

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. LXXVII

1945



LIEUT.-COLONEL T. C. SKINNER,
HONORARY SECRETARY, 1931-1945

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

VOL. LXXVII
1945



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HARRISON AND SONS, LTD.,
PRINTERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING,
44-47, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
REPORT OF COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1944....	vii
THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, JUNE 25th, 1945	xv
THE PLACE OF INTELLECT IN THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. BY THE REV. J. W. WENHAM, M.A., B.D., R.A.F.V.R.	1
<i>Communications.</i> —Dr. H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., E. J. G. TITTERINGTON, Ninian Lewis, A. McDonald Redwood, Everard Jose, Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies	12
THE MEDICAL MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. BY H. J. ORR-EWING, M.C., M.D., B.S., F.R.C.P.	19
<i>Communications.</i> —Dr. H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Arnold S. Aldis, M.B., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., Jas. B. Nicholson, Elliot FitzGibbon	27
ANTI-SEMITISM: ITS CAUSES, PALLIATIVES AND CURE. BY THE REV. CHARLES FISHER, M.A.	32
<i>Communications.</i> —Sir. Wyndham Deedes, C.M.G., D.S.O., Dr. Norman Bentwich, O.B.E., M.C., LL.D., Leslie I. Moses, E. H. Betts, B.Sc., Dr. Paul Levertoff, D.D., Ph.D., Mr. Douglas Dewar, B.A., Stanley B. James, Sir Edward Spears, K.B.E., C.B., M.C., M.P., Dr. H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., W. E. Leslie	46
MODERN SCIENCE AND THE NATURE OF LIFE. BY R. E. D. CLARK, M.A., Ph.D.	60
<i>Discussion.</i> —Professor R. O. Kapp	70
<i>Communications.</i> —Dr. H. Martin Cundy, M.A., Ph.D., Dr. L. Richmond Wheeler, Ph.D., M.Sc., F.L.S., Dr. Julian S. Huxley, E. J. G. Titterington, Dr. F. T. Farmer, Walter Powell, Rev. A. W. Payne	73
THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF DIVINE REVELATION. BY THE REV. G. W. BROMILEY, M.A., Ph.D.	81
<i>Communications.</i> —The Rev. Principal P. W. Evans, B.A., D.D., Rev. Alexander Fraser	95

	PAGE
ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By AIR COMMODORE P. J. WISEMAN, C.B.E., R.A.F.	101
<i>Discussion</i> —Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., F.B.A. D.Litt., LL.D., Dr. Hart Davies, Mr. Charles Tresise, Rev. A. W. Payne	111
<i>Communication</i> :— Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A.	114
THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D.	116
<i>Discussion</i> :—F. F. Bruce, Esq., M.A., The Rev. G. R. Beasley- Murray, B.D., Wing Commander F. Anderson, G. J. E. Askew, Rev. A. W. Payne	125
<i>Communications</i> :—The Rev. Dr. Cawley, Brig-Gen. H. Biddulph, Major H. B. Clarke	129
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS. By SIR CHARLES MARSTON, F.S.A. "THE BIBLE AND PRESENT-DAY DEVELOPMENTS"	132
<i>Remarks by the Chairman</i> —Air Commodore Wiseman, C.B.E.	142
LIST OF FELLOWS, MEMBERS, ASSOCIATES, ETC.	145
CONTENTS OF THE LAST THIRTY-THREE VOLUMES	166
OBJECTS, CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS	180

* * The object of the Institute being to investigate, it must not be held to endorse the various views expressed either in the papers or in the discussions.

VICTORIA INSTITUTE

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1944.

READ AT THE

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, JUNE 25TH, 1945.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council submit with pleasure the Seventy-Eighth Annual Report marking eighty years continuous work of the Society. The twelve months under review have been difficult, but with the prospect of peaceful years to come, they hope to recover, and even to improve upon, the best traditions of earlier years. Once more they take occasion to offer to the Authors and others who have contributed to the Transactions their best thanks.

2. *Meetings.*

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold Ordinary Meetings in January, February and March, the first three papers of the Session were circulated to subscribers and discussed by written communication. Four Ordinary Meetings were then held.

(Circulated and published.)

“ Evolution and Entropy,” by E. H. BETTS, Esq., B.Sc. (being the Langhorne Orchard Essay, 1942—2nd Prize).

“ Kierkegaard’s Message to Our Age,” by M. CHANING-PEARCE, Esq., M.A.

“ Current Theories of Special Creation,” by D. DEWAR, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S.

(Read and published.)

“The Philosophy of Religion,” by The Rev. E. W. HADWEN,
M.A., L.Th., B.D.

Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., in the Chair.

“Christianity and Marxism,” by The Rev. D. R. DAVIES.

R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., in the Chair.

“The Contribution of the Sciences to Religious Thought,” by
E. H. BETTS, Esq., B.Sc. (being the Gunning Prize Essay,
1943).

F. T. Farmer, Esq., B.Sc., Ph.D., in the Chair.

“Positive Conclusions of Biblical Archæology,” by SIR CHARLES
MARSTON, J.P., F.S.A. (Presidential Address.)

Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., in the Chair.

3. *Council and Officers.*

The following is a list of the Council and Officers for the year
1944 :—

President.

Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A.

Vice-Presidents.

(Limited to seven.)

Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.

A. W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S.

Prof. A. Rendle Short, M.B., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S.

Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A

W. Bell Dawson, Esq., M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.C.

Trustees.

Alfred W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S.

Robert F. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D.

Wilson F. Leslie, Esq.

Council.

(Limited to Twenty-four.)

(In Order of Original Election.)

A. W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S.	Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc., late R.A., F.G.S., F.R.S.E.
Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.	Wilson E. Leslie, Esq.
Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R. Met.S.	Percy O. Ruoff, Esq.
Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D.	Robert E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D.
Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S.	Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.I., R.A.F.
	Prof. S. Nevin, M.D., B.Sc., M.R.C.P.

Honorary Officers.

Wilson E. Leslie, Esq., <i>Treasurer.</i>
Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S., <i>Secretary.</i>
Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., <i>Editor.</i>
Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E., <i>Papers Secretary.</i>

Auditors.

Messrs. Luff, Smith & Co., *Incorporated Accountants.*

Assistant Secretary.

L. L. M. E. Malcolm-Ellis.

4. *Election of Officers.*

In accordance with the Rules the following Members of the Council retire by rotation: Lt.-Col. T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S., Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S., Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., of whom the first and third offer (and are nominated by the Council) for re-election.

The following co-options, to fill vacancies in the Council under Rule 3 of the Constitution, are submitted for confirmation, viz.: Rev. Charles T. Cook, Ernest White, Esq., M.B., B.S., Oliver R. Barclay, Esq., M.A., Ph.D.

Trustees.—The Annual General Meeting of May 22nd, 1944, having appointed as Trustees the Chairman of Council, the Honorary Treasurer and the Honorary Secretary (all for the time being), the surviving Trustee under earlier appointment, R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., relinquishes the office at his own request.

The Auditors, Messrs. Luff, Smith & Co., Incorporated Accountants, offer, and are nominated by the Council, for re-election as auditors for the ensuing year, at a fee of five guineas.

5. *Obituary.*

The Council regrets to announce the deaths of the following Fellows, Members and Associates:—

Miss Mary R. Strange, Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., R.E. (Vice-President),
Rev. H. T. Rush, W. Bell Dawson, Esq., M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.C.

(Vice-President), Lt.-Col. A. H. C. Kenney-Herbert, Lt.-Commander J. P. Hunt, R.N., Mrs. R. Duncan, Rev. G. Wales King, Rev. Prof. E. McCrady, D.D.

6. *New Fellows, Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Fellows, Members and Associates up to the end of 1944:—

FELLOWS: Wilfred J. Wiseman, Esq., C. H. G. Carver, Esq., A.M.I.Mech.E., F.Ph.S.Eng., R. W. Pinchback, Esq., F. W. Martin, Esq., A. E. Mills, Esq., Rev. W. A. French, Neil Highton, Esq., M.A., A.M.I.Mech.E., Wing Commander F. Anderson, R.A.F., Rev. A. W. Morton, M.A., A. E. Coombe, Esq., S. P. Cully, Esq., G. E. Askew, Esq., F.Ph.S.Eng., Charles Tresise, Esq., Arthur Pool, Esq., M.B., M.R.C.S., M.R.C.P., D.P.M. (Life Fellow), Arnold S. Aldis, Esq., M.B., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., F. T. Farmer, Esq., B.Sc., Ph.D. (Life Fellow), S. F. Olford, Esq., F.R.G.S.

MEMBERS: Frank Brewin, Esq., M.A., Samuel Milner, Esq., Franklin S. Harris, Esq., Jr., A.B., M.A., Ph.D., F. Alton Everest, Esq., B.Sc., L. H. Bunker, Esq., F. R. Dain, Esq., M.A., Rev. J. Graham Miller, LL.B., A. W. Young, Esq., F.Z.S., Rev. E. C. Ettman, J. R. Halliday, Esq., M.D., Rev. R. F. Hettlinger, B.A., Rev. C. G. Swann, M.C., M.A., Rev. H. A. Needham, Rev. J. E. H. Wood, M.A., W. F. Freeman, Esq., Rev. J. Price Williams, M.A., J. R. Casswell, Esq., B.A., W. H. Vernon, Esq., Paymaster Lieut. W. H. Jemphrey, R.N.V.R., D. A. B. Owen, Esq., A. Vale, Esq., F.B.O.A., M.P.S., Dr. N. C. Deck, Pastor K. Bounds, Miss E. Chave Jones, B.A., Miss M. A. W. Roberts, S.T.A.C. Ox., Ralph J. Ford, Esq., John Binning, Esq.

ASSOCIATES: Kenneth Neville Taylor, Esq., Rev. F. W. Hopkins, Rev. J. G. L. Wedge, B.A., Rev. R. H. B. Braithwaite, B.A., Miss M. E. Orme, Alexander Stewart, Esq., Moody Bible Institute of Chicago (Library Associate), Lt. D. B. Thompson, R.A., B.A., Rev. A. Colledge, C.F., Kenneth N. Taylor, Esq., B.S., M.Th., O. S. Papps, Esq., Paul Faunch, Esq., L.T.C.L., M.R.S.T., L.T.S.C., Toronto Bible College (Library Associate).

7. *Membership.*

Life Fellows	19
Annual Fellows	111
Life Members	28
Annual Members	256
Associates	78
Library Associates	43
Total Nominal Membership				535

8. *Donations.*

Chas. J. Young, Esq., 15s. ; S. H. Flook, Esq., £1 1s. ; Rev. H. T. Rush, £2 17s. ; Conway Ross, Esq., £1 1s. ; Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, £1 18s. ; F. Junkison, Esq., 3s. ; J. McKellar, Esq., £1 ; Prof. Glen

Gates Cole, 15s. 6d. ; Dr. H. H. P. Clark, £1 14s. ; S. H. Flook, Esq., 13s. ; H. H. Goodwin, Esq., £2 2s. ; Dr. Barcroft Anderson, £20 ; Kenneth N. Taylor, Esq., 6s. ; D. E. Prismall, Esq., 4s. 6d. ; John W. Laing, Esq., £10 ; J. A. MacGregor, Esq., 5s. ; Chas. J. Young, Esq. 6s. Total, £45 1s.

9. *Finance.*

It will be seen from the Balance Sheet and Accounts accompanying this Report that the Income for the year 1944 was very nearly sufficient to meet the Expenditure of the year. It is the earnest hope of the Council that the rising membership will eventually result in a surplus of income over expenditure so that the adverse balance accumulated in past years may be disposed of.

The Council offer their humble thanks to God for enabling them to maintain the witness of the Institute throughout another year.

P. J. WISEMAN,

Chairman.

BALANCE SHEET, 31st DECEMBER, 1944

LIABILITIES.				ASSETS.			
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID IN ADVANCE				9	9	0	CASH AT BANK :—
SUNDRY CREDITORS FOR EXPENSES				157	12	4	Current Account
LIFE SUBSCRIPTIONS :—							202 0 10
Balance at 1st January, 1944	350	0	0				“Gunning” Prize Account
Additions	53	9	0				52 17 8
				403	9	0	“Langhorne Orchard” Account
<i>Less</i> Amount carried to Income and Expenditure Account	9	9	0				18 8 0
							“Craig Memorial Trust” Account
“GUNNING” FUND (<i>per contra</i>)				508	0	0	13 3 4
Balance at 1st January, 1944	40	16	3				286 9 10
Add Dividends and Interest received	23	16	11				21 0 9
				64	13	2	INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS RECEIVABLE
“LANGHORNE ORCHARD” FUND (<i>per contra</i>)							
Balance at 1st January, 1944	13	15	7				SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ARREARS :—
Add Dividends and Interest received	9	3	0				Estimated to produce
				22	18	7	93 8 0
“SCHOFIELD MEMORIAL” FUND (<i>per contra</i>)				220	0	0	INVESTMENTS (AT COST) :—
Dividends received	9	9	4				“Gunning” Fund :—
<i>Less</i> Prize and Expenses	9	9	4				£673 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock
							508 0 0
							“Langhorne Orchard” Fund :—
							£258 18s. 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock
							200 0 0
							“Schofield Memorial” Fund :—
							£378 14s. 6d. 2½ per cent. Consolidated Stock
							220 0 0
							“Craig Memorial Trust” Fund :—
							£376 7s. 4d. War Stock 3½ per cent.
							400 0 0
							1,328 0 0

" CRAIG MEMORIAL TRUST " (per contra)

400 0 0

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT :—

Balance at 1st January, 1944 267 19 4

Add Excess of Expenditure over Income
for the year 1944 24 16 2

292 15 6

Deduct :—

Donations received 45 1 0

247 14 6

£1,976 13 1

£1,976 13 1

We report to the members of the Victoria Institute that we have audited the foregoing Balance Sheet dated 31st December, 1944, and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required. We have verified the Cash Balances and Investments. No valuation of Furniture, Library or Tracts in hand has been taken. In our opinion the Balance Sheet is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the affairs of the Institute according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Institute.

(Signed) LUFF, SMITH & CO.,
Incorporated Accountants.

Drayton House,
Gordon Street,
London, W.C.1.
12th May, 1945.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE
VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JUNE 25TH, 1945, AT 4.30 P.M.

THE PRESIDENT, SIR CHARLES MARSTON, J.P., F.S.A.,
IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 22nd were read, confirmed and signed.

In reading the obituary list for the year under review, the Hon. Secretary announced also the death of Sir Ambrose Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., former President of the Victoria Institute, and asked the audience to stand in silence for a few moments in commemoration.

It was also announced that a copy of Sir Ambrose Fleming's Will had been received from Messrs. Baxter and Co., Solicitors, saying that after certain legacies, the life rent of the residue to the widow and certain further legacies had been paid, the ultimate residue was to be divided into five equal parts of which the first was to be paid to the Victoria Institute.

The *First Resolution* as under was read and explained, the Chairman then calling on Major H. B. CLARKE to propose and Brigadier N. M. McLEOD to second it :—

“ That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1944 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.”

The Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The *Second Resolution* as under was proposed by Mr. W. E. LESLIE and seconded by Mr. P. O. RUOFF:—

“That Lieut.-Colonel T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S., Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S., and Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., R.A.F., retiring members of Council, be, and hereby are, re-elected. Also that the several appointments to the Council of the Rev. Charles T. Cook, Ernest White, Esq., M.B., B.E., and Oliver R. Barclay, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., co-opted during the current year to fill vacancies, under Rule 3 of the Constitution, be, and hereby are confirmed.”

“Also that Messrs. Luff, Smith & Co., Incorporated Accountants, Drayton House, Gordon Street, W.C.1., be, and hereby are, re-elected Auditors, at a fee of five guineas.”

The Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously

The *Third Resolution* as under was proposed by Air Commodore WISEMAN, C.B.E., and seconded by the Rev. A. W. PAYNE:—

“That the President, Sir Charles Marston, J.P., F.S.A., the Vice-Presidents, Prof. A. Rendle Short, M.B., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., the Hon. Treasurer W. E. Leslie, Esq., the Hon. Secretary, Lieut.-Colonel T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S., and the Hon. Editor, Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., be, and hereby are, re-elected to their offices.”

The Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The *Fourth Resolution* as under was proposed by Mr. E. LUFF-SMITH and seconded by R. MACGREGOR, Esq. :—

“That the Chairman of the Council, the Honorary Treasurer, and the Honorary Secretary (all for the time being), having been appointed Trustees by the Annual Meeting of May 22nd, 1944, and empowered to carry out all duties that devolve upon the Trustees under Rule 18, of the Constitution, R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., and W. E. Leslie, Esq., surviving Trustees under earlier appointment, be, and hereby are, released from their appointments.”

The Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The *Fifth Resolution* as under was proposed by Air Commo-
dore WISEMAN, C.B.E., and seconded by Mr. RUOFF:—

“That the Meeting records its appreciation of the work of
Lieut.-Colonel T. C. Skinner as Hon. Secretary.”

This was carried with acclamation.

The Hon. Secretary then announced Prof. C. F. H. Henry,
M.A., Th.D., as winner of the Langhorne Orchard Essay 1945,
for his paper on “The Relationship between Conduct and
Belief.”

The Gunning Competition for 1946 was next announced. The
subject chosen being “The Spheres of Revelation and Science.
What are the Limitations in Relation to each other?” Prize
£40. The length of the essay is not to exceed 15,000 words.
Essays to reach the Hon. Secretary not later than December
31st, 1945. Printed rules for the competition would be issued
to all Fellows, Members and Associates forthwith.

A hearty vote of thanks to Sir Charles Marston for presiding
was proposed by Mr. RUOFF and seconded by Mr. DEWAR,
which was carried with acclamation.

LIEUT.-COLONEL T. C. SKINNER.

Honorary Secretary, 1931-1945.

With indefatigable zeal and unremitting constancy Lieut.-Colonel Skinner served the Institute for a period of fifteen years. He was nominated to the Council at the Annual General Meeting in 1929, and within a few months became Assistant Honorary Secretary, and shortly afterwards Joint Honorary Secretary. His election in 1931 as Honorary Secretary made him successor in a line of distinguished men and he sought to uphold worthily the traditions of the Institute.

