at the surface it would contract, and as it contracts, its speed of rotation would increase, and at the same time it would become hotter at the centre. Then various actions might cause streamers of gas to be thrown off at the equator and these would be folded round the central part in spiral arms. We see such nebulae sometimes edgewise, like flat disks, but in some cases, when viewed in the direction of the axis of rotation, we see the spiral form well developed, as in the great nebula in the constellation of the Hunting Dogs (*Canes Venatici*).

As the arms of such a spiral nebulae stretch and cool, they would break up, as Sir James Jeans has shown, into discrete masses, each one of which might become a star.

5.—THE STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSE.

One of the great objects which the eminent astronomer, Sir William Herschel, held before himself in all his observations was the discovery of the structure of the Universe, that is the general arrangements in space of that enormous multitude of stars visible in the telescope. He had no means of measuring, as we can do, the distance of these stars, but he managed by indirect means to anticipate some modern conclusions on the subject.

Broadly speaking, the Universe appears to be composed of an immense number of more or less isolated galaxies or immense groups of stars in rotation, some of which are in a more advanced condition of development than others. The main mass to which we give the name "our galaxy," because it contains the group including our solar system, appears to be composed of a number of such clusters, which have been drawn together by their mutual gravitation, whilst other outlying galaxies which are called "island Universes" lie far remote from our galaxy. This last or main mass of the stars is collected into a galaxy, which is lens-shaped or like a bun in form, that is, roughly, circular, but thicker in the middle than at the edges, and various estimates of the dimensions seem to show that it may be about 300,000 light-years in diameter and 4,000 light-years in thickness at the centre.

It may possibly contain some 30,000 million stars, some giants, but most of them more or less dwarfs. Then, far away, and in the space above and below this disc of stars, are the spiral nebulae and clusters without number which are individually separate galaxies in process of creation.

The idea which we thus obtain of the grandeur and magnitude of the stellar Universe is one which far transcends any of our previous conceptions. The old Ptolemaic, or geocentric, astronomy which made the earth the centre of the Universe, was replaced 300 years or more ago by the Copernican or Heliocentre theory, which transferred the centre to the Sun, but our modern cosmogony makes a far greater step forward and lifts us into a position in which we see our Sun and all its attendant planets as a mere insignificant speck of matter amongst an infinity of stars.

A question which is very closely related to the structure is the age of these stars we see. Here we enter a region of investigation which is much more difficult, and, to a large extent, more speculative than the question of arrangement or size. Yet, even here observation and calculation have been able to give some help. We know that in a gas, our atmosphere for example, the molecules or atoms are moving in all possible directions and with all possible speeds, some fast, some slow, and colliding with each other continually. As far back as 1869, Clerk Maxwell showed by mathematical reasoning that the result of these collisions would be that after a certain time all the molecules would have the same energy of motion. It is measured by the product of their mass and half the square of their respective velocities. This is called the Law of Equipartition of Energy. We can also calculate how long it would take for the equipartition to be reached.

Sir James Jeans has applied the same kind of calculation to the stars. We have stars of very various known masses and velocities and we can, therefore, calculate their energy of motion. When this is done we find that they have very nearly identical energy. The heavy stars move more slowly than the lighter stars.

If we ask how has this equipartition been brought about, the answer is by the mutual gravitation or pull the stars exert on each other. The next and most important question is: How long has it taken to produce this equality, assuming that the stars have been left undisturbed except by their mutual gravitation? The answer Sir James Jeans gives is: From 5 to

10 million million years. Nearly the same result is arrived at by two other lines of reasoning, and the result is to give us something like the same age roughly determined. Hence, we see that in comparison with these vast periods of time all durations with which we are concerned in human history are about in the same ratio as fifty years are to a single second of time, or an average human life to a single tick of a clock.

One more point remains to be mentioned which is intimately connected with the structure of stars, and this is the source of their Light and Heat.

There has been much discussion in the past on the source of the Sun's Heat and Light. The Sun cannot be merely an incandescent ball left to cool or else it would long ago have become a cold and inert mass. At one time it was supposed to be supplied with energy by meteorites falling into it, and later on its heat was supposed to be maintained by a gradual shrinkage in size. But neither of these sources would supply its heat for the required time. From each square inch of its surface our Sun sends out heat enough to keep a 50-horse-power engine continually at work.

The new knowledge on atomic structure has, however, supplied the key to the mystery. The chemical atom is built up of a nucleus composed of far smaller atoms of positive electricity called protons and of negative electricity called electrons. Owing to the exquisitely small size of these electric atoms a direct collision between protons and electrons is very infrequent. But it does sometimes happen, and then the proton and electron colliding disappear as Matter and produce a flash of Radiation which may pass into the form of Light and Heat. The masses of the sun and stars are thus melting away into their Radiation. Our Sun loses every minute 250 million tons of its mass to supply the light and heat radiated by it. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the stars in the early stages of development have on the average more mass than older stars. The old ones have wasted part of themselves to supply the light by which they are seen.