He was born at Woodstock, Ontario, Canada, in 1865, of Scottish parents who had recently purchased an estate and settled there, his father becoming Member of Parliament for the district. He studied at the Royal Military College, Kingston, and after successfully completing the course was selected for the Royal Engineers and commissioned in 1885. At the very beginning of his military career, while at the School of Military Engineering, Chatham, one of his instructors so influenced his mind in regard to the claims of Christ upon his life that his whole outlook and mode of life was thereafter altered, and he continued steadfastly unto the end. Besides service in this country he held appointments in Malta, Gibraltar, Bermuda, and during the 1914-1918 war, in France.

Retiring from the Army in 1919 he immediately realised his responsibility for service to his fellow men in public life. He moved to Reigate in 1927 and became immersed in the study of the theory stated in the "Untrodden Ground in Astronomy and Geology" by Major-General Drayson. He published various articles on this subject which were the result of his considerable mathematical calculations and correspondence. In his studies in climatology and changes in climate since the Ice Age he collected much valuable evidence.

But his great interest centred in the Victoria Institute, to which he had been elected in 1928. From the time he became Honorary Secretary until his death his duties were one of his major occupations. In this work he showed his characteristic

faithfulness and conscientiousness in everything which he did, for he took an exceptional view of his duties and undertook a weight of correspondence which some would have considered unnecessary. He never spared himself over his self-imposed tasks, and never allowed the "black out," or difficult travelling conditions of the war years, or his uncertain health and advancing age, to deter him. The impelling nature of his life was his strong religious faith which permitted no slackness or easy-going methods in anything which he considered his duty. Yet for some time before he died he endured much suffering which lowered his vitality and hindered him from putting all that he wished into his activities, but he never allowed this to cloud his faith or indomitable spirit. Before going into hospital for the operation he was meticulous that every detail of Victoria Institute business was up to date. He served it to the end.

War conditions made it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on February 5th, 1945, the Paper for that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion.

THE PLACE OF INTELLECT IN THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

By THE REV. J. W. WENHAM, M.A., B.D., R.A.F.V.R.

IT is perhaps presumptuous of me to attempt to tackle the subject which has been chosen for this afternoon, since it involves a treatment (however slight) of most profound philosophical questions, in particular the question of the nature and function of the intellect. It is particularly presumptuous because this is a philosophical society and I can lay no claims to the title of philosopher. I shall, however, try as far as possible to avoid philosophical abstractions, and I have deliberately stated the title in concrete and practical form, because my aim is a practical one. I want to consider the question of the nature and function of the intellect for the quite practical purpose of strengthening those engaged in Christian work; for I believe that one of the greatest causes of weakness amongst that considerable body of devoted Christians who hold conservative views of Holy Scripture is to be found in a deep-seated tendency to depreciate the intellect. If anything I can say has any effect in overcoming this weakness, I shall consider that my attempt has been worth while, even though I feel bound to crave your indulgence for a treatment so inadequate.

In making a plea for the importance of the intellect before this society I am doubtless preaching largely to the converted, since the very *raison d'être* of the Victoria Institute is that it should consider intellectual questions bearing on the Christian faith. But there are many of the younger generation who are zealous and severely orthodox Christians who are deeply suspicious of discussion and argument, of philosophy and theology—of anything, that is, that may appear to countenance the slightest element of doubt in regard to the body of Christian teaching which they have espoused. I imagine that I as a young man have been called upon to write this paper partly with a

view to saying something relevant to young men, so I make no apology for directing my remarks primarily to them, and particularly to those with conservative views on Holy Scripture.

Conservative views on Holy Scripture have been championed during the present century by two main groups, the Roman Catholics and the thorough-going Evangelicals. The latter (with whom we are mainly concerned) have shown on the one hand a most commendable zeal for the cause of Christ, but on the other a tendency to narrowness and obscurantism which has again and again alienated their would-be leaders and driven them either into Liberalism or Traditionalism. The achievements of the Methodist-Evangelical revival, both evangelistically and socially, compare favourably with any religious movement of the past. It was the dynamic that covered the heathen world with Christian missionaries. It was the chief motive power behind the great philanthropic movements initiated by William Wilberforce and the Earl of Shaftesbury. Yet in modern times forceful Evangelical leadership is conspicuous by its absence within the councils of the churches and in affairs of society generally. It is my belief that the main cause of this decline is to be found in Evangelical depreciation of the intellect. I am convinced that there is nothing wrong with the old-fashioned Evangelical gospel—it is still the one power that can really save a man, that can recreate and permanently reform him. I am equally convinced that there is nothing wrong with the old-fashioned Evangelical views on Holy Scripture. When the plain teaching of the Bible is revered and accepted as the Word of God, it is still like “a fire and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces.” No, there is nothing wrong with these basic beliefs, what *is* wrong is that we have not taken them seriously enough and have not thought out their real implications. Many have been content to rely upon a few clichés, such as, “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God,” “argument never won a soul for God,” or “all we need is the ‘simple’ gospel,” which they imagine relieve them of any necessity for painstaking thought.* It is the aim of this paper to show that

* There is a quite prevalent custom of citing St. Paul's procedure at Athens (Acts 17), not as an apostolic example to be imitated, but as a mistake to be avoided. It is maintained that because he descended to philosophical reasoning, therefore he failed. Though this argument is widely current, it is really an argument without foundation, for it is scarcely fair to describe an address that gathered out a group of converts in such a sophisticated centre of paganism as a “failure.”

this depreciation of the intellect is unjustified on Biblical, psychological and pragmatic grounds. If we take the Bible seriously, the intellect must be regarded as of fundamental importance. If we study our own nature, we see the sheer impossibility of relegating reason to a secondary place. If we look at the practical needs of the Christian world, we see an appalling need for intellectual leadership.

THE BIBLICAL ARGUMENT.

One of the underlying reasons for the idea that the Bible depreciates the intellect seems to be that the Biblical teaching never divorces the intellectual and the moral. Reasoned argument always leads to practical ethical consequences. It never indulges in argument simply as an intellectual exercise. Thus, since it is always possible to show that every argument leads to a moral issue, it is erroneously inferred that therefore it is the moral issue that matters and that the reasoning leading up to it is of no importance. Or again, the Biblical teaching about the necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit for entry into salvation is similarly misinterpreted. Because mere human reasoning alone without the operation of the Spirit will not bring salvation, it is falsely inferred that therefore the reason has *no* important part to play in the process. The fact that some people fail to give the Holy Spirit His rightful place provides no justification for others to fail to give the intellect its rightful place.

Now as a matter of fact the witness of Scripture itself is as plain as could be. The New Testament is full of the appeal to reason. The most obvious examples are naturally to be found in St. Paul, who wrestles in argument with his readers to show them the necessary and logical consequences of the premises they are working from. How often we have at the crucial point the favourite Pauline "therefore . . ." But what is so characteristic of St. Paul is to be found throughout the New Testament, not least importantly in the teaching of our Lord. Throughout the gospels He is continually stating clear propositions which carry immediate conviction to His hearers (sometimes by virtue of their Jewish training and sometimes from their innate sense of what is right and wrong) and from these He draws simple, logical, almost self-evident conclusions. One need go no further than the Sermon on the Mount to see several examples of His reasoning

(e.g., Matt. v, 23, 29, 46 ; vi, 2). But in fact He is ever appealing to reason in His teaching, whether in the lucidity of His open-air preaching, or in His devastating thrust and counter-thrust in controversy.

Furthermore the whole *modus operandi* of Christian teaching is such as to demand the fullest cooperation of the intellect, for the New Testament gives us not a system of legalistic enactments but a body of *principles*. There is no neat rule of thumb for automatically deciding ethical problems, if for no other reason than that no collection of laws, however bulky, could ever provide rulings to fit all circumstances for all time. Thus, at its very heart, Christian teaching carries with it the necessary demand for the active cooperation of the human understanding. To discourage painstaking thought is to undermine Christian ethics.

Finally, before leaving the Biblical Argument there is one item to be considered, which is closely related to the Psychological Argument which follows—that is the scriptural use of the term “heart.” In the Bible, neither the Hebrew words לֵב and לִבָּי nor the Greek word *καρδία* refer primarily to the emotions, and when the popular evangelist tries to “reach the hearts of the people” simply by stirring the emotions, he is not proceeding in a scriptural fashion. It is much nearer the Biblical idea to identify “the heart” with “the will,” where the will is conceived as the centre of the personality. But even here the will is never for a moment thought of as divorced from the rest of the personality—from the heart spring not only affections and resolves, but also “thoughts,” “reasonings” (Mark vii, 21 ; Luke ii, 35 ; xxiv, 38) and this intellectual aspect of the heart receives strong Biblical emphasis. Abbott-Smith summarises the matter fairly for both Old and New Testament thus : “*καρδία* . . . In a psychological sense, the seat of man’s collective energies, the focus of personal life, *the seat of the rational as well as the emotional and volitional elements in human life.*”* This gives a double force to the First and Great Commandment : “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *heart* and with all thy *mind.*”

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

The fundamental importance of the intellect is also to be seen from the study of human psychology. It is quite impossible to

* Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (3rd Ed.), p. 230.

isolate the purely moral and spiritual activities of man from his intellectual activities. The human personality has a strange trinitarian structure. It has three clearly distinguishable modes of activity—feeling, thinking and willing—which the older psychologists used to relate to three distinct and separate faculties, the heart, the intellect and the will.† But at the same time the personality is an indissoluble unity, and each mode of activity reacts and is reacted upon by the others. In particular, the activity of the intellect has the strongest influence on the set of the will and the character of one's feelings. Any attempt to undervalue the intellect will pervert the will and impoverish the emotions.

Consider for a moment what actually takes place when one performs an "act of will," in any particular situation. Firstly there arises a number of desires, probably conflicting with one another; then the intellect goes to work upon the desires, sorts them out and weighs them up; then finally the personality is set in motion by the will on the basis of what has gone before. Let us take a very simple illustration. Imagine a small and hungry boy going down a road past an apple orchard, on the trees of which are many beautiful, ripe apples. The road is not very secluded, and between him and the apples is a high and jagged wall. What is he going to do? What "act of will" is he going to make? Observe the process by which the decision is made. First there is an uprush of desires—"Coo, I am hungry! Don't those apples look marvellous. I'd love one. And it would be awful sport to climb that wall." Then his intellect comes into action. He begins to think it over. "Yes, but suppose I'm caught red-handed. Or these new trousers of mine—if I tear them on one of those sharp bits, what explanation am I to give? And I wonder if I ought to; I suppose they are not *really* mine." His mind weighs up the pros and cons, and then he acts. That is the process: desires, intellectual judgment, act of will.

† The Faculty Psychology is now out of favour, because it is recognized (quite rightly) that we have no knowledge, indeed no conception, of separate "faculties." We only know the various forms of activity of the single personality, and these forms of activity are themselves closely interwoven. I am inclined to think that the pendulum has swung too far the other way and that the modern stress on the unity of the personality tends to minimise its three-foldness, and I think that we may still find the "faculty" idea useful as long as we avoid a materialistic conception of it. After all, "personality" is only known by its activity, yet as a concept it is very useful.

Now, whether one takes a strictly self-deterministic view or allows some measure of indeterminism in the "act of will" is immaterial; on *any* view the judgement of the intellect is an integral and inescapable factor in the process, and in so far as it is faulty the act of will will be faulty too. It is no accident that in common parlance "strong-minded" and "strong-willed" are practically synonymous terms. Clarity of intellectual grasp is essential for steadfastness of purpose.

Let us take another instance of the interdependence of the intellectual and the moral, and consider the operation of conscience. Conscience is admittedly a factor of importance in the spiritual life, yet it is very easy to show that the intellect has a profound effect upon conscience. In fact it is even true to say that what a man believes in the last resort determines what his conscience says. Wrong beliefs can dull and misdirect conscience. If an Oriental devotee believes that it is right to place his mother on a funeral pyre when his father dies, he will be conscience-stricken if, on considerations of mere humanity, he fails to do so. It is probably true to say that not a few of the Inquisitors who tortured and burnt Protestants really believed that they were glorifying God and doing mankind a service. Furthermore, not only may wrong beliefs cause a dulling of conscience, but equally they may cause an over-sensitising of conscience, which amounts to morbidity. I heard of an instance of a young man who nearly lost his reason through trying to obey the least prompting of the Holy Spirit without having been first properly instructed in the methods used by the Spirit in giving guidance. He thought he was guided to put a lump of coal on the fire, then to take it off again, then to put it back, and so on . . . with nearly disastrous results. These are extreme cases, but they illustrate a principle of first-class importance and of great practical consequence. Incalculable unhappiness and no little harm to the spread of the Christian Faith is resulting at the present time from uneasy consciences of those who have not been properly instructed in Christian ethical principles. Conscience does not give a ready-made, cut-and-dried answer to the problems of Sunday observance, worldly amusements, pacifism, birth-control, and so on, which at times so sorely perplex such a host of earnest Christians. The only way to peace of mind is by honest thought to sort out the factors involved in the light of New Testament principles and by God's help resolutely to follow what appears to be right.

Irrationality or lazy-mindedness will inevitably reduce the standard of reliability of the dictates of conscience.

This argument for the fundamental place of the intellect in the human personality could be developed in several directions (*e.g.*, the influence of thought on emotion could be illustrated by the power of noble thought to produce fine emotions), but enough has been said to establish our main conclusion, and we can proceed to our last and most tangible line of reasoning—the argument from practical needs.

THE PRAGMATIC ARGUMENT.

The need of the hour is for a great revival of simple New Testament Christianity—therein alone lies hope for the individual and hope for society. Such a revival will only come through a great cleansing and revivifying within the churches. Our problem is to discover what are the chief hindrances to Christian vitality. The hindrances are doubtless legion, and it is no purpose of mine to minimise such sins as prayerlessness, moral cowardice and sloth, which so persistently grip us, but I do believe the failure to glorify God with our minds has been one of the most pervasive and destructive factors in killing the usefulness of conservative Christians. By depreciating the intellect we have depreciated scholarship and surrendered the teaching of our ministers and of our children to the enemies of the gospel. Our schools of theology, instead of being power centres of Christian progress, have become the training ground of unbelief. By discouraging thought, we have killed leadership and lost our power, not only to continue the glorious triumphs of social reform, but even to check evil within the Church. Anti-intellectualism has sapped our strength and left us impotent at the time of direst need.

Now it is a simple fact of history that the great movements of mankind are movements of thought. Thought seeds well sown in receptive minds sweep the world. Think of the influence of a Karl Marx or a Charles Darwin, of a Martin Luther or an Ignatius Loyola. A theory clearly conceived and vigorously propagated, irresistibly captures the imagination of men and leads them on in spite of themselves. We who have lived to see the appalling power of false ideologies ought to be the first to see the need for a clear and comprehensive Christian ideology. Such an ideology, I hope to show, is indispensable to a great revival of pastoral, evangelistic and missionary effectiveness.

What is the real cause of the ineffectiveness of Christian

preaching at the present time? It is not that the day of the power of the spoken word is past. Hitler's spoken word has been as powerful to move the masses as any old-time preacher. Nor is it lack of ministerial training. On the technical side the training of ministers is more thorough to-day than it has ever been. No. The real trouble is that those who are trying to teach others are themselves hazy as to what they want to teach. The average theological student is more certain of what he does not believe than of what he does believe, and though he may sincerely want to do good, he has not that burning, consuming conviction which makes the good preacher and teacher. Lack of clarity on basic principles makes teachers in the same church contradict each other and even contradict themselves, with the inevitable result that the ordinary man in the street has the most confused and erroneous idea of what Christ's teaching really was. It is a plain statement of fact (which any service chaplain will confirm) that the majority of even church-going young men and women (let alone the 95 per cent. who own no active allegiance to any church) are completely vague about the fundamentals of the faith, and cannot be relied upon to show any clear grip of such doctrines as the deity of Christ, the atonement, and the new birth, or the authority of the Bible. Is it any wonder that we have so few vigorous Christian propagandists when so few have a clear idea of what needs propagating? ?

Now it is obvious that if our beliefs about the Bible are correct, the whole situation would be at once revolutionised if our teachers were brought back to a whole-hearted belief that the plain teaching of the Bible is the truth of God. The devastating power of a united "Thus saith the Lord" from ten thousand pulpits would stir the whole country overnight. But the fact is that the majority of ministers do not believe, and quite seriously do not believe it would be honest to believe, the old-fashioned doctrine of Holy Scripture. The standard text-books and most of the leaders of thought amass an array of apparently incontestable evidence to forbid such belief, and one man standing alone feels incompetent to oppose them. The only answer is to attack the problem at its source and let those who have experienced the power of the Scriptures stand together and consecrate their minds to the re-establishment of truly Christian scholarship. With the help of God, man for man, the Christian ought to be a more clear-thinking and hard-working scholar than the corresponding non-Christian. Once we have really

seen the need we should be able to establish centres of Biblical research and a school of theology of a higher standard than any which our opponents can achieve. But we must first see the need and be prepared for the sacrifice which the call to scholarship will demand.

So much for the need of scholarship for the revival of the churches, but its need in the evangelistic sphere is equally evident. It is quite true that many fine evangelists have been ignorant and ill-instructed men, and it is quite true that *mere* reasoning does not constitute evangelism. But this does not imply that the evangelist can afford to do without an intellectual foundation for his work. I believe that it is the change in intellectual atmosphere since the days of Moody which largely accounts for the relative ineffectiveness of Moody methods when applied at the present day. By and large it would be true to say that in Moody's day people generally believed the Christian Faith to be true—but they did nothing about it. His task was to face them up to the implications of their belief and get them to surrender their hearts and lives to their Redeemer. Nowadays the situation is entirely different. The common man has a vague theistic belief, but he has neither understanding of nor belief in the Christian doctrines of redemption. He believes that modern knowledge has quite out-moded the ancient Christian superstitions. Now to such a man the Moody technique is entirely inappropriate. You cannot face him up to his beliefs as a prelude to surrender to Christ. You are attempting the ludicrous plan of getting him to entrust himself to a person he has not the slightest reason for believing to be trustworthy. True faith is based on knowledge, and the "leap of faith" can only follow upon the receiving of sufficient evidence of the faithfulness of the One trusted. "Simple" faith is not faith based upon insecure evidence; it comes from profound assurance of the love of God. The human parallel is exact. The apparently simple act of trusting a person the first time one sees him is not really so very simple. It results from long study of human nature. Through continuous observation of all types of people one comes to recognise characteristics (probably not analysable at the time by the observer, but surely recognised none the less) which assure one that the character behind the external characteristics is dependable. So with God, the simplest faith is based on the profoundest knowledge.

Thus in modern evangelism, except amongst the small minority

who have had a good background of Christian teaching, we have to start much further back than Moody did. As always, the trifler must be rebuked for his sin and attacked via his conscience. Protracted reasoning will probably do him little good, but a few well directed thrusts may go far to stir his conscience. He can be shown the hollowness of his attempted denial of God ; he can be shown the inescapable fact of a Providential judgment upon wrong-doing. A penetrating pulpit analysis of the shams of unbelief can lay bare the nakedness of a person's soul in a terrible way, *but* such an analysis presupposes a lucidity that comes only from very hard thinking and the most careful study of human nature. Our reliance will not be on the spoken word alone—it will of course be backed by prayer and consistent Christian living—but how else is the word of God to be brought home to a man's conscience unless by reasoning ?

With the sincere seeker, the need for intellectual clarity is even more obvious. While it is true that the actual creative act of regeneration is an instantaneous operation of God, there is a long process leading up to conversion and a long process following after it, and throughout both periods God is working upon the whole personality, including the intellect. The prominence of the intellectual element in conversion varies with the degree of intellectuality in the cast of personality of the person concerned. In some the intellect plays a dominant role, and the conversion of such from an anti-Christian to a Christian mode of life is bound to involve a painful intellectual pilgrimage. In others the intellect may be poorly developed in comparison with the emotional and æsthetic side of character, and intellectual objections to the Faith may be relatively easily overcome, but overcome they must be—for no one, however limited his intelligence, can put his trust in someone he does not believe to be trustworthy. To everyone the facts of the gospel must be presented to the mind, and where the mind has reason to doubt the facts, these doubts must be removed before faith can result. The particular grounds for belief which especially carry conviction will vary enormously from person to person. One person will be helped by abstract philosophical reasoning, another will be convinced of the truth of the gospel by the evidence of a friend's transformed life ; but in each case it is a *rational* ground for belief, and in almost every case belief results from a combination of such rational evidences.

Thus the modern evangelist must be prepared to use reason to

undercut error, to probe the conscience, to lead the seeker for truth patiently step by step from one conclusion to another till he is brought boldly face to face with the final decision for or against Christ. Personally I believe that for purposes of evangelism, it would be well to reinforce and even in part replace the old-time mission by Christian lectures. Lectures alone, unless they finally impinge upon the conscience, are of little use, and fervent emotional appeals without intellectual content are worse than useless. The ideal evangelist must both instruct and challenge,* and of necessity the instruction must precede the challenge. Alas! how few there are to-day who can show themselves qualified for this task. And what is the reason? Simply that for years Evangelicals have discouraged would-be evangelists from fully training their minds.

Lastly, I should like to suggest that a revival of sound scholarship would have an immense, direct influence in forwarding world evangelization. At the present time much of the foreign mission field is in a state of transition. The native churches founded during the past two or three generations are taking over the responsibility for the evangelization of great areas hitherto regarded as the responsibility of the white man. For such areas it is the task of the home churches to send teachers to train a native ministry rather than to provide itinerant white evangelists. It is these teachers of the teachers who are the key people in forwarding world evangelization. The question is, Have we the qualified conservative men to fill these posts? I fear that already the rot has set in in some hitherto fervent and vigorous missionary communities. Missionaries are going out instructed in the Liberal theology which dominates our divinity halls, and they are undoing the fine work of their predecessors built up at the cost of so much blood and tears. What scope there is here for a man with brains and zeal! What a tragedy it is that we have by our anti-intellectualism alienated so many able men from the historic doctrines of the faith, and discouraged so many others from fitting themselves for this task. Let us cease decrying the intellect and dedicate ourselves to the rebuilding of a school of Evangelical theology, and ere long we shall be pouring forth a stream of men and a flood of literature which will grant a new lease of life to the younger churches of the world.

* Incidentally, by this definition St. Paul is the ideal evangelist—a conclusion borne out by results.

The witness of the Bible, the witness of psychology, and the demands of practical expediency all point in the same direction : The intellect is of strategic importance in forwarding the cause of the gospel, and we depreciate it at our peril. It seems to me to be a clear call to the younger generation to dedicate their brains to God, and to try with His help to build up the best possible school of Christian learning. The results accruing from the hard labour of patient scholarship appear but slowly, yet in the end they are more enduring and more potent for good or ill than the fevered activities of ill-instructed zeal. May the older generation grant unstinted backing by personal encouragement and by releasing the funds required for the gigantic undertaking.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., wrote : Mr. Wenham's essay is a timely one. There is a widespread movement in evangelical circles, both conservative and liberal, to assign to the intellect a much lower place in religion than it ought to hold. One explanation, of course, is the reaction from the rationalism and humanism which has dominated Protestant theological scholarship for more than a century. For a prolonged period reason had practically the last word in the discussion of Christian doctrine with the result that the supernatural was being slowly and steadily eliminated. Christianity was ceasing to be a religion, and becoming more and more a religious philosophy combined with an incomparable code of ethics. There was no place for revelation in the usual acceptation of the term. Reason was self-sufficient to unravel all the riddles of existence and experience, provided that sufficient time and patience were forthcoming. What the schools think to-day, the streets think tomorrow, and there can be no doubt that this tendency has helped to promote the wave of irreligion which is sweeping the Northern Hemisphere at the moment. It is not the only factor by any manner of means, but it is a potent one. A welcome change is now manifest. Reason is no longer regarded as an absolute monarch in the things of God. But there is a danger, as Mr. Wenham emphasises, that the new trend of theological thought will go too far in the opposite direction. The popularity of some modern religious cults, whose existence is only made possible by the repudiation of reason, proves that point.

Mr. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON wrote: This is a valuable and challenging paper—may its challenge be heeded. Mr. Wenham has rightly stressed the need that we love God with all our *mind* as well as with all other faculties with which we are endowed, and has pointed out various directions in which Evangelical Christians seem often to fall short in the exercise of their intellectual activities. The matter is not one that affects the leaders of religious life and active workers alone, but also to a very great extent all believers alike. We are bidden to be able to give a *reason* for the hope that is in us. There is far too much slipshod thinking current in Christian circles; a too facile acceptance of other men's ideas without due examination, especially if those ideas are put forth with some show of authority; or, perhaps, if those ideas fall in with the traditions current in the circles in which we move. There is not enough of the Berean "searching the Scriptures to see whether these things are so." From this flow several evils, one is, that our beliefs are in danger of being, however sound, merely secondhand. We have not thought them out for ourselves and thus made them our own. But further than this, there is a real risk that unsound ideas may gain wide currency by dissemination until they become so familiar that they are regarded as almost axiomatic, and accepted as the very teaching of the Scriptures themselves. When this stage is reached, it becomes an actual bar to any critical examination. In a word, we do need from time to time to review the things that are most surely believed among us, that we may continue to be assured that they are in very truth based upon the Word of God and not merely the interpretation of man.

Mr. NINIAN LOWIS wrote: I have read Mr. Wenham's paper with great interest. It is most thought-provoking and helpful. The suggestion that the absence of effective Evangelical leadership to-day is mainly the result of a depreciation of the intellect among Christians of that school is interesting, but surely there are other greater causes?

I have been particularly interested in what Mr. Wenham has to say on the increased need for scholarship in evangelism. There can be no doubt that largely as a result of national compulsory education (however imperfect we may feel it to be) there has been a "change of intellectual atmosphere since the days of Moody." This is evidenced,

for instance, by the sincere intellectual difficulties raised often by quite young persons. It is also sadly true that to-day in evangelism we have to begin much further back, as Mr. Wenham says. I feel, however, that these facts are being increasingly realised by the greater number of those who are called to "do the work of an evangelist." Anyone engaged in such work in the past ten years must surely realise that mere emotional appeal alone has little if any lasting value, and that more and more the need is for a teaching evangelism. By no means the least of the difficulties that such an evangelist has to face to-day is that of overcoming the prejudice which is so common, even among Christian people, and which is based on the idea that all evangelists are intellectually ignorant, a theory which is, one is thankful to know, very far from being true.

Mr. A. McDONALD REDWOOD wrote : I should like to express my thanks to the author for his helpful paper on a very important subject. Of the several points raised, some are worthy of fuller treatment, and many are provocative.

The author, I rather think, has tended to over-emphasise the "Evangelical depreciation of Intellect," as he terms it. That it exists to a certain extent, and in certain small circles, I am prepared to admit. But I feel the point needs developing from a rather different direction than he has taken. Actual and deliberate depreciation is not so much the vogue, as he seems to imply. What is obvious, is the *apathetic* "unthinkingness" prevailing within and without the Church. People, including church-goers, do not *want* to think too deeply. Any preacher who rises above a certain "accommodating" level, and begins to display a serious desire for presenting truth through sustained intellectual argument, is simply not listened to—of course, with due regard for the "certain exceptions." The inevitable reaction is that the preacher has to lower his level of intellectual approach, and even take to the more emotional. Hence, "the simple Gospel" class the author refers to.

The author may also have in mind the tacit belief entertained in certain circles that the "balance of power" intellectually, has passed almost entirely to the Critical School, leaving the conserva-

tives to drift "on the misty flats below." We have all been treated to some such smugly complacent remark as "All clear-thinking people have now abandoned the claims of an infallible Bible," etc. Does this need to worry us unduly? For one thing, it has yet to be proved, I submit. Not many years ago, Prof. Gresham Machen in *What is Faith?* argued trenchantly, in reference to the "Critical Controversy" that much of the theological liberalism and allied modernism of the day would never hold its own but for the prevailing *lack of thinking*. To "think through" a subject is not what the majority have any special desire for, least of all in religious matters.

The causes which contribute to a lowered intellectual virility lie more elsewhere than in a conscious and deliberate "anti-intellectualism." Rather are they to be found in the realm of the "anti-moral" and the "anti-spiritual" spirit of the day. It seems to me we cannot dismiss as of no immediate application the prophetic word of St. Paul in 1 Tim. iv, 1-2. And I submit that, the "appalling poser of false ideologies," which the author instances, is not due to their irresistible "intellectualism," but to their fanatical and fantastic parading of threadbare theories "dressed to the fashion," immediately adapted to unthinking minds, already blinded by the particular "fashion," for there are prevailing fashions in every sphere.

I cannot help thinking, therefore, that the diagnosis of the present conditions in reference to the lack of an intellectual Christian propaganda is hardly correct. It follows that, the remedy needs further adjustment. It is not only an increased stimulation of the intellectual forces, but a fresh infusion of the "blood plasma" of Divine life-power into the *spiritual* experience, which will most affect the anaemic mentality of the "average Christian" of to-day.

Are we not beginning to see something of the signs of this "new infusion" in the very definite and fairly widespread revival of earnest desire for more systematic and spiritual Bible Study and Bible Teaching? If so, as I venture to believe, then the author does a good service in drawing attention to the "real trouble"—"that those who are trying to teach are themselves hazy as to what they want to teach" (p. 5). Does not part of the cause lie in the unconscious *influence*, if not the unthinking acceptance, of the modern

“Critical Methods” of studying the Bible? Do people in general pay more attention to the productions of these methods than they did to the, for example, “simple Gospel”?

The author’s reference to the need of better-trained men for the mission fields, prepared, that is, to stand staunchly on the side of the conservative view-point of Biblical interpretation and principles, I can heartily endorse. After more than thirty years’ experience of missionary service in India, that is, without doubt, the great desideratum in the present world crisis, I am quite convinced. This point is enticing and is worthy of further discussion, but the problem of space prohibits. Peter’s challenge to present-day Christians is one terse phrase, “*Gird up the loins of your mind.*”

Mr. EVERARD JOSE wrote: The lecturer’s remarks on page 6 need to be taken to heart and acted on. Our gospel is the same as Moody’s, the everlasting Good News, but the audience has changed; the same seed, but new ground.

Moving about among all sorts and conditions of men, I find it generally accepted (1) that the Christian faith, as formerly understood, is disproved and out of date, and (2) that ministers of religion as a body, believe this to be the case. Consequently everything is uncertain and problematical. The more thoughtful in the population have dilettante ideas about some sort of idealism, or are bitter about some supposed political cause of world evil. But the usual refuge is an attempted forgetfulness under the dope of jazz, cinema or anything that obliterates thought or feeling.

For the most part this restless hysteria of unbelief is of second-hand origin. Outside the Gospel of Christ, the dominating influence of life in all ages, everywhere, is “Everybody’s doing it NOW.”

Here, obviously, is the field for sanctified thought, feeling, and will. We can take nothing for granted, the familiar truths, and phrases and associations, which are so dear to us, are altogether unknown to our audience and of no interest to them.

Lt.-Col. L. M. DAVIES wrote: I welcome this paper, and agree with every word of it. The author refers to himself as a young man. If he is young, all the better. He shows a mature grasp of the

subject, and places his finger on a root cause of the relative ineffectiveness of far too many well-meaning preachers to-day. Even when sound on the Gospel, they ignore the wide dissemination of "science, falsely so-called" which makes the Gospel seem ridiculous to our contemporaries. As a result, they make little impression upon people with whose supposed factual objections to belief they have no power of dealing.

When I found, many years ago, that one Christian friend after another was losing his trust in the Bible owing to "Darwin's scientific discoveries," I set myself, with God's help, to get to the root of that matter, although it was out of my line as a young gunner officer. It took many years' study, and the sacrifice of many leave periods, in order to master it. Some evangelical friends gravely doubted my efforts, and urged me to remember that "Christianity is of the heart, not of the head." To this I replied that if my heart were not in the right place, I would not be using my head like that, but would be after game in Kashmir instead of swotting in the Geological Survey Offices in Calcutta.

I asked God to show me the actual facts, and to give me an unchallengeable position from which to testify to His Word. That prayer was granted. After retiring from the Army, I finally graduated, in order to seal matters; and now in old age hold two doctorates in geology, with a long record of research, and a factual knowledge which no B.B.C. propagandist—Prof. D. M. S. Watson, Dr. Julian S. Huxley, or any other—cares to face in public dispute.

My faith is as it always was. But my power of "putting it across" to those who try to counter Paul—or Moses—by Darwin is incomparably greater now than it was in far-off subaltern days.

I apologise for these personalities, which are quoted only because of their relevance, and as showing how emphatically I agree with the author of this very able paper. Our Lord said: "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" Unless we can show that we have a competent grasp of natural facts, people will hardly trust our judgment on supernatural ones.

It is not easy to acquire the power to talk soundly about earthly problems (by which I refer in particular to facts which are supposed to disprove the statements of Scripture). It involves hard and pro-

tracted work, whether one takes up the doctrine of organic evolution, or its literary parallel in textual criticism. But if done to God's Glory, such work returns abundant interest. Knowledge so acquired is not of itself fruitful; the Word of God alone is the living Seed. But this knowledge is a most useful accessory. I would compare it with the ploughshare which (although barren in itself) breaks up the ground to take the seed before the fowls of the air remove it. The ground is much harder now (as our author rightly points out) than it was even in Moody's day; and much ploughing requires to be done if sowing is to be effective.

Major R. B. WITHERS, the Rev. E. E. INGHAM and the Rev. A. W. PAYNE also contributed to the discussion.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am not anxious to burden the transactions with lengthy comments and I trust that I shall be forgiven if I content myself merely with an addendum, which I hope may be a source of cheer to those who have so kindly expressed their approval of the thesis. Since I originally wrote this paper there has come into existence an institution on the very lines that I have advocated—the Tyndale House for Biblical Research, 16, Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge, founded under the auspices of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. This is a residential library with already a considerable collection of excellent books for biblical research. It has been conceived largely by young men and should prove an important instrument in effecting what we all so much desire.

War conditions made it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on February 26th, 1945, the Paper for that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion.

THE MEDICAL MIRACLES OF OUR LORD.

BY H. J. ORR-EWING, M.C., M.D., B.S., F.R.C.P.

IT was suggested that a Paper upon this subject might prove of interest to the Members of the Institute. It is unnecessary to say that neither the writer nor anyone else supposed that he would be able to add anything new to the knowledge contained in the voluminous works already published on the subject by many experts in many languages.

The reason for the proposal was that the writer is, himself, a physician, and hence interested in the medical side of the question, and further more that he has had the privilege of twelve years residence and work in the Land where God Manifest in the Flesh accompanied with men, and so should be familiar with the very same diseases with which He dealt and the race into which he chose to be born. In a Paper of the necessarily restricted length of this one it will not be supposed that any attempt will be made to examine in great detail all, or indeed any, of the many beneficent deeds of healing recorded in the Sacred Pages.

Actually, there are at least 24 separate recorded instances of miraculous healing of individuals of which some detailed account is given, and there are a good many other places where we are told that "He healed many of divers diseases," or in similar words are made aware that He exercised His healing powers upon considerable numbers of persons at one time. There are three separate instances of restoration to life, four of recovery of sight to the blind, a similar number of cases of demoniac possession cured, two of paralytics healed, a similar number of cases of lepers cleansed, and one instance each of a number of other disabilities such as dropsy, deadly fever of Peter's mother-in-law and a number of others, with the unnamed afflictions of the nobleman's son and the centurion's servant—the only two cures wrought *in absentia*.

As already mentioned, volumes could be, and many have been,

written on these cases ; each one meriting a close study and detailed examination ; and to such the writer has had pleasure in devoting himself in days past, and with the help of such indispensable aids as works by Trench and Edersheim ; to name only two, has had not only interest but also profit ; but such is beyond our present scope, and it is proposed to deal with matters upon much more general lines.

There are many objections to the miracles, and Trench enumerates no less than seven general lines along which such have been raised, and doubtless in our sceptical age many more variations could be produced ; but there appears little profit to be gained by the detailed discussion of such. To one who devoutly believes in the Incarnation there is not the least difficulty in subscribing to a belief in the healing miracles. In fact, it appears to be the height of absurdity to believe that God could be Manifested in the Flesh in the Person of His Son, could break into our human life and existence in a Divine manner, and that having done so, he would not, in the presence of the world of sin, disease and death—reverently be it said—be forced to show forth His Glory by dealing with such evidences of man's suffering and man's fate as a result of sin.