Matter and radiant energy are thus different aspects of the same entity. Matter can be converted into radiation spontaneously, but we have no knowledge that the reverse effect can take place. If not, then the material Universe is slowly vanishing away, and more, this fact shows us there must have been a beginning to it in an Act of Creation.

6.—COSMOGONY.

By this term is meant the processes or stages by which the Cosmos, that is the whole entirety of the material Universe, has arrived at its present condition and form. These processes as far as we can fathom them may certainly become the subject of scientific enquiry, just as are those by which an animal or a plant is developed from a minute germ or a seed.

The view has been held by many philosophers that if we could go back far enough in the history of the stars we should find an origin in a universally-diffused and rarefied material or medium.

After Newton had enunciated his law of gravitation, Bentley, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, asked him if the force of gravitation would account for the concentration of such diffused matter into stars. Newton replied that if the amount of the original fluid or material was finite, it would collect itself into a single sphere. If it was infinite in amount, it would segregate itself into an infinite number of spheres. But there are good reasons for the belief that the amount of matter in the Universe is not infinite, and Einstein has furnished some arguments for the opinion that space itself is not infinite in volume, though it may be unbounded in the same sense the surface of a sphere is limited but unbounded.

In his remarkable book, *The Universe Around Us*, Sir James Jeans has expounded in detail the possible process of star development. He has shown that such a universal and uniform gaseous mass would be in unstable equilibrium, and that if from any cause such an unequal cooling, condensations above a certain size were produced, this would result in the break up or segregation of the whole into parts. In short, it would tend to break up into portions of about equal mass and the mathematical discussion shows that these masses would be about of the order of those of the spiral nebula and these, in turn, would give birth to clusters or large groups of stars. The full details of the process or the proof of it are far too long to repeat here. These star groups would in certain cases draw each other together by their mutual attraction, and aggregation may have given form to the Milky Way or our own galaxy.

Jeans shows in a very striking way the manner in which the rare event of the near approach of two stars might give rise to immense tidal waves in each, drawing out long streamers

of gas which would ultimately form a system of planets. He thinks that in this manner the system of planets surrounding our Sun, including our earth, may have been formed.

Whether there are any other planets or worlds suitable for habitation by such beings as ourselves, we have no means of discovering. The stars themselves are all too high a temperature to permit the existence on them of material bodies such as ours, which can only live within narrow limits of temperature. But there may be planets circulating round other solar stars, which planets may be like our earth and suitable for physical life such as ours.

On all these questions our ignorance is complete, and it is vain to speculate as to the ultimate end and object of that innumerable multitude of worlds without end which are scattered like dust through the infinity of space.

7.—CREATION.

The view that our modern astronomy thus compels us to take of the awe-inspiring size and immense age of the stellar Universe is one which some have held to be inconsistent with the idea of Creation in any sense of the word as generally understood. In the light of this new knowledge some have asserted that all human affairs seem to shrivel up into insignificance and to become mere transitory phenomena on one of the smaller planets revolving round a star of no particular size. But this is altogether a mistaken idea. Spiritual values have no connection with physical size or duration. This small globe on which we live may yet be the arena and place of events of unspeakable importance, not merely to the family of mankind, but possibly also to great, yet unseen, intelligences who have cognizance of them in regions far above this mortal state.

The objection that so many now take to the word Creation seems to arise from an imperfect definition of it, namely, that it necessarily implies making something out of nothing instantaneously. The proper signification of it is that the visible and tangible material Universe has not existed from all infinite past time, nor has reached its present state by automatic impersonal agencies, but has had its origin in the Will and Purpose of a Supreme Intelligence, Infinite in Wisdom and unlimited in Power, which seems to have been manifested or exerted in

gradual stages. This, however, need not necessarily involve any abolition of the law of causation nor of the absence of stages or steps on the way to perfection.

Creation is none the less Creation, even if the slow development of the stellar Universe from some primordial nebula is the direct and necessary consequence of the properties of the atoms of which it is composed. The atom itself is then the true wonder, and it is essentially stamped in its structure with overwhelming evidence of adaptation and design.

We have clear proof along three lines that the physical universe cannot have existed from infinite past time, but must have had a beginning in a creative act. These lines, briefly, are the irreversible and spontaneous transformation of radioactive matter into non-radioactive matter. Next, the similar transformation of matter into radiant energy, and, thirdly, from the diffusion of heat, so as to produce finally equality of temperature in all material substances.