As one glances through the list of the diseases, which Christ then healed, one finds oneself once again back in Palestine in the 20th Century. The same diseases (with the notable exception of demon possession, of which more anon) are still to be found in the streets and lanes once trodden by the Son of God. The blind still form one of the greatest, if not *the* greatest medical problem of Palestine. Figures are misleading : It has been well said that there are three kinds of lies—"lies, bad lies and statistics" ; but the percentage of the native peasant population infected with trachoma and other diseases, which, untreated, progress to blindness, such as the almost universal prevalence of conjunctival infection, the incidence of ulceration of the cornea and other diseases, was, in 1920, when the writer first went out, truly appalling. Things were better then than years before, and are much better now. The Order of St. John of Jerusalem with its magnificent ophthalmic work, has been one of the main agencies whereby cure—and even better, prevention—have been accomplished. But even to-day the incidence of blindness is at least ten times what it is in our own country, and a sickening and common sight is that of a peasant mother with a poor little baby on her back with both eyes fast closed exuding pus, and

swarms of flies buzzing round to feed on and carry the infection elsewhere. Blindness, therefore, should be prominent in a list of diseases dealt with in Palestine by the Great Physician, and blindness is so found.

Paralytics are still a common sight there. The incidence is no greater than here, or little more, but here we keep our poor paralysed people in and do not allow them to be dragged out and laid in public places to excite the charity and sympathy of the passer-by (such is no longer allowed in the cities, but was a common sight until recently).

Leprosy is still present, though, obviously, to a much diminished extent. History, not only in Bible times, but as late as that of the Latin Kingdom, shows us that this foul plague has been rife up to modern days.

The woman with the hæmorrhage, the man with dropsy, the woman crippled by spinal arthritis, still are found in just the same way as they were present in New Testament days. The devastating fever, which struck down Peter's mother-in-law was presumably malignant malaria, which has so often claimed its hecatomb of victims in the land, especially along the Litoral of the Sea of Galilee, where her infection occurred.

It is sometimes said that the miracles were but instances of the healing art displayed through the medium of a great and outstanding personality with a hypnotic power unequalled by any other; that the cures wrought by the Divine Master were those over hysterical persons, and that such could have been cured by others, who also might possess to a great degree the power of impressing their personality upon others. The man at the Pool of Bethesda is especially thus cited (St. John v). Here, we are told, is a typical example of a man with a hysterical paralysis of the legs, who was waiting for the miraculous cure to be effected, when the bubbling of the siphon spring should proclaim to the credulous a mysterious healing presence of an angel. There seems to be little doubt that many of the people clustered in the five porches were cases of hysteria: hysterical disease is extremely common amongst the Jewish Race—it is said (it is mere hearsay) that in a particular London Hospital, whose out-patient clinic deals with a large Hebrew clientele, that there is a notice, in a position only visible to the doctor: "Do not forget that Jews do sometimes suffer from Organic Disease!" and it is possible that the man in the porch was so affected. Many instances are on record of hysterical paralysis which has

lasted many years, being suddenly cured by a shock, or in a hypnotic seance, or by similar agency—one has seen such oneself; and to the sceptic it might be conceded that this man may have been such a case. However, after 38 years of paresis, a cure is not as a rule possible so suddenly to such an extent. Hysterical blindness, dumbness, deafness, etc., may be instantaneously cured; but 38 years of muscular inactivity would produce such weakness, such contractures, such incapacity, that for such a one to leap up and walk away with his pallet bed presents almost insuperable difficulties; and there are other miracles which could not possibly have been explained away in such a manner. Hysterical blindness, true, may occur, but the writer has never seen it in Palestine and never heard of it there. Nearly all the hysterical cases seen there were concerned more with the motor functions (although these are unusual) or occurred as fits (fairly common) or as various symptoms complained of, such as unbearable pains, for which no known organic cause existed. That four cases of hysterical blindness should thus occur, and be recorded as cured, when all around our Lord we are certain were hundreds of people blind from organic disease, is absolutely incredible, and one at least of the victims was "born blind." As Spurgeon said, the only thing the Pharisees and Rulers were not able to gainsay was the fact that the man saw, and the only thing that his terrified parents were compelled to admit was that he was born blind. No hysterical blind man was ever blind from birth. Dropsy cannot be a hysterical manifestation, nor can atrophy of the hand, nor persistent hæmorrhage.

The case of the nobleman's son and the centurion's servant are quite inexplicable upon any such hypothesis, however far-fetched, for they had no direct contact with the Healer, nor, in the case of the boy, had the patient apparently any faith, however faint or remote, in Him. Then, again, leprosy is a slow, progressive, incurable (when well established) disease, and here we are told of a man full of leprosy, who, with a sublime faith transcending mere human power, comes and says "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean," and received his cleansing with a touch. No! should we concede the man with paralysis or even both the men with paralysis, the rest of the miracles cannot be explained by any such fantastic theory. The opponents of miracles call upon us for far more credulity to enable us to accept their explanations than do the miracles themselves.

There is a class of miracle, that of the cure of demon-possession,

which calls for rather more detailed study. Books could be (and at least one actually has been) written upon this vexed question. There are so many problems that arise :—The nature of the phenomenon in the people who were “demonised” (the name “demon-possession” comes from Josephus and is never used in the New Testament); Our Lord’s view of the matter; the commonly held ideas; all these are most interesting, and difficult points and explanations are legion in number. A very usual method of solving the question seems to be “that the ignorant people of Christ’s day believed that many diseases, which with our more advanced knowledge we know to be due to other causes, were to be ascribed to the agency of demons.” Epilepsy, deafness and dumbness, mania, are amongst the lesions thus attributed to the in-dwelling of evil spirits. Another explanation of our Lord’s attitude to the question is that with His “kenosis” he deliberately limited himself to the beliefs and views of His day in such matters. Another suggestion is that whilst He knew that such things were not to be attributed to the assigned cause, yet he forebore to point out the error, dealing with the people along the lines of their own knowledge and exercising His power over their condition by seeming to drive out evil spirits for the sake of the afflicted sufferer himself. It is objected that demon-possession, to use the ordinary term, never occurs nowadays, that the phenomena described do all occur as forms of obsession, insanity or as other manifestations of mental disease, and that, therefore, these explanations meet the case.

As to the first question : one has been much interested in the problem as to whether such manifestations do not still occur in heathen lands. There is a restraining power in nominally Christian countries, where, in spite of so little real Christianity, there is, nevertheless, always a great volume of devout prayer and worship ascending, which is lacking in the “dark places of the Earth, which are full of the habitations of cruelty.” In the moral sphere, of course, we all recognise that there are widespread evidences of true demon-possession in the state of men imbued with every species of ferocity and cruelty; but here the question is more of physical manifestation. Do such actually occur, and can they be attributed to demoniac agency? The testimony of many missionaries from such parts of the world as China is that there men and women do become demon-possessed and that demons frequently have been exorcised by

the Power of God, through the name of Christ pronounced by His servants. Many of us will remember instances given in such well-known books as the "Life of Pastor Hsi." But, disappointingly, when recently a questionnaire was sent to a number of medical missionaries from China, asking whether they personally had seen such cases, which they, as trained *medical* observers, could recognise as differing from the obsessions of the insane and had seen such dealt with, those who replied all stated that, whilst they believed such instances to occur, that they felt the evidence was too strong to be refuted, whilst they had had such cases reported to them, nevertheless, they themselves, personally, had never seen such cases before and after treatment. That is a rather disappointing negative. On the other hand, as every commentator suggests, it would be only reasonable to suppose that such an event as the Incarnation and the Son of God being Manifested to destroy the works of the devil, would hardly fail to arouse special manifestations and efforts of the powers of evil themselves, even along such lines as the in-dwelling of men by fiendish powers. Edersheim makes the point that such possession or in-dwelling is nowhere stated to be a permanent or continuous state, and not always did it imply complete moral degradation, for one had been "afflicted even from a child," and undoubtedly the sense of a dual personality was present in some instances. So that, whilst with regard to the small body of expert medical opinion which one has been able to collect, the question as to whether the phenomenon exists to-day, the verdict must be one of "not proven," yet there seems no reason to conclude that such could not have been present in Christ's day, and there are a number of compelling evidences that it did, for it is impossible to believe that the Son of God, to whatever limitations He voluntarily subjected Himself, held the same superstitions as the ignorant folk He came to save. Actually we know that He did not; for the view of the Evangelists and those which they attributed to Him are poles asunder from the contemporaneous Jewish and Rabbinic notions of the same problems. Incidentally, the same remark applies with equal force to their ideas of remedies for such conditions as blindness, hæmorrhage, and indeed all others. For a detailed and masterly treatment of the subject by an expert in Rabbinic Law one must refer to the appendix on the subject in Edersheim's immortal work. But the writer has, himself, seen enough of even present day eastern Rabbinic Judaism,

beliefs in the possession of devils, their exorcism and methods of preventing their influence, to be able to testify that Christ's views on the subject were far apart from those held by the Jewish people of His day. One does not, of course, refer to enlightened Jewish beliefs, but as a great deal of one's time in Palestine was passed in treating those delightful people, the Eastern Sephardic, the Yemenite, Halabi and Palestinian Jew, whose religious views are so clouded and tainted by the belief in the personal in-dwelling and malevolent action of demons, one can the more readily understand the beliefs about such matters, which prevailed in the early Christian Era ; commencing with Lilith, the female demon who must be warded off from the lying-in bed with charms, through the hundred and one malevolent spirits who cause sickness and must be propitiated by votive offerings or averted by amulets ; the whole of life is surrounded by such ideas.

To return to the point that He, knowing otherwise, yet appeared for the patient's sake to believe in these things in order to free the victim from his obsessions : this is alike both impossible and abhorrent ; for He sent His disciples to cast out demons, thanked His Father in moving terms when they returned glorying in their success, chided them with their failure to succeed in the case of the epileptic boy and agreed with the Pharisees on the subject, in such a way as to leave in one's mind no doubt that He, Himself, did, in fact, firmly believe in the objectivity of the phenomenon with which He dealt. Besides which, to agree to the patient's ideas, to act as it were by a sort of super hypnosis, or rather mesmeric influence on the poor disordered mind of the sufferer, would prove no genuine cure. The Psychiatrist does not attempt to help nor does he succeed in curing his patients by agreeing with their obsessions, nor by exorcising their fears by acknowledging the reality of their cause. It might be possible, by supreme effort of personality and mind, sometimes to quiet a maniacal patient by such methods, but such are never used ; for apart from the extreme difficulty and unlikelihood of even transient success, they could never prove curative. The patient whose obsessions were thus momentarily relieved would shortly fall victim to other equally fallacious and dangerous delusions. Christ's cures were permanent cures. See the Gadarene demonised, clothed and in his right mind, not kept under the magical influence of the all-dominant quietening personality which had wrought his cure, but sent home as a witness

of God's Goodness and Power! No! whatever was the exact nature of the disorder; why it was clear to the Saviour and the recorders that some were demonised and others not, such as deaf or dumb; why some showed themselves as epileptic, others as maniacal; where the moral began and the physical ended; are matters which it does not appear possible to solve and certainly the writer is not competent to attempt to do so. But this he firmly believes, Christ came into contact with a class of sufferers whose bodily and mental diseases were but a part of their trouble; they were under the malign influence of evil and spiritual forces which had obtained an overriding, overmastering power over them. That such phenomena were especially prevalent at the time of the Divine Manifestation in Human Form appears certain. That such occur under certain circumstances to-day appears probable; but no complete explanation is entirely satisfying. In the words of Oesterley: "Christ saw in the case of every 'possessed' victim a result of sin, not necessarily through the co-operation of the victim. Sin he saw embodied in Satan, who is identified with demon; he was the personification of the principle of evil, which was manifested in men in a variety of ways. When Christ exorcised a demon by His Divine Power He drove evil out and at the same time obliterated the visible results of sin."

Space prevents more than a mere reference to the climax of the miracles, the threefold restoration to life from physical death:—A child whose spirit had but just passed beyond the confines of this world, a young man some hours dead, and Lazarus three days in the grave. If we only had the case of Jairus's daughter we might consider it possibly as a trance, for did not Christ, Himself, say "She is not dead, but sleepeth." But the Evangelists apparently make it clear that He spoke figuratively—"They laughed Him to scorn, *knowing* that she was dead." But the young man at Nain had been dead for hours and was on his way to burial, and although Jesus spoke of Lazarus, again figuratively, as asleep, He, Himself, explained plainly "Lazarus is dead." Explanations are, of course, useless; comments unnecessary. He, the Prince of Life, "Who death, by dying, slew," "Himself could not be holden by death," and even before He passed triumphant through its dark portals He had recalled these three souls from physical death to physical life; the climax of the miracles—and yet He said "Greater works than these shall ye do because I go to the Father." For even now He calls

men and women from spiritual death to spiritual life by means of the "foolishness of preaching" and the witness of His ambassadors.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., wrote: As far as the possibility of the medical miracles, performed by Our Lord, goes, there can be no doubt or question in the minds and hearts of those who believe that God exists, and that with Him all things are possible in heaven and in earth. These convictions are rooted and grounded in the greatest of all miracles whose truth involves the credibility of all other signs and wonders. I refer to Our Lord's resurrection, a medical miracle which He performed, and which immeasurably surpasses all others in grace and glory. Medical miracles are but one class of supernatural happenings which were due to the finger of God in Jesus Christ, His Incarnate Son. These observations may profitably be extended to include all the medical miracles recorded in the Bible, including that strange story in II Kings xiii, 20-21. The Acts of the Apostles also records some striking instances.

A variety of random reflections occur as one considers the subject, so clearly and helpfully discussed by Dr. Orr-Ewing. Thus it may be observed that, since medical science was so rudimentary in Our Lord's day, His medical miracles were almost a necessity. There was no other way of effecting a cure. Again, attention may be drawn to the spiritual value of these incidents. They were usually conditioned by faith in the recipient of the blessing, or in his friends. They were frequently associated with spiritual healing. They have been well described as acted parables. As for the intractable problem of demon possession, may it not be argued that it has disappeared like such medical miracles as Our Lord habitually wrought? It was a passing phase of evil just as the latter were a passing phase of good.

Dr. Orr-Ewing refers to the great words of Our Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do;

because I go unto My Father" (John xiv, 12). The miracles of modern therapeutics are the best commentary on these words, as far as the subject under consideration goes. Feats can now be performed by up-to-date means and methods which would have been dismissed as incredible or impossible a hundred years ago, while the achievements of medical science a hundred years hence will be such that none can now foretell what they will be, save only that they will reveal new heights and depths of significance in these words of the Great and Greatest Physician.

Mr. ARNOLD S. ALDIS, M.B., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S. wrote: There is, I think, a trifling error on the first page when it is stated that the healing of the nobleman's son and the centurion's servant were the only cures wrought *in absentia*; for there remains the case of the Syrophenician woman's daughter. I found the paper a most excellent summary of the whole matter but could have wished that it had been somewhat expanded.

Mr. JAS. B. NICHOLSON wrote: I was much surprised on reading the paper on "The Medical Miracles of our Lord" by Dr. H. J. Orr-Ewing, to find that he was not at all satisfied that such a thing as demon possession occurred.

The whole history of the China Inland Mission is a testimony to the reality of this. Dr. Hudson Taylor had personal experience of the presence of demons on at least one occasion, I think at Ningpo, when he was lodging over the premises of a man whose business was connected with idol worship.

He spent a very wakeful night calling on God for help as demon forces were most evidently attacking him. Many of the C.I.M. missionaries have told how demons were cast out, some of these men were medicals.

In the January issue of *China's Millions*, published in Toronto, Mr. E. Smith, of Sienka, Chekiang, China, tells of two striking instances in his own experience, of which he made notes at the time. In the Australian I.V.F. Magazine, Dr. Norman Deck, who has spent most of his life in the Solomon Islands, writes as follows: But though spiritist phenomena are not common amongst our

“civilised” communities (except in spiritist circles), missionaries who work among the heathen, especially among animists, soon become aware of their reality. Dr. Nevius, a Presbyterian missionary in Korea for many years, has written what is probably the classic on the subject, in his “Demon Possession, and Allied Themes” (Revell’s). The subject also appears in “Pastor Hsi” (C.I.M.). Once I wondered about the matter, but now, after an experience of thirty odd years in the British Solomon Islands, I am firmly convinced about the reality of spiritist phenomena and demon possession. The first case (among many) which opened my eyes took place in 1916, and is worth recording. I had gone, with a Christian interpreter, into the interior of San Cristoval on a Gospel tour. At one of the villages visited I had preached the Gospel with the aid of pictures of the Crucifixion of our Lord, His Resurrection, and Ascension. It was necessary to start at the Creation, for the heathen had no concept of a supreme God Who made the universe; then followed the Fall and the Incarnation. The audience of about 100 was intensely interested. The evening meal was had at sun-down. Later my bed was made on some banana leaves on the ground in a corner of a house, with my interpreter near by. There were from forty to fifty heathen in the house. About midnight I was awakened by a great commotion among the natives. They lit some torches made of the resin of a nut-tree, and across the room was a man, a heathen priest, talking most rapidly and in a curious falsetto voice. I asked what was the matter. The interpreter replied that the man was possessed with a “devil-devil.” I asked what he was saying (for I did not understand the native language). He replied that it was the “devil-devil” speaking. But I objected that I could see his lips moving. He replied, “Oh, you new chum, you no savvy nothing about this. This man no talk, ‘devil-devil’ talk through mouth belong him.” I may explain that pidgin English is the *lingua franca* of the Islands. Then I asked, “What is the ‘devil-devil’ saying?” The reply was astounding. The spirit was blaspheming Christ, saying that He was a wicked person, and that the people were not to listen to me. I was dumbfounded. Why this opposition to Christ? The man had never heard the Divine Name before I preached at supper time, and I had not said anything about spirits to rouse opposition. It was a direct challenge.

What was I to do ? I had heard before of such things from missionaries working in China. I could not let the challenge go by default. After prayer I went forward and, placing my hand on the man's shoulder, I said in English, " In the name of Jesus Christ the Son of God come out of him." The man had no knowledge of English whatever. But the immediate result was that the man became very violent, and I stepped back in a hurry. His voice went up and up in a crescendo until he shouted " Au gawa," *i.e.*, " I depart." Immediately the man became quite quiet ; and when he spoke again it was with his natural voice. He had no knowledge of what he had been saying. The incident was too vivid ever to be forgotten. The man was not converted. I understand that he died not long after. I never saw him again. But the incident made me realise just what missionaries are up against, " not flesh and blood " merely, but the organised antagonism of the Devil. There seems to be no other explanation of the fact that the Evangelical message so often rouses opposition among the heathen.

Mr. ELLIOT FITZGIBBON contributed some very lengthy comments in twelve paragraphs (too long to be inserted) supporting the view that demon possession is prevalent to-day, sometimes in forms not generally recognised.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Mr. A. S. Aldis is perfectly correct in his statement that I am inaccurate in my omission of the Syrophoenician's daughter as a miracle wrought *in absentia*.

Dr. Curr's comments are very helpful. I feel, however, that the " greater works " referred to by our Lord transcend any purely physical cures, wrought by modern therapy or by any yet to be discovered. As a physician I yield to no one in my admiration of these methods and marvels, but none of them, present or future, can be said to be " greater " than the restoration of sight to the blind by instantaneous cure or the raising of a body after three days in the tomb.

I cannot possibly argue with Mr. FitzGibbon. He apparently holds that all mental disease is a form of " Demon Possession."

I quite agree that in a certain sense all disease is the result, primarily, of the presence of sin in the world, and therefore originally has its *Fons et origo* in the machinations of the Devil, but I do not believe that all, or indeed much, of mental disease is due to the "demonisation" of the sufferer. His beliefs seem to be a return to the superstitions of the Middle Ages or to such as are still found among the more ignorant natives of Palestine and similar backward countries.

I am sorry I conveyed the impression to Mr. Nicholson that I was not at all satisfied that such a thing as demon possession occurred. I used the expression "not proven" in its technical sense, not as implying disbelief, as, as far as *my* investigations are concerned, no irrefutable proof had been produced. The whole history of the China Inland Mission is a testimony to this, says Mr. Nicholson, which is rather a sweeping statement. They were medical missionaries of the C.I.M. with whom the Home Director kindly put me in touch, and they were the people who replied as I recorded. However, I have always felt sure personally that such possession does occur and the instance from the Solomon Islands quoted in the article forwarded by Mr. Nicholson from the pen of Dr. Norman Deck would appear to me to satisfy any but the most prejudiced reader that such a phenomenon is there described. I am most grateful to Mr. Nicholson for bringing this case to my notice.*

*[A most valuable contribution to this subject, though nowadays not easily accessible, is *Demonic Possession*, by W. M. Alexander (Edinburgh, 1902). Ed.]

War conditions made it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on March 19th, 1945, the Paper for that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion.

*ANTI-SEMITISM: ITS CAUSES, PALLIATIVES,
AND CURE.*

By The REV. CHARLES FISHER, M.A.

ANTI-SEMITISM, or more accurately anti-Judaism—for other branches of the Semites have not been involved, only Jews—existed in pre-Christian days, but became more definite and persistent after the Fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews from Palestine. In the early centuries of the Christian era, the opposition came chiefly from church councils and the leading clergy; but things got worse for the Jews after the Roman Empire embraced Christianity in the time of Constantine, for their Christian opponents had behind them the power of the State.

For nearly a thousand years the outbreaks against the Jews were intermittent, due to definite efforts on the part of the clergy, and were in no way popular; significantly enough, the Popes were frequently their defenders. But with the fanatical enthusiasm and widespread public interest aroused by the Crusades a complete change came about, and Jew-hatred began to stir the masses to wholesale persecution of the Jews. This more sinister development received great impetus from the Lateran Council of 1215, whose wide influence may be judged by the fact that 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 800 abbots and a host of other church dignitaries were present.

It was at this Council that the distinctive dress ("Yellow badge") was imposed upon all Jews throughout Christendom, causing them shame and suffering beyond imagination, and reducing them to servility and a life of fear. The Lateran Council also decreed that Jews should be confined in ghettos and should be subjected to many humiliating restrictions.

The Reformation at first brought some improvement in their lot, for the movement was liberalising in its nature. But Martin Luther, who at first was friendly to the Jews, later became their bitter critic and opponent, and his works have been a rich storehouse from which anti-semitic propagandists have drawn ample materials to lampoon the Jews.

The Russian Orthodox Church has also not been behind in supplying its quota of anti-semitism, for the Russian pogroms at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, led by the clergy, who incited the mobs to plunder and destroy Jewish homes and slaughter their occupants as they tried to escape, outdid all that had gone before in cruelty and violence. Pobiedonostoff, Procurator of the Holy Synod, declared, "When the pressure on the six million Jews in the Russian Empire has had its full effect, one-third will be dead, one-third will have fled the country, and the remaining third will have adopted the Christian religion."

As we survey the sufferings of the Jews from the time of the Crusades to the opening of the twentieth century, we are obliged to admit that the following lurid picture by Péguy is not overdrawn: "I know this people well. There is no portion of its epidermis that is not painful, where there is not some old bruise, some ancient contusion, some secret woe, a scar, a wound, a laceration of the Orient or of the Occident."

Now the world has been stirred by the Nazi attack upon the Jews, which makes all previous persecutions pale into insignificance. Nazi anti-semitic propaganda, which was intended for export, has also exercised a wide influence on the thought of the whole world, coming as it did at a time of great political unrest and economic insecurity. Even this country, which has shown a traditional friendship for the Jews, and the United States, until recently "a second Promised Land," have both begun to develop obvious traces of anti-semitism. Thus the whole world has become Jew-conscious, and is rapidly becoming Jew-hostile.

CAUSES OF ANTI-SEMITISM.

There must be many causes to produce such a condition as that briefly summarised above, and there is danger in oversimplification; but the main sources may conveniently be considered under the following headings: (1) Religious, (2) Economic, and (3) Racial, which is the historical order of their development.

1. *Religious*.—From its very beginning, the basis of Israel's national existence has been religious. God called them to act as His instrument for the restoration of the world, and by this divine election they became "a peculiar people," separated from

the rest of the nations. As they were chosen to stand with God they were necessarily placed in opposition to the spirit of the world. This is revealed more clearly in connection with the second divine election of the Church. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own : but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, Therefore the world hateth you" (John xv, 18, 19). "Thus hatred of the Jews and hatred of Christians spring from the same source, from the same recalcitrance of the world, which desires to be wounded neither with the wounds of Adam nor with the wounds of the Saviour ; neither by the goad of Israel for its movement in time, nor by the cross of Jesus for eternal life" (Maritain, "Anti-semitism," p. 20). As Samuel Rutherford quaintly puts it : "The wind was blowing in the face of Jesus Christ, and anyone who will walk on the same side of the hedge as He did will find that the wind is blowing in his face too" (*cf.* Jeremiah xii, 9). One thing to which the Jews have clung down the ages is the fact that they are God's chosen people, and any attempt to explain anti-semitism will fail unless this peculiar burden that was laid upon them in the divine election is given due consideration.

But the purpose for which they were called demanded high spirituality and sacrificial service, and the tragic history of the Old Testament shows that they were unwilling to accept this rôle. They thus cut themselves off from the divine protection, which alone could have preserved them from their strong enemies on the North and South of the Holy Land.

The law, which was the very core of their national life, made them clearly distinct from other nations by its pure monotheism, the observance of the Sabbath, and all the regulations concerning food and daily life. But the law was obviously given for the land of Palestine, and for a homogeneous people ; its precepts could not be observed by a minority in a foreign land without untold difficulty and friction. The nation's refusal to follow God's revealed purpose for them led to their chastisement by banishment to Babylon. There we find instances of difficulties arising from their religion (*cf.* Daniel i, 8, iii, 12, and vi, 10), and full-fledged anti-semitism is seen in Haman's accusation of the Jews in Esther iii, 8.

But while the sore discipline of captivity did succeed in eliminating their proneness to idolatry, the heart of the nation

was not brought back into fellowship with God. God's blessing was still withheld from the restored remnant, as the post-captivity prophets show, and finally the voice of prophecy ceased amongst "this stiffnecked and rebellious people" four hundred years before the coming of Christ.

In order to try to restore their former national glories, certain religious leaders concentrated during this period on observance of the letter of the law, and developed a rigid legalism which crushed the true spirit of worship out of their religion and exalted to absurd importance the observation of minute rules and regulations, which actually "made the word of God of none effect." "Ye tithe mint, and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law" (Matt. xxiii, 23). But see the whole chapter, with Christ's eight-fold "woes" against the Scribes and Pharisees, ending with the official rejection of the nation (vv. 34-39).

Corruptio optimi pessima est. The failure to respond rightly to the privileges of the divine election meant that this nation, which had qualities which fitted it for its high calling, missed its way and became intensely hostile to the full development of that revelation in the Gospel. The Pharisees were the bitterest opponents of Jesus Christ all through His ministry, and their opposition led to His death. It was this same party which strove at all costs to preserve the nation after the Resurrection and the rapid growth of the Church after Pentecost, by bitter opposition to the Gospel everywhere, both in Palestine and throughout Asia Minor and Greece, as is so plainly seen in Paul's missionary journeys and his epistles.

After the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jews, the Pharisees maintained their spiritual leadership of the nation, intensifying their legalism, and at the same time their fanatical opposition to the name of Jesus of Nazareth and the new Faith. Though both Jews and Christians suffered considerably in the Roman Empire, both being termed "atheists" because they refused to acknowledge the Roman deities, the bitterness of Judaism against Christianity was maintained as the hard core of the spirit of national survival in dispersion. But when the Empire became "Christian" in the days of Constantine, Christians had now the backing of the State in their controversies with the Jews. As Judaism could no longer exact physical vengeance against its enemies, it carried on the struggle in another way. It retaliated in writing, and the Talmud and

other Jewish writings have ample proofs of this hostility. The spurious Jewish life of Jesus, *Sepher Toldoth Jeshu*, has succeeded from the earliest centuries of the Christian era until now in fanning the flame of bitterness against Christianity. Klausner says of it: "The inventions and legends, compact of hatred and sometimes of penetrating and stinging ridicule against Christianity and its Founder, went on increasing. . . . Nothing in the Gospels was denied; it was only perverted into a source of ridicule and blame. . . . This is the spirit which runs through the Toldoth Jeshu and which was certainly the spirit which prevailed among all Jews during the early Middle Ages" ("Jesus of Nazareth," p. 53).

It is necessary to know this feature of Judaism's religious development to understand its rigid intransigence and continued opposition to the Gospel. When this attitude is set over against the record of the Western Church, the Eastern Church and Protestantism (as briefly noted earlier), it is easy to understand the bitterness of the controversies between church and synagogue during an age when religion played a much greater part in human life than it does now.

The Crusades were the turning-point for the Jews in Christendom. Wherever the crusaders found Jews as they made their way across Europe, they attacked and butchered them. They were going to rescue the tomb of the Lord from the infidel's power, and here were infidels in their midst, "deicides" who had killed the Son of God, on whom they could practise destruction by way of rehearsal! A reign of terror fell upon the Jews in the Rhineland, where many thousands were brutally slain; others made their way eastward into Poland, establishing the Jewish community there, which has been the cultural and religious centre of Judaism ever since.

Through the decrees of the Lateran Council of 1215, embodying the Jew-hatred born of the Crusades, the lot of the Jews became unspeakably bad, and for the next five hundred years their existence was a perpetual nightmare. They were expelled from nearly every European country (from some several times), suffering severe losses. This absence of security forced them to adopt business methods which brought them into conflict with the citizens of the countries where they settled, and thus tended to increase their insecurity! This brings us to the Economic cause of anti-semitism.

2. *Economic*.—In the Roman Empire, Jews were allowed the

rights of citizenship, but when the Empire collapsed they could only live where they were granted permits, and it frequently happened that they became the property of the governing prince, who allowed them to live in his city. For centuries Jews were almost restricted to the business of money-lending and dealing in old clothes. (In the Middle Ages they were not allowed to become members of the trade guilds.) They were used by the princes to squeeze money out of their subjects, and the odium of this nefarious business fell upon the heads of the Jews. One of the most potent causes of "instinctive" anti-semitism is the evil reputation attached to the Jews through their money-lending, and yet they were forced into this occupation by the Gentile princes, who gave them sanctuary and a means of existence.

Later, particularly in Poland and Eastern Europe, great landowners often farmed out their lands to Jews, because thereby they could get the best returns for them ; but the Jews gained a notorious reputation for exploiting the poor peasants, and thereby developed anti-semitism. But while the charges were doubtless often true, the fault was in the system rather than in the Jews, who acted only as most Gentiles would have done under similar circumstances. The same applies to the permission to distil and sell alcohol, granted by the king to the nobles, and in turn passed on by them for a consideration to Jews. This was one cause of intense Jew-hatred, resulting in massacres ; but again it was the system, rather than the individual Jew, which deserved the chief censure.

Jews have been charged with being guilty of unfair business competition, and with introducing doubtful and wrong business methods. The very nature of their existence during the Middle Ages made them quick to seize any opportunity of earning money and, being naturally quick-witted, they often did forestall their Gentile competitors. But such charges came chiefly from Poland, which is a desperately poor country, where there was not sufficient trade for all. When peasants were driven to try to seek better conditions in towns, especially with the coming of the industrial age, no wonder that the Jews who were almost entirely town-dwellers had an advantage over them. The only solution of this aspect of the trouble is by increasing economic well-being all round, not by venting hatred on the Jew, who cannot be blamed for trying to live ! Seeing that they were not granted the privilege of citizenship and were restricted to certain occupa-

tions, it could not have been otherwise than that friction should come between them and their neighbours, especially with the religious background, which helped to poison their relations.

But the greatest incidence of economic anti-semitism arose out of a combination of religious and racial aspects. The pogroms in Russia (which then included much of present Poland) from 1881 onwards drove hundreds of thousands of Eastern Jews into Germany, England and America. Nearly all of these were extremely poor, and of low cultural standing. They were a menace to the standards of economic life in the countries where they settled, for they were ready to work for long hours at low rates of pay, and thus challenged the Trade Union standards which had been built up over many years. But America was then experiencing a very rapid industrial expansion, and was able to absorb almost unlimited immigrant labour. Between one and two million Jews crossed to the United States at this time from Eastern Europe.

But the industrial and economic crisis which developed after the Great War, causing widespread unemployment, almost completely closed the doors against further Jewish immigration into England and America. This damming up of the flood, which alone had relieved Central and Eastern Europe of a most pressing problem—what to do with its unwanted Jews—created a tension which was becoming almost intolerable when the World War came in 1939.

3. *Racial*.—While it is difficult to attach any exact meaning to the word “race,” which is used very loosely, and usually in a non-scientific way, it can positively be stated that there is no scientific basis for the Nazi race-theories of Nordic blood giving racial superiority to the Germans, or of the Jews belonging to an inferior type. Gobineau, who propounded the race-theory which Germany has developed with such tragic results to herself, the Jews and the whole world, frankly confessed that “he evolved it in order to support his political views of autocracy!”

Gobineau's famous book, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1855), set forth the claim that the Aryans were obviously the master-race, holding that the French aristocracy were the truest expression of it! This theory was taken up and largely reproduced in Germany by Wilhelm Marr to establish the racial supremacy of the German people and the disintegrating qualities of the Jews. Houston S. Chamberlain carried this forward to the extreme limit in his *Foundations of the Nineteenth*

Century, which was the bible of Germany after the Great War. Hitler was a friend of Chamberlain long before he wrote *Mein Kampf*, in which one of the author's obsessions is the rottenness and racial inferiority of the Jews, whom Chamberlain had described as a "bastard race," whose "existence is a crime against the holy laws of life."

Another chief ingredient in Hitler's anti-Jewish complex was *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, an egregious forgery which he accepted at its face value. This pernicious book also exercised a very strong influence upon the Czar of Russia, and led to the outbreak of the Russian pogroms in 1881, which flooded Western Europe with a host of poor and backward Jews, who showed many traces of inferiority! But those traits were no proof of racial inferiority, but were the outcome of their historical development under unjust living conditions and repressions of all kinds, extending over hundreds of years.

The writings of Gobineau, Marr and Chamberlain were used to support the movement of national expansion in Germany after the victories over Austria in 1866 and France in 1871. It was wishful thinking on Germany's part that led her to adopt these theories of Aryan race supremacy, and to find that in her own "pure Nordic" blood. The defeat of Germany in 1918 nearly pricked the bubble, but the legend of their having been stabbed in the back by the Jews, thus never having been defeated at all, was the main plank of the Nazi programme which swept Hitler into power, and prepared the way for his most shameful attack upon the Jews and threat to exterminate them.

Economic and Racial anti-semitism flourishes most readily when economic conditions are bad. The tragic condition of Eastern Jewry after the Russian pogroms from 1881 onwards, and the plight of the Jews in devastated Poland after the Great War, both helped to develop local anti-semitism, and to fan the flames of racial anti-semitism in Germany and the West. But worse even than this was the almost complete industrial breakdown in post-war Germany. The Germans were in despair because of their seven millions of unemployed workers and closed world markets. Thus it was that Hitler's bitter attacks upon the Jews in *Mein Kampf*, and in his campaign speeches, gained a hearing and made their lot absolutely impossible.

These three causes of anti-semitism—Religious, Economic and Racial—have combined with others to provide a problem which

bids fair to become a cancer in the life of the Western nations, and must be solved if civilisation, as we know it, is to survive.

PALLIATIVES.

The trouble is so widespread, and appears in such different forms in the different countries, that no universal solution is possible. The problem was acute before the world war broke out, because of the pressure of economic difficulties. It seems likely that it will have been increased immensely by the destructiveness and impoverishment of the nations due to total war, though in one tragic way the problem may have been eased, for many of the Jews in Europe have perished ! It is impossible to forecast with accuracy what the post-war economic state of Europe will be, though the slight glimpses afforded by the internal conditions of Italy, France, Greece and Poland provide no grounds for optimism. As the Jews have no territory of their own, it may be that their problem will have to wait till the other nations have been settled and rehabilitated. In the meantime, there are certain ways of improving the situation which may be considered.

The only practical scheme which has a wide Jewish backing is Zionism, of which more will be said in a moment. Anything that tends to promote better industrial and economic conditions, locally or world-wide, will help very materially.

1. An effort must be made to secure full minority rights for Jews, wherever they exist in considerable numbers, for the basis of their existence demands the right to order their own modes of life. It may be that the very need for labour for re-building industries shattered by war, and for the rehabilitation of national life in the various countries of the Continent, will make Jews an asset wherever they are.