Matter and energy are, therefore, not self-produced, but imply and demand a creative act in their origination. We know nothing about the processes by which mind or spirit can express itself as matter, but the borderland between the two realities may not be sharply marked. Nevertheless, all order, numerical relations and adaptation or step-by-step advance, involving classification require thought and intelligence on our part to apprehend them, and therefore demand thought in an infinite mind to produce them.

The Universe exhibits in all its parts thought, and that necessitates a Supreme Intelligence. The highest scientific investigation is therefore not atheistic, but its last word on the subject of beginnings agrees with the first word of Revelation that "In the beginning (Heb., *Bereshith*) God created the heaven and the earth." Much futile controversy has taken place in former days concerning the degree of scientific accuracy of the Genesis account of Creation. It has been futile, because it was not always recognized that the Biblical narrative is not expressed in language solely appropriate to one age or one class of mankind, but conveys its insistent and important lessons in words which are true for all ages, and appeal to every branch of the human race. Its lessons are mainly spiritual, not scientific, and are true because they convey truth, though not in the vocabulary of this scientific age. If we compare it, for instance, with the early efforts of the unassisted human mind to penetrate

into the origin of all things, we see at once how incomparably superior is the Biblical record.

Between the years 1848 and 1876 numerous clay tablets, inscribed in cuneiform characters, were discovered in the ruins of the palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh, and deciphered by Sir A. H. Layard, Hormuzd Rassam, and George Smith. Amongst them were found certain tablets, seven in number, identified by George Smith to be Babylonian legends of the Creation.*

At one time some persons supposed we had in these Babylonian legends the source of the Hebrew Cosmology. But the slightest comparison between the two shows the astonishing difference between them. The Babylonian creation story is merely an allegorical description of the contest between Light and Darkness, Order and Chaos. The story is one of struggle between imaginary gods and demons. The gods are deifications of the Sun, Moon, and planets. The demons of darkness and evil. It is characterized throughout by a debasing polytheism and demonism, and never rises above the level of thought engendered by the worship of astronomical bodies, the irregular movements of which across the sky caused them to be considered as living beings. There is no trace of the pure and elevating Monotheism of the Mosaic record, nor of creation by definite stages of the material world.

The Genesis narrative has been criticized as being entirely geocentric and, therefore, antiquated in idea. If, however, we take certain words in an enlarged and quite permissible general meaning, it is at once seen to be consistent with our scientific discoveries, as far as these are fact. The words "heaven" and "earth," in verse 1, may be taken as meaning the whole of the invisible or spiritual world and the whole of the visible or material universe. The word "light," of verse 2, may be taken to mean radiation of any wave-length and not merely that single octave of it which affects our eyes. In the same way the word "day," of verse 5, and the following, may be understood to be an unstated and perhaps prolonged period of time.

On this point I sought the advice of our honoured Vice-President, Dr. Thirtle, and he tells me that the Hebrew word *Yôm* (= day) is susceptible of three meanings, just as in the case of our English word "*day*," or the Latin "*dies*," or the Greek "*hemera*."

* An illustrated pamphlet describing them and giving a translation can be obtained at the British Museum Bookstall, price 1s. 6d.

It may mean the period of daylight as opposed to night, or it may mean the astronomical day of 24 hours, or it may mean an undefined period of time, as in such expressions the "day of the Lord," or the "day of Jesus Christ." The particular meaning has to be decided by the context. There is nothing which does violence to the essential teaching of Genesis i, if we take the word "day" to be an indefinite and perhaps very prolonged period of time.

In this sense the word is used merely to state that the Creation of the material world proceeded in stages of time, marked by increasing complexity and perfection, and in alternating periods of activity and repose. It was crowned by the advent of an intelligent being, Man, possessed of the power of free choice and made in the image of God in the sense that he had faculties which were a faint copy of some of those of his Creator which enabled him in some degree to comprehend His Works and to glorify Him for them.

The scientific study alone of those works as they at present exist can never give us true information as to their origin. For this we need a Revelation, such as is given us in the Scriptures of Truth and from them, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. xi, 3).

Sir Isaac Newton concludes his epoch-making book, the *Principia*, allowed to be one of the greatest productions of the human mind, with a Scholium or Appendix, in which he declares his conviction that the whole diversity of natural things can have arisen from nothing but the Ideas and Will of a Being necessarily existing, Supreme and most Perfect in all His works.

Countless others who, like Newton, have been students of the wonders displayed to us in the material Universe, have followed him also in asserting them to be, not the result of an impersonal Evolution, but the Creation of the Everlasting God.

On the call of the CHAIRMAN, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Sir Ambrose for his address.