2. Repeated efforts should also be made to provide that individual Jews should be treated with fairness and justice. There are good Jews and bad, just as there are good and bad nationals in every country. Let the bad Jew be punished for his crimes, as he deserves to be ; but let us avoid blaming the whole Jewish people (in our minds, if not openly) for the sins of individuals, which the majority repudiate as much as do their Gentile neighbours.

3. Let it be recognised that the leaders of Jewry have no

means of control over the Jew who has broken loose from the synagogue and has not developed any sense of responsibility towards the community where he lives. He is a problem and a trial to all, as was the gangster in America, and much patience will be needed to solve the problem of the Jew "wandering between two worlds."

4. Here in our own land much more could be done to get combined committees of Jews and Gentiles to consider together the things that cause irritation between them, and to suggest ways of overcoming or avoiding them. All the faults are not on one side, but those who have many contacts with Jews recognise their over-sensitiveness, and all know how their inferiority complex, due to centuries of unjust treatment, frequently makes them aggressive. As has been well pointed out, ability to put up with the awkwardnesses of the Jews is a proof of national health! The Germans broke down under the test and strove to get rid of the Jews, when actually most of the blame was due to their own sense of frustration owing to defeat in the Great War.

5. There is need for a wider understanding of the tragedy of Jewish life during the Middle Ages, and of all the forces that have combined to make the Jewish case the most tragic blot on human history. "To know all is to forgive all" may not be literally true, but a true perspective gained by a better understanding of where the Jewish shoe pinches would create sympathy where there is now indifference, if not hostility.

As the remarks in the former part of this paper show, much of the trouble has been due to human folly and blindness to the elementary principles of justice and fair play. But now Europe is the legatee of all the past centuries of repression and persecution of Jews and of all the anti-semitic propaganda that has poisoned the body politic for nearly a hundred years, and has to try to solve this problem, intensified many times over by the upheavals resulting from total war. It may be that the Jews will get full consideration in post-war planning, and one of the best ways to mitigate anti-semitism in the coming days will be to stress the need for this now. But, as Dr. James Parkes says, "There is no going back to the past. If human nature becomes to-morrow all that the idealists desire, there would still remain in the Jew question cultural, political and economic difficulties which would take the best intelligence to resolve. With the best will in the world, the progress is going to be slow" (*The Jew and His Neighbour*, Introduction, p. 8).

ZIONISM.

The revelation of the deep-seated anti-semitism even in liberal France which was made by the "Dreyfus affair" (1895) convinced a typical assimilationist Jew from Vienna, Theodor Herzl, who was a journalist in Paris, that there was no possible solution of the Jewish problem apart from the provision of a national home. That was not the beginning of Zionism, but he undoubtedly made it begin to make history. At first Herzl was not committed to Palestine as the National Home for the Jews, but experience of trying to forward his scheme convinced him that only by making the Holy Land the objective could he rouse the enthusiasm which was necessary to make the proposition a matter of practical politics.

Zionism made an immediate appeal to the masses of impoverished Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe, whose economic and social conditions were unspeakably bad; but liberal Jews in Britain and America, and the large number of assimilationist Jews in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent, did not welcome it, and often definitely opposed it, as did also the Rabbis of Poland because of its political emphasis. The whole movement received a great help forward by the Balfour Declaration of 1917, promising the support of the Allied Nations in the reconstitution of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. In 1922 the Mandate for Palestine was granted to Britain, but at that time the subsequent happenings in Europe could not possibly be foreseen. Instead of a normal flow of Jews back to the Holy Land, which might have been carried through without undue opposition from the Arabs—though from its very inception they viewed the whole scheme with sullen disfavour—the fury of the Nazi attack upon the Jews sent tens of thousands of refugees fleeing from Germany, with Palestine as the first objective for many of them.

In 1933 there were 30,000 Jewish immigrants into Palestine, over 42,000 in 1934, and nearly 62,000 in 1935, with the result that the Arabs refused point-blank to try to make the plan of the Mandate work. In spite of a Royal Commission and two other Commissions sent to Palestine, and a Palestine Conference of Jews and Arabs held in London in February, 1939 (at which the Arabs refused to meet the Jews), no agreed solution could be found, and the Mandatory power had to impose its own settlement, which it did by the White Paper in May, 1939, knowing

that it would not be acceptable to either party. The last quota of 10,000 Jews to be admitted under the terms of the White Paper, *after which no more Jews are to enter without first securing the consent of the Arabs*, was completed in May, 1944, and there the *impasse* stands.

Thus the working of the Mandate has proved impossible without the consent of the Arabs. To have imposed it by force would have been contrary to the terms of the Mandate, but the outbreak of war in 1939 suspended all further consideration of the question for the present. But neither Arabs nor Jews have suspended judgment in the matter, and Arab intransigence and opposition have assumed a much graver significance through the calling of the Pan-Arab Conference in Cairo (1944). It seems that any attempt to re-open the question of the Jewish National Home in Palestine will be met by a solid Pan-Arabic resistance. If so, there seems little likelihood that the Mandatory power—certainly not Great Britain, with all her Mohammedan subjects throughout the Empire—would undertake to incur an Arab war by forcing the return of the Jews upon them. At a time when the need is far greater than it was in 1917, because of all that has happened in Europe, the only way out for the Jews is blocked by a solid stone wall! The recent Jewish attempt to stampede the issue by terrorism, in the assassination of Lord Moyne, the British Resident Minister in the Near East, has done untold harm to the cause of Zionism, though it has been repudiated on all hands by responsible leaders of Jewish thought.

If the Arabs agreed to a considerable measure of Jewish immigration into Palestine, that would not solve the problem of anti-semitism, though the surprising success of the Zionist effort there has had the much-needed effect of giving those Jews sharing in it, and in some measure world-wide Jewry, a new psychological attitude of hope and sense of freedom from frustration. What the re-action will be if Arab opposition is adamant when the war is over it is impossible to say. But even if the whole land of Palestine were put at their disposal, it might intensify Jew-hatred, especially in countries where there is an unduly large Jew population, for Palestine could only absorb some two or three millions at the most, and that over a period of several years. All the unwanted Jews of Europe, who couldn't be accommodated in Palestine, might find themselves in a worse plight than ever before.

Reference may be made to Biro-Bidjan, the recently-estab-

lished autonomous Jewish Republic in the Far East of Siberia, though actually this has no connection with anti-semitism. Under the Czarist régime, Jewish life had become impossibly narrow. After the Revolution it was recognised that the Jews were a separate people, and an attempt was made to establish Jewish agricultural settlements, some 6,000 Jewish families being settled in the Crimea and 40,000 in the Ukraine.

In 1928 the policy was changed, and Biro-Bidjan was set apart for further colonies. This new venture may have had a two-fold objective: (1) to counteract the illegal, but strong, Zionist propaganda amongst the Jews in European Russia, and (2) to develop the potentially rich country of Biro-Bidjan, and thus provide a valuable frontier guard in a thinly-populated area in case of war with Japan.

When Lord Marley visited the settlement in 1933, the total population was between 40,000 and 50,000, but only 10,000 of these were Jews. In that year a thousand new settlers arrived from America, Belgium, Latvia, Palestine and elsewhere, but 60 per cent. of these were disillusioned by the appalling difficulties, and returned westwards (cf. *Biro-Bidjan: An Eye-Witness Account of the New Home for the Jews*, Lord Marley).

In 1937 the population is reported to have risen to 60,000, 21,000 of whom were Jews, and of these about 14,000 were living in the one town of Biro-Bidjan. It must be borne in mind that the U.S.S.R. has always maintained that Biro-Bidjan is a purely Russian concern. As a result they were reluctant to grant visas to German or Polish Jews to settle there. They finally did grant an official immigration quota, but it is probable that only a mere handful of foreign Jews were able to get there before 1939. For this reason, Jews abroad are uninterested in it. Eugen Lyons (*Assignment in Utopia*) states that during the Trotsky purges (1935), the leaders of the Jewish autonomous region perished.

THE CURE.

There is only one real cure for anti-semitism, the Scriptural one. "A thing is never settled till it's settled right." "They gat not the land in possession by their own sword." It was given them by God, as the Scriptures plainly teach. But it was that they might serve His purposes, otherwise they would lose their tenure (cf. Deut. xxviii, 64; xxx, 18, etc.). The prophets repeatedly warned them of their departure from God, but all in

vain. Finally the day of reckoning came, as foretold by our Lord (*see* Luke xxi, 20, 24), and Israel was scattered to the ends of the earth.

But God is a covenant-keeping God (Mal. iii, 6). Paul asks the question, "Hath God cast off His people whom He foreknew?" and answers with the emphatic word, "Perish the thought" (Rom. xi, 1, 2). God's honour and sovereignty are involved in the carrying out of His covenant promises to Israel, and yet His character demands that His "chosen people" should also be a choice people. They thought their divine election guaranteed their security and supremacy among the nations; this led to racial pride and spiritual declension. As a substitute for spiritual fellowship with God they developed their own intense legalism, which made them a problem to themselves and an offence to the nations (Mal. ii, 8, 9).

As God is a moral being He will not use force to compel Israel's obedience. Also, having thrust them out for their sins, He cannot consistently reinstate them till they are adjusted to His will. Israel's original calling was to restore the world to God by providing a Saviour; their existence, therefore, is bound up with the problem of sin. But they needed the Saviour just as the rest of mankind, even though they were God's chosen people. It is this unwillingness "to submit themselves to the righteousness of God" that has characterised the Jewish nation from its inception until to-day, in which respect they are exactly like the rest of mankind (*cf.* Rom. iii, 9, 22, 23). But the Jews, by their divine election, were set forth as an example before the nations, hence their failure receives special attention from God. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (Amos iii, 2, 3).

But Israel will yet be brought to the place of obedience, in the same way as individuals are brought, by repentance and regeneration (*cf.* Zech. xii, 11-14, and Isaiah lxvi, 6-8). Just as Jacob became Israel at Peniel, when he met God face to face, so the Jews will become "Israelites indeed" at the revelation of the Lord from heaven. It is the Jacob nature that has caused "the controversy of Zion," God's long striving with Israel (Hebrew, *God striveth*), and has also made the Jews so hated by the nations. But when she is redeemed and restored to the divine favour, which involves her return to the Promised Land, those undesirable traits will vanish, and the nations will turn to her saying, "We will go with you, for we have

heard that God is with you" (Zech. viii, 23). Thus will anti-semitism fade away in mutual recognition and sympathy, as the Gentile nations accord to Israel her true place in God's wondrous plan for the redemption of mankind.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Sir WYNDHAM DEEDES, C.M.G., D.S.O., wrote thanking the Council for their courtesy in sending the paper on "Anti-semitism," and for inviting his comments.

Under the heading "Religion" the implication is "The Jews began it," and the part played by the Church, the Inquisition, etc., is passed over very lightly. The Jews treated early Christians as Christian Churches came to treat their own heretical sects. But on balance and over 2,000 years, and as between Judaism and Christianity, the latter, in my opinion, is more "sinning than sinned against." But not according to this article. Page 43, "the recent Jewish attempt to stampede the issue by terrorism . . ." Pray! state this otherwise—the Jewish community in Palestine and Jews the world over were as horrified at the crime as were Gentiles.

It was committed by two fanatical youths who belong to a relatively small group. As written in the article it looks as though the Jews, as a whole, had wittingly had recourse to this method. "Zionism" (page 42). This paragraph does not, of course, represent views which I myself hold. To me the treatment of the subject is quite inadequate and shows insufficient acquaintance with the *imponderabilia* of Zionism. As to "the cure" I agree that it is to be found in that sphere—of the spirit. But I should have stated it otherwise myself.

Dr. NORMAN BENTWICH, O.B.E., M.C., LL.D., wrote: I do not think that the cure proposed is very helpful, though the diagnosis of the disease is fair enough.

The statement about the religious cause of anti-semitism is one-sided. The writer would do well, I think, to study Dr. Parkes's big work on the Church and the Synagogue, which brings out that it was the persecution of the Church after Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire that caused the hatred. What is

said on page 35 suggests that it was the Jews who first fostered hatred of Christianity.

Some statements on page 38 about the Jews from Russia are startlingly inaccurate; that they were backward and that they showed many traces of inferiority. Nor were there pogroms in Russia in 1881. The cause of the Jews' exodus was the enactment of restrictive laws.

On the historical side, the author might read Roth's history of the Jews.

The statements about Zionism are also often inaccurate. The Arab opposition to the Palestine Mandate was not the result of the large immigration after 1933. The serious outbreak of 1929 had little to do with immigration. It is not a fact that the last quota of 10,000 Jews to be admitted under the White Paper of 1939 was completed in May, 1944. The Government of Palestine has in fact granted two quotas since then and there is still a balance. It is mistaken to speak of a Jewish attempt to assassinate Lord Moyne. It was an attempt of two Jewish youths.

Mr. LESLIE I. MOSES wrote: The Rev. Charles Fisher in his paper takes no account of the curse that the Jewish leaders laid on their people. "His blood be on us and on our children."

This curse will not be lifted until that day when "they shall look unto Him whom they pierced."

Mr. E. H. BETTS, B.Sc., wrote: I should like to thank Mr. Fisher for his exceptionally fair-minded and well-balanced statement which has provided a sound basis for further thought and a stimulus to watchfulness. While recognising that there is no complete solution, Mr. Fisher points out to us certain palliatives, attention to which is surely a grave and solemn Christian responsibility. That our observance of these duties can only mitigate and not abolish the evil must be obvious if we reflect that it is largely the outcome of God's retributive ways and the fulfilment, whatever the human instruments and however evil the human passions deployed, of repeated solemn warnings (See, *e.g.*, Deut. xxviii, 15-68 and Matt. xvii, 25). Further, prophecies which are as yet unfulfilled and must

remain unfulfilled until the "time of the end" indicate very clearly that anti-semitism will not only continue its course but will work up to a great and terrible climax, when final deliverance will come in the person of Christ the Messiah. (See Dan. ix, 27; xii, 1-13; Zech, xiv, 2-3; Rev. xii.)

Dr. PAUL LEVERTOFF, D.D., Ph.D., wrote: There is one comment that I should wish to make to Mr. Fisher's paper. Christians who are suffering for their Christian faith cannot be anti-Jewish. They see the members of this people enduring shame and torture, often for wrong reasons—on trumped-up charges and vulgar accusations. They know that if the Jewish people were to accept Christ to-day, it would still be suffering: it would be suffering for the very things that Christians are prepared to suffer for. A Jewish writer, Maurice Samuel, rightly says that we shall never understand the maniacal world-wide seizure of anti-semitism unless we transpose the terms. It is of Christ that the Nazi-Fascists are afraid, it is in His omnipotence that they believe, it is Him that they are determined madly to obliterate. But the names of Christ and Christianity are too overwhelming, and the habit of submission to them too deeply ingrained after centuries and centuries of teaching. Therefore they must make their assault on those who were responsible for the birth and spread of Christianity. They must spit on the Jews as the "Christ killers" because they long to spit on the Jews as the "Christ-givers."

Mr. DOUGLAS DEWAR, B.A., wrote: Mr. Fisher has given us a most interesting paper, but it contains two statements which seem to be open to question. The first is his description of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* as "an egregious forgery." What evidence has he of this? By whom were these long-winded documents forged? When and where? What court has pronounced them to be a forgery? These questions are most important, in view of the influence these Protocols have exercised on the conduct of many people. Some years ago, two young men were prosecuted in a police court at Berne for selling a book embodying these Protocols on the ground that these were forgeries. The defence put in a list of twenty-five witnesses to prove the authenticity of these documents. The

court, however, refused to hear all except one. It then found that the defence had not proved the authenticity of the documents and therefore they must be forgeries, and one of the accused was fined 50 francs and the other 20. They appealed to the Chief Court at Berne and this court quashed the proceedings of the magistrate, acquitted the accused and held that the magistrate was not empowered to pronounce on the authenticity of the documents. Have there been any later proceedings which have not come to my notice ?

The second statement which I venture to think is quite wrong is that their inferiority complex frequently makes the Jews aggressive. The truth is that any aggressiveness shown by the Jews is due to a superiority complex. The Talmud, again and again, tells the Jews that they are immensely superior to all other peoples. Here are some examples. In *Sanhedrin* 58b we read : " He who strikes an Israelite acts as if he had boxed the ears of the Holy One (God)." This is based on Prov. xx, 25. In *Berakoth* 25b and *Sabbath* 150a we are told that the flesh of non-Israelites is as the flesh of asses and in consequence the command not to work on the sabbath does not apply to them. The statement that the Gentiles are as asses is based on *Ezekiel* xxiii, 20.

Seeing the views such as the above are expressed in their religious books it would be very strange if the less tactful Jews did not often behave in such a way as to rouse anti-Jewish feelings among those with whom they come into contact.

Mr. STANLEY B. JAMES wrote : The instructive paper by the Rev. Charles Fisher on anti-semitism does not, in my opinion, go far enough. Opposition to anti-semitism is merely that of one negative to another. We must be more positive. There is need for something which might be called pro-semitism. Such a movement would take two forms.

1. In our Christianity we must show ourselves more Jewish than the Jews. The Primitive Church regarded itself as the true Israel. In Christ it saw the flowering of the Hebrew tradition, the fulfilment of Jewish hopes. Even after Pentecost, Christians continued to worship in the Temple. Severance from the synagogue was a much slower process than has been supposed. Though at Pisidian Antioch

St. Paul declared that henceforth he would turn to the Gentiles, it is on record that subsequently to this, at Iconium, Thessalonica, Corinth and Ephesus, he continued his habit of going first to the synagogue. It is even said explicitly (Acts, xvii, 2) that this was his custom. He regarded his Gentile converts as grafted into the stock of Israel.

Later, this close connection waned. The influence of the West increased and that of the Orient declined. This lessening of the Hebraic influence in Christianity led to a loss of dynamism. The ethical emphasis was partly obscured. How serious had been the loss thus suffered was seen at the time of the Renaissance. Contemporary Christianity must recover its Hebraic heritage, as that heritage is revealed in the New Testament. The challenge of the Nordic Myth, repudiating Christianity's Jewish origin, must be taken up.

2. We must realise that the Jew, so far from being cast off, has reserved for him a place in the Church of his Messiah corresponding to the promises made to his forefathers. When, through the grace of God and an experience of suffering without parallel in the history of the world, he accepts the Pauline Gospel, it will be found that his natural gifts and the deepening of his spirituality effected by that experience have qualified him for leadership. The truth that "the first shall be last and the last first," which, in its earlier application, relegated him to the tail of the procession, will, in the days to come, justify his priority.

There would seem to be some close connection between the return of Israel and the ushering in of Christianity's last, triumphant phase. Bossuet declared that we have the right to believe that "it will not be with the end of the world, but rather with the most astonishing splendour of the world that the conversion of the Jews will coincide." That scarcely goes beyond what the words of St. Paul himself (Romans xi, 12) suggest.

Acceptance of this unpalatable view may not be easy. But the workings of Divine Providence are always an affront to human and racial pride. One thing is certain: if we are compelled to accept this forecast of Jewish destiny, we must not only abandon all anti-semitism but we must give the Jew a leading place in the drama of human redemption.

Sir EDWARD SPEARS, K.B.E., C.B., M.C., M.P., wrote: The historical outline is valuable. I have felt for a long time that anti-semitism has been fanned by Zionism. In fact political Zionism as it is manifested in Palestine to-day preaches very much the same doctrines as Hitler. It raises the question, most painful to Jews themselves, of whether Judaism is a religion or a race. This at once establishes a difference between assimilated and non-assimilated Jews. The assimilated Jew feels himself a member of the country of his adoption. The un-assimilated Jew, immigrant or the son of an immigrant, driven out by persecution, sees salvation in a separate Jewish State. It seems to me, therefore, that the question of Zionism, which stimulates anti-semitism, must be solved by the Jews themselves. Either they are a religion and should aim at being assimilated by the countries of their adoption or they are a separate race in search of a country. In the latter case Palestine cannot solve their problem since it could not absorb all the Jews in the world and the Jews who did not settle in Palestine would be permanent aliens in the countries of their adoption. They would be bound to be looked upon as a separate class of citizen and sooner or later the demand for their expulsion would be overwhelming, *e.g.*, in times of economic crisis, during wars and threats of wars, etc. As for Zionism itself it is either a religious question or a political one. If it is a political one, it is a question of deciding whether it is expedient to create a Jewish nation. It is hardly possible to justify Zionism on both political and religious grounds at one and the same time.

If a Jewish Palestine is claimed on religious grounds several difficult questions arise.

I understand that many learned divines hold that according to the Scriptures themselves the Jews forfeited their claim to Palestine and this seems to be the implication of your paper.

If nations can claim land on religious rather than political grounds this implies a completely new political structure. If the Jewish claim to Palestine is upheld by some, those who do so must be prepared to confine the claim of the Jews to the land they originally held. It is a historical fact that the Philistines, Canaanites and others were established in Palestine long before the Jews, remained there during the time the Jews occupied the highlands of the country

and long afterwards, and that the Arabs of Palestine to-day are the descendants of those early inhabitants who have adopted the Arabic language and the Moslem or Christian religions. It is interesting to note that the Jews in fact only occupied the coastal province and the plain of Esdraelon for seventy-two years, and that during the whole of the rest of the time that the Jews were in Palestine before the dispersal, these provinces remained in the occupation of the indigenous inhabitants.

If the claim of the Jews to Palestine is not urged on religious and historical grounds—and indeed I cannot see how a nation can claim to return to the land of its origin after a lapse of two thousand years without establishing a precedent which could disrupt all the countries of the world—then the claim of the Jews must be based on humanitarian grounds. A land must be found for the homeless Jews. If this is the ground on which Zionism is defended, then there is no reason in justice and equity why the Arabs alone should provide a land for the Jews. I think I am right in saying that the mass of emigrant Jews are descendants of early converts in Russia itself. On these grounds, co-operation by Russia might be invited. In this extremely difficult and seemingly insoluble problem there is one glimmer of hope. If order is re-established in Europe, and conditions are not too difficult there, it may be possible that a considerable proportion of the European Jews now in Palestine will seek to return to the lands of their birth. In any case pressure of immigration may be relaxed. This, of course, will not be the case if conditions in central Europe are abominable; but presupposing reasonable conditions in Europe, I suggest that facilities should be given to the Jews in Palestine to establish a kind of Vatican City there, and that an effort should be made on the lines of the valuable suggestion contained in the paper that Jews and Gentiles should look into and eliminate where possible causes of local friction wherever there are Jewish communities. I think also that encouragement should be given to the Jewish Fellowship which looks upon Judaism as a religion and not as a political movement. An effort should be made to draw a line between the assimilated Jews, *i.e.*, people not prepared to give up their adopted nationality under any consideration, and those who definitely refuse to be assimilated. The ideal would be to provide a sufficiently wide region somewhere in

the world where un-assimilated Jews might settle. It is probable that there would be a constant flow from this centre once it was established towards those other centres where assimilated Jews were settled and the latter could absorb into their own community Jews who had been filtered through this half-way house.

The above are merely thoughts that occur on reading the paper, and I do not suggest that they should provide more than a basis for discussion for those who have gone into the subject more deeply than I have. I do not pose as an expert on the subject and am only interested in it in so far as it affects the British position in the Middle East. One thing is quite certain, and that is, that under no circumstances whatever will the Arabs consent to being a numerical minority in Palestine, and that all the Arab States will oppose such a possibility by force if need be.

Dr. H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., wrote: Mr. Fisher has placed the Institute under a deep debt of gratitude by his discussion of a problem which seems at times to be almost insoluble. The outline of its history is of great interest, for, although the hand of the past is always on the present in every direction, the principle applies with special force to the Jewish question.

Insufficient attention is paid to the fact that antipathy to the Jewish people is not confined by any manner of means to nations which are professedly Christians. Mr. Fisher refers to the dislike shown towards them by Arabs, for example. That, of course, is largely due to the Zionist policy, as far as Palestine is concerned, but in other parts of the Arab world, a very large and influential section of Semitism, a certain unfriendliness probably exists, although it may not find expression in active opposition. That may be somewhat conjectural, but we are on sure ground when we turn to consider the attitude of the Roman Empire in general towards the seed of Abraham before its emperor professed Christianity.

One of the Roman satirists described the ghetto of the metropolis as hating all, and being hated by all. The expulsion of Jews by Claudius from Rome, mentioned in Acts xviii, 2, is said to have been due to their dissensions, but it may be an index of dislike as well.

In the famous episode in which Gallio figures (Acts xviii, 12-17), the maltreatment of Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, seems definitely to prove that the local community of Jews was decidedly unpopular. "The bystanders, Gentiles, ever ready to take advantage of the despised or hated Jew, took their cue from Gallio's resentment at their over-reaching attempt, and wreaked a sort of wild justice upon their leader Sosthenes, with Gallio's connivance—he feeling that the Jew richly deserved the beating" (J. Vernon Bartlet. *The Acts Century Bible* p. 308).

Such instances of bad feeling require explanation and consideration in the investigation of this perplexing question.

Whatever be its difficulties, the spirit in which that ought to be approached, is described in the classic words of a writer who was proud to describe himself as an Hebrew of the Hebrews. "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh : who are Israelites ; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises ; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever.—Amen."

Mr. W. E. LESLIE wrote : The information given concerning special Jewish settlements in the U.S.S.R. is interesting. But the numbers living in them must be but a small minority of the Jews in the whole of the U.S.S.R. territory. Under the old regime these Jews suffered persecution, to-day, as far as one can gather, they do not. Is this due to the change in the economic system, or to the lessened influence of the Greek Orthodox Church ? If anti-semitism has practically disappeared from an area where it was very prevalent it should be possible to draw helpful lessons from the facts.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I agree with Sir Wyndham Deedes's conclusion that "on balance and over 2,000 years, and as between Judaism and Christianity, the latter in my opinion, is more 'sinning than sinned against.'" Limitation of space may be pleaded for not treating this aspect of

the subject in greater detail, but I certainly did not wish to convey the impression which Sir Wyndham seems to have drawn.

While my remark about "the recent Jewish attempt to stam pede the issue by terrorism" is a rather careless one, it expresses what the man in the street thought of it. "Jews" in the mass are held responsible for the actions of certain Jews. I stated immediately afterwards that the act of terrorism "has been repudiated on all hands by responsible leaders of Jewish thought." Actually, however, Jews were more sympathetic to the terrorism than he allows.

Dr. Bentwich is highly inaccurate in his criticism.

(1) Parkes clearly brings out that the roots of the trouble precede the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Empire.

(2) While my statement about Russian Jews may not be true from the point of view of strictly Jewish culture, it is idle to deny its truth from the point of view of West European culture.

(3) He says, "Neither were there pogroms in Russia in 1881," and suggests that "On the historical side the author might read Roth's History of the Jews." May I quote from Roth ("A Short History of the Jewish People," p. 384, seq., 1943 edition) ?

"On Wednesday, 27th April, 1881, a dispute about the Blood Accusation in a tavern at Elisavetgrad, in the government of Kherson, served as the pretext for the outbreak of a riot. . . . The example spread like wildfire, being followed on an especially large scale at Kiev (8th to 9th May), and Odessa (15th to 19th May). By the autumn, outbreaks had occurred at no fewer than one hundred and sixty places in South Russia. At Christmas another series began at Warsaw. . . . In May, 1882, there were promulgated the infamous 'May Laws,' by which the Jews were excluded from all villages and rural centres even in the Pale of Settlement, outside Poland proper."

Dr. Bentwich's statements about Palestine are accurate. The high rate of Jewish immigration increased, but did not cause, Arab opposition. I am glad to be corrected about the further quota arrangements after what was stated to be the Government plan in the White Paper.

Mr. Moser : There is need to distinguish between the judicial blindness of Israel, of which the crucifixion was the culminating

act (so far), and the curse that the Jewish leaders laid on their people. God's righteous judgment visits "the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation" only. Many people, however, hold modern Jews responsible for the death of Jesus Christ, and this idea is still a factor in anti-semitism.

It is their moral blindness, due to continuing opposition to God's will, which will be removed at the return of the Lord Jesus, when "they shall look unto Him whom they pierced."

There is nothing in the way of criticism in Mr. Betts's comments, but I would like to add one word about "the mystery of Israel." It seems that Israel in dispersion is serving a double purpose in the divine moral government of this world. Their dispersion, according to the clear teaching of Scripture, is a judgment upon them for their disobedience to the revealed will of God, and continues as a chastisement to bring them at last to acknowledge their sin. But the presence of "the Chosen People" amongst the nations is a serious and severe test to the Gentile nations, and they have come badly out of that test. The Jewish Question is actually the Problem of Sin in this world, and the moral government of God robs both Jew and Gentile nations of rest "till they find rest in Him."

Space unfortunately makes it quite impossible to deal adequately with Mr. Dewar's statements about *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. I do not know that anyone has ever seriously challenged Philip Graves' proofs that they are for the most part borrowed from Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers*. So much so is this the case that one of the anti-semitic experts at the Berne trial (Mr. Dewar's statements here are far from accurate) tried to prove that Maurice Joly was a Jew; and the chief expert, Lieutenant-Colonel Fleischauer said, "Whether the *Protocols* have been copied or not is not at all important (*sic*!); what is important is the history of the last 150 years, and they alone decide upon the question of forgery." But even in Tsarist Russia it was realized that they were a forgery, and the Tsar himself forbade their use in the notorious Bailiss ritual-murder trial on this very ground.

It is strange that he should think it necessary to cast doubt on their inferiority complex, for it is blatantly obvious to all who have closer dealings with them. There is not much point in judging the modern Jew by remarks made between 250 and 800 A.D. It is a

well-known psychological fact that an inferiority complex often shows itself in aggressiveness.

I agree with much that Mr. James says. The fact that Paul was himself a Jew, "a Hebrew of the Hebrews" and a Pharisee, is sufficient to explain his constant return to the synagogue. He had a passionate love for his own nation (*cf.* Rom. ix, 1-5; x, 1-3).

How could Christianity ever have become a universal religion while it was wedded to the Law, as so much of Jewish Christianity was. It was therefore, necessary, for the dominating position of Jerusalem and its identification with the Law to be set aside. Such was the amazing progress of the Gospel amongst Jews after Pentecost, that when the break-up of the nation came, Christianity was able to stand upon its own feet and "go into all the world." Yet the great principles of divine grace which preceded the law, and were enshrined in it, cannot be discarded except at the peril of vital Christianity.

There seems to be no ground for the assumption that the Hebrew Christian is generally a leader. While it is gloriously true that some out of Israel have become mighty in proclaiming the Gospel, it is still a fact, true of Jews as of Gentiles, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty . . . are called."

Sir Edward Spears's over-simplification of "either . . . or" (used twice over) does not meet the case. He says that the Jews are *either* a religion *or* a race. The fact is they are both! The very basis of their national existence is a religious one! Again, his distinctions between assimilated and un-assimilated Jews breaks down. In Germany the assimilated Jews suffered just the same as un-assimilated Jews, for Hitler's attack was upon them racially, not religiously. In view of the breakdown of the foremost attempt at assimilation, that in Germany, the Jews are being compelled to re-think their whole position over again.

Further, Sir Edward overlooks the fact that the narrow slip of land called Palestine is by no means the whole of the Promised Land, which stretches from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates. It is calculated that there is room for a nation of sixty millions in this area. When "the desert shall rejoice and blossom as a rose" much of what is now desert will become rich agricultural land, providing support for the utmost

development numerically that Jewish nationalists can visualise.

While it is true that "many learned divines hold that according to the Scriptures themselves the Jews forfeited their claim to Palestine," it still remains a fact that the Bible is the most misleading book in existence if the future of Israel is not bound up with their return to the Promised Land. The return of the Lord Jesus introduces "the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts iii, 19-21), one of which promises is "He that scattered Israel will gather him" (Jer. xxxi, 10).

Sir Edward's concluding remark about Arab intransigence raises an interesting point. When Jacob was returning to Palestine at God's bidding, after he had run away from the anger of his brother, he was full of fear about meeting Esau. But that night Jacob "had an interview with God," and his name was changed from Jacob to Israel, and he became "a prince with God." When Jacob got right with God the trouble over Esau vanished, for Esau packed up his goods and left the whole land to Jacob! May it not be so again, when at long last the Jews become reconciled to God? As David Baron pithily suggests, "The whole nation shall have the whole of the land when God has the whole of their heart." Sir Edward suggests that my paper implies that I agree that the Jews have forfeited their claim to Palestine. I am glad to have the opportunity of making my position clear about this. My paper should have ended thus: "But when she (Israel) is redeemed and restored to the divine favour, which involves her return to the Promised Land, those undesirable traits will vanish," etc. It will be so amplified in the final reproduction.

Mr. Leslie raises a most interesting and valuable point. There are various reasons for the lack of anti-semitism in the U.S.S.R. Here are a few.

(1) As Lenin tried to create a confederation of peoples among whom the Russians would only be the predominant partner, the anti-foreign element dropped away.

(2) The Communists had already got a scape-goat—the capitalist, the fascist—so he did not need the Jew!

(3) The religious motive fell away; if the Jew was persecuted for his religion, the Christian was even more.

(4) The Jew had been economically ruined by the May Laws and the 1914 war, so the economic motive largely vanished.

It is true that where religion plays a lessening part in the life of the community there is a tendency for anti-semitism to become less pronounced, but the religious aspect of the trouble is only one part. It was the development of a virile paganism in Germany which made the clash with the Jews so bitter. But whether the Jews try by assimilation to discard their religious background, or the Gentile nations lapse into religious indifference, whatever alleviation of anti-semitism comes in this way is bought at too high a price! "A thing is never settled, till it is settled right," and behind the problem of anti-semitism is the problem of sin.

858TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1, AT 4.30 P.M. ON APRIL 16TH, 1945.

F. T. FARMER, ESQ., B.Sc., PH.D., IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Dr. R. E. D. Clark to read his Paper entitled "Modern Science and the Nature of Life."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which Professor R. O. Kapp, B.Sc., M.I.E.E., Rev. A. W. Payne and Mr. W. M. Powell took part.

Written communications were received from Dr. Julian Huxley, M.A., D.Sc., Dr. Richmond Wheeler, Ph.D., M.Sc., B.A., F.L.S., and Dr. H. Martin Cundy, M.A., Ph.D.

The following elections have been made: D. A. Quadling, Esq., Member; Major C. E. Griffith, late R.A., Member; Basil F. C. Atkinson, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., Member; James Boyce Stonebridge, Esq., Member.

MODERN SCIENCE AND THE NATURE OF LIFE.

By ROBERT E. D. CLARK, M.A., Ph.D.

FROM the earliest times the nature of life has offered scope for speculation. An ancient Indian MS asserts that all moving things are alive, while all still things are dead. Some such distinction must have existed in ancient Hebrew thought, for the "living water" of the Old Testament clearly means "moving water." In the middle ages Aquinas tried to state the same distinction more clearly: "Living and non-living things differ in that living things are self-moving in respect of vital functions whereas non-living things are not." For a like reason it was once supposed that the stars were animated, while right up to modern times we read of peasants who, on first seeing a locomotive, declared that it must have horses inside.*

With the dawn of modern technology emphasis on movement

* It is commonly assumed that primitive peoples think of things that move as (1) living and, *therefore*, (2) as endowed with wants and sensations. The fact that among such peoples inanimate objects are often treated as if they were sentient (Hans Kelsen, *Society and Nature*, 1943) supports this view. But this may be a mistake. Until recently, it has been generally assumed that children argue in the same way as primitive peoples, but research has indicated that in the child mind proposition (2) is not a necessary corollary of (1). A young child may argue that a car is "alive" because it moves, but he will nevertheless classify it with unthinking objects such as stones and nails and not with people and animals (I. Huang, *Jour. Genet. Psychol.*, 1943, 63, 71-121 Esp. p. 102). It seems quite possible, therefore, that the description of dead but moving objects as "living" is in no way indicative of an animistic outlook.

naturally declined and other suggestions were put forward. Living things were supposed to be distinguishable because they reproduced themselves (mules do not); fed on their surroundings and grew bigger; responded to stimuli; produced optically active compounds (Pasteur), formed wholes when cut in half at an early stage of their embryonic development (Driesch) or achieved "the active maintenance of normal and specific structure" (J. S. Haldane).

These and all other definitions* have proved inadequate. Not only can inorganic analogies be found for all of them but it is obvious that every attempt to define life along such lines is doomed to failure. An animal is not less alive than it was before if, for some reason or other, it temporarily loses its power to reproduce, to digest its food or to maintain itself in adverse surroundings. It would be fantastic in the extreme to define a house as a building which emits smoke from its chimney, for if a house could be so *defined* it would normally cease to be a house during the summer time. Yet biological writers in the past have sometimes made this identical mistake in their desire to define life—they have sought to define it in terms of what it can do.

The simple fact is that no definition of life which will stand up to criticism has ever been proposed. This is not, perhaps, altogether surprising. Whatever life may be it is not something which immediately appeals to our ordinary senses—we may *infer* that other people are alive by the way they behave, but we are not directly conscious of the fact that they are alive. At times, inferences are apt to be wrong, so it is no cause for wonder if all attempts to define life in terms of behaviour are misleading.

Clearly, then, we shall have to speak of life as best we can, in the absence of any clear definition as to what we mean by the term. This is not, however, as great a disadvantage as at first sight it may appear. The hunt for definitions has been the curse of philosophy and it is fortunate indeed that science has largely been able to proceed without them. The electronic engineer, for instance, gets on well enough without trying to define rigidly what he means by a "valve" while the chemist does not bother to define "flasks" or "test-tubes" and is unconcerned that earlier attempts to define a compound or a catalyst have

* For referenced summary of these, see R. E. D. Clark, *School Science Review*, 1940, p. 1117. Compare also E. Schrödinger (*What is Life?* C.U.P. 1944), who develops the idea that life feeds upon negative entropy.

broken down. Even the physicist only bothers to give extremely rough and ready definitions of his fundamental concepts. Rigid definitions have a way of being so rigid that we create endless confusion by expecting nature to conform to them, instead of learning humbly what nature has to teach us.* For the time being we must be content, then, to speak of life in the hope that we shall all have at least a rough idea of what we mean by the word.

* * * * *

If the attempts to define life have been uniformly unsuccessful the same is even more true of attempts to *explain* life in terms of physical and chemical concepts. Yet such attempts have been made in great number. When cyanogen was new to chemistry it was said to be semi-alive, and a primitive "fire-mist" containing the gas was supposed to have made the first germs of life. From that time to the present day, with its supposedly half-alive virus molecules, scarcely a scientific discovery has fired the popular imagination without someone venturing to suggest that it explained life. Optical activity, electricity, magnetism, vibration, radiation, radioactivity, evolution, special atoms with double nuclei which are supposed to have been made when the moon left the earth, molecules called "spirazines," certain types of chemical reactions, coacervates, and even calculating machines have been invoked to explain the mystery. Yet others have sought to avoid the difficulty by asserting that all matter is alive—the mind has been imagined as a mechanism controlled by a few undetermined quanta of energy, atoms have been endowed with sexes and so on.

All these supposedly scientific explanations of life are merely attempts to explain one mystery by means of another. If we do not know how a gas meter works it does not help us very much to be told with a knowing look that "activity" or "rotation" is the explanation unless we can see, at least in a general way,

* The dangers associated with an undue desire to define terms have recently been ably discussed by K. J. W. Craik (*The Nature of Explanation*, C.U.P., 1943). For a brief discussion of physical concepts, see later p. 69. The typical attitude of the modern scientist is well shown by the following quotation (W. R. Jones, *Minerals in Industry*, 1943, p. 9): "What is a Mineral? . . . The fact is that it is not possible to give a simple and perfect definition of a mineral, for the good reason that in nature there are few sharp lines of demarcation. The geologist, however, like the child who easily recognises his toys without being able to define them, has a pretty clear conception of what is implied by the term mineral."

how these concepts might explain the functioning of the meter. In the same way, if we do not understand life, our understanding is not enhanced by the magic word "radioactivity" unless we can see how, at least in principle, the splitting of atomic nuclei will give rise to thought, consciousness, growth, etc.

All this is obvious enough and it would scarcely be worth pointing out were it not that some very eminent men have a habit of overlooking it completely. Thus, Dr. Joseph Needham has recently said that: "Biologists find their work is only possible if they *define* (*sic!*) life as a dynamic equilibrium in a polyphasic system consisting of proteins, fats, carbohydrates, lipoids, cycloses and water"—a definition which Sir Charles Sherrington* considers to be "admirably lucid and comprehensive." But this is neither a definition nor an explanation. No one supposes that a mixture of the substances named, whether brought into "dynamic equilibrium" or not, would necessarily be alive. The statement covers all that we can directly observe in living matter, but that is all: it no more helps us to understand, far less *define*, life than does radioactivity, the calculating machine or the supposed sex of atoms. Our experiences of dynamic equilibria sometimes seem to be connected with growth but they are not connected with consciousness. Finally, it is surely obvious that biologists would not really be put out of work if they were deprived of this supposed definition of life.

* * * * *

Thus far our discussion has been purely destructive, but it has been vitally necessary to clear the ground. From what we have already seen it would appear at first sight that science has taught us nothing one way or the other about the nature of life. But this is only part of the story. It is certainly true that science has thrown no light upon the *nature* of life in the sense that it has not shown us how the properties of inanimate matter can lead to life. But, on the other hand, it has certainly given us some very definite guidance about the correct manner of approach to our problem.

The history of science shows us that progress is dependent upon the study of extremes. In the early stages of every science investigators asked, for instance, how *strongly* magnetic or electrified bodies (lodestone, amber) differed from other bodies; how

* *Man on His Nature*, C.U.P., 1940, p. 83.

black differed from white; colloids from crystalloids; light from darkness and so on. Early progress never came about by asking how one shade of grey differed from a nearly similar adjacent shade or how two suspensions with particles of very nearly equal sizes differed from one another. Explanation and the final unification of science have always come, in the first instance, from the study of exceptional cases in which some property is manifested to a quite unusual degree.

It is true that if we adopt this procedure we may be led at first to imagine a radical difference or *dualism* between things which, as we later learn, actually merge into one another. But it is the mere fact of recognizing the dualism which leads to the final unity, whereas if we start off by imagining a unity before we have evidence of its existence, progress will be impeded. To quote Professor C. D. Broad: "It is much more disastrous to slur over differences which are really irreducible than to recognise differences and wrongly think them to be irreducible. If we make the latter error we still have in hand all the data for the solution of our problem, and we or others will solve it when we have pushed our analysis a little further. But if we make the former mistake, our data are incomplete and the problem cannot possibly be solved until we have recognized the fact."*

If, then, we wish to treat the problem of life scientifically we must first of all characterize the living and the non-living in terms of observations made upon the most extreme examples of each that we can find—viz., between man and inanimate matter.

When once we do this we see startling evidences of dualism. As was more fully argued in an earlier paper† the laws of inanimate matter all depend upon the fact that events take place at random. But in mind—as developed in man and the higher mammals—we meet the ability to reason and to arrange events so that they do not take place at random. The laws of nature can never produce a petrol engine, a wireless set, an intelligent sentence, or a piece of music. Only because man's mind can conquer the law of randomness is he able to design and create these things.

The conclusion seems inevitable that mind is not, as some maintain, a mere complicated arrangement of organic substances following the ordinary laws of science, but involves a new principle—the principle of planning new arrangements which are not in

* *Mind and its Place in Nature*, 1925, p. 12.

† R. E. D. Clark, *Evolution and Entropy*, Trans. Vict. Inst. 1943, 75, 49.

any way consistent with the law of randomness. It is difficult to see any escape from this conclusion except to argue that everything which man creates is "determined" because it is already present in his genetical make-up—a view which creates many more difficulties than it solves.

We are led, then, by the usual scientific procedure to suppose that there is a dualism between mind and matter. Is this dualism final? Or will there come a time when we shall be able to see the unity between the opposites? In answer to this question we can only say that the evidence *at present* available to us indicates that it must be final for the simple reason that mind does not behave in a way that merely happens to be inexplicable to present-day science but involves a principle that it is *contrary* to all scientific generalisations. In this respect the dualism between mind and matter cannot fairly be compared with the less important dualisms of the past which have disappeared with the advance of science.

It seems clear, then, that we ought to accept the evidence as it stands. Even if we still feel that this evidence is not quite conclusive and that there is a slight chance that mind-matter dualism will one day be resolved, we ought still to adopt a philosophy of dualism, at least tentatively, if we wish to be scientific in our attitude. Monism finds no support from scientific method and even in the unlikely event that it should finally turn out to be true, the position of the modern monist is at present indefensible if he claims an empirical basis for his position.

* * * * *

The conclusion we have now reached is not one which commands assent in all quarters* and we must now try to understand the point of view of our opponents. We may well imagine one of them saying to us: "Yes, your logic is unassailable, but you are quite out of date. From the time of Descartes up to perhaps fifty years ago dualism was a perfectly sensible point of view. Scientists at that time adopted it tentatively because there were then no known facts which helped them to bridge the gulf between the living and the dead. Today, however, a sharp line of distinction is no longer tenable. Biologists have shown that the living and the dead do as a matter of fact merge into one another and so we know that the world is, after all, monistic."

* Cf. Julian S. Huxley: "The scientific method . . . rejects dualism . . . nor is there the least reason for postulating any sudden injection of life into our world" (*On Living in a Revolution*, 1944, pp. 44-48).

If we press our critic further he will remind us that there was always the difficulty of plants and trees which—though by general consent alive—show no signs of thought or creative power. He will then proceed to tell us of microbes, bacteriophages and especially the crystallizable viruses which, though they behave like definite chemical compounds, possess the power of reproducing themselves and even of undergoing mutations like the higher forms of life. He will very justly demand to be told how the dualist view which we have reached can survive in view of these and countless other instances which seem so definitely to prove the existence of a gradual transition between the living and the dead.

It is these facts that materialist and monist writers have chiefly in mind when they assert so dogmatically that modern science has vanquished the old dualistic views. The argument is certainly plausible and in view of the frequency and dogmatism with which popular scientific writers have brought it forward, it is little wonder that a section of the public have been led to believe that dualism has been disproved by science. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to show that the argument contains a fallacy which those who use it so confidently have overlooked.

At first sight it appears that our critic is right in asserting that the apparent gradual transition between the living and the dead really does mean that the two are not truly distinct but merge into one another gradually. The history of science affords a number of instances in which pairs of apparent opposites—black and white, acids and bases, complex and double salts, colloids and crystalloids—were once supposed to reveal fundamentally different opposites. But in each of the cases mentioned it has turned out that the distinctions are to some extent arbitrary—there is a gradual transition between the opposite pairs of concepts, so that it is, in some cases, meaningless to say that a given acid, salt, etc., belongs to one or other of the possible classes. Here, then, we have cases in which our inability to classify means that the classification is itself only a matter of convenience and corresponds to no fundamental difference in nature.

Yet, to jump from this fact to the conclusion that the living and the dead are not truly distinct because here also we meet the border-line case where we cannot tell whether an organism is alive or dead is to forget the rules of logic. It is easy to find cases of gradual transition of a very different character. Thus

in everyday life we distinguish between fresh and salt water. As we consider increasingly dilute solutions of salt, there comes a time when we just fail to detect it by taste. At this threshold concentration opinions will vary as to whether or not the water contains salt. Chemical analysis will set a new and lower threshold. Indeed, whatever ordinary criterion we use for the detection of salt, we shall always be faced with a failure to find a definite break between the presence and absence of salt in the water. Here and in many other instances, however, science has shown us that a definite break exists *despite* our inability to recognize it in the laboratory by any simple means. There is a perfectly sharp distinction between pure water and water containing at least *one* molecule of a particular solute. If the dissolved material is a bacillus or virus the distinction may even be of practical importance.

This second possibility is often overlooked. Even scientific workers like N. W. Pirie* have argued that because *we* cannot distinguish between the living and the dead, nature knows of no such distinction and the words "living" and "lifeless" are but convenient terms with no precise meaning. Yet it is obvious that this conclusion does not follow at all. We cannot be sure that our failure to classify is not due to difficulties of observation rather than to nature's refusal to be classified according to our categories.

On the whole, in fact, past experience does not support the modern monist. At one time it looked as if it was possible to have *any* quantity of liquid in a vessel and that when a liquid flowed it flowed evenly. It was likewise supposed that bodies could be charged with *any* quantity of electricity, or magnetized to *any* degree, or given rotational velocity of *any* amount—all within certain limits. This being so it was considered meaningless to argue that a body was either charged or not charged, magnetized or not magnetized, rotating or not rotating, etc., for there were an infinite number of possible states between the absence and presence of the property in question. But in all these cases the scientists of an earlier day were wrong. For the most part nature seems to work by discreet jumps—there is in fact a real difference between a charged and an uncharged particle: atoms, electrons, magnetons, quanta of energy, etc., cannot simply be

* In *Perspectives in Biochemistry*, Ed. J. Needham and D. E. Green, 1937, p. 11.

divided indefinitely.* The biologist who asserts that the apparent gradual transition between the living and the dead indicates that nature does not know of a discrete "jump" between dead and living matter is ignoring the lessons of the past.

Thus the facts that we have been considering afford no evidence whatsoever against dualism. The grounds for accepting the dualist position are, then, quite unscathed by the new developments and assertions that dualism is out of date often only serve to afford evidence of muddled thinking on the part of those who make them.

* * * * *

Yet having reached this point, we have admittedly not solved the problem as to whether bacilli, viruses and the rest are, in fact, alive or dead. It can only be said that it would be foolish even to attempt to solve it—for since we lack clear ideas of life it seems inevitable that we shall always be uncertain about what is alive. Nevertheless there are certain important points which ought to be discussed at this point.

We have examined the two possibilities of explaining the fact that there is an *apparent* continuous transition between the living and the dead. At the present time the concept of life lacks precision from a scientific point of view to such an extent that it is not possible to decide between the two possibilities by any known observational means. But let us suppose that one day biologists succeed in overcoming this difficulty and are able to discover a fairly exact definition of life. Will it then be possible to decide finally which of the two possibilities is the correct one?

In looking for an answer to this question, it will be necessary to learn to think in a way which, for many people, may seem a trifle unfamiliar. When we speak of weight, length or electric current we usually think of a *quantity* because we at once associate these things with a pair of scales, a ruler or an ammeter—all of which serve as instruments for measuring. But we must not

* As Mr. P. E. Trier has pointed out (*Private communication*) the calculus of continuous variation is always easier than that of finite differences. For this reason, there is in every science a tendency at first to overlook real differences and to assume a continuity which does not in fact exist. It is likely, therefore, that if a means of measuring life (see later, p. 69) were one day to be discovered, mathematically inclined biologists would first of all develop a calculus concerned with its continuous variation and would at first interpret their results in an anti-dualistic sense.

forget that these physical concepts are also *qualities*—weight, for instance, is the quality of being heavy and so on. Conversely, when we think of love, beauty and truth, we instinctively think of them as qualities, for we but rarely think of them in a quantitative connection and so we focus our attention on “what they are” rather than on “how much of them is available.” But here again, these things also have a quantitative side to them—it is meaningful to say that one man is more truthful than another, one picture more beautiful than another and so on.

When we speak of life, it is the qualitative aspect that instinctively comes first to our minds, for here again we have no instrument for measuring magnitude. It is partly for this reason that life is so difficult to define. If we try to give a clear qualitative statement of what we mean by *mass*, we soon find ourselves in deep waters. We usually avoid this difficulty by defining mass as a mere number—we say that a mass is defined by comparing it with a given standard mass or else we discuss how it accelerates under the influence of a force—which also begs the question as to what it is which accelerates. In this way the physicist often shirks the trouble of having to give definitions and thinks of numbers or pointer readings instead.

In the case of life we cannot avoid the difficulty in this way—we cannot say that the life in one fly is precisely 2.38 times that in another fly. So when we try to define life we are forced to give vague qualitative definitions not unlike our tautologous definition of weight as the quality of being heavy.

But even though we cannot measure life it is obvious that it must be intrinsically measurable—just as love, beauty and truth are intrinsically measurable. It is obvious to a child that a hundred live men contain more life than one live man and ninety-nine dead ones. Life must, in fact, have a quantitative aspect and the fact that we do not often think of it in this way is due to our lack of suitable sense organs or suitable instruments and not to the quite absurd possibility that life is a quality without quantity.

It is necessary to emphasize this rather unfamiliar way of looking at life for two reasons. First it shows that the analogy we drew between life and salt water with varying amounts of salt in it affords a very close parallel to what we find in nature. Our perception of life (though reached inductively or intuitively and not through the sense organs) corresponds to our vague sense of taste rather than to the refined methods of the physicist, and

the very vagueness leaves room for differences of opinion. Some living organisms contain more life than others, but as we are not able to perceive life in small quantities we can never reach certainty as to whether it is present or absent in any given case.*

Secondly, this approach shows us exactly why we experience difficulties in speaking of the so-called non-measurable concepts. It shows us that our difficulties are not necessarily due to the unreality of the concepts we are discussing but are at least as likely to be due to *our* inability to measure these concepts. But this, cosmically speaking, is a purely parochial affair which may only depend upon the anatomy of *homo sapiens*.

The difficulties which some moderns raise about life only show that in their thinking they are putting man in the centre of the cosmos to an even more dangerous degree than did the *savants* of the middle ages. They are saying, in so many words, that what *man* cannot measure is not there.

* The general argument remains unaffected if life of more than one kind exists—just as the argument about salt water is unaffected if the salt is not pure sodium chloride but a mixture of several salts. It is also unaffected if life quanta of different sizes (*e.g.*, in mammals and *amœbæ*) exist: energy quanta also may be of different sizes.

DISCUSSION.

Professor R. O. KAPP: The subject of this paper is in a sort of no-man's land bordering both on science and philosophy and barely acknowledged by either. It is in a region where amateurs of all kinds may disport themselves unrestrained by the disciplines that exist in those regions where a body of experts have formed means of checking and counterchecking every statement. In such regions the spirit of enquiry is always weak, but there is an abundance of theories; intellectual integrity is less in evidence than imagination; questions are rarely formulated with any care, but the answers to them are given with profusion. It is, therefore, all the more refreshing to listen to an author like Dr. Clark, for whom the spirit of enquiry is the driving force, whose intellectual integrity does not permit him to seek easy solutions, who has here undertaken the rare and hard task of formulating a relevant question.

May I suggest that the question becomes even more relevant, while none of Dr. Clark's meaning is lost, if the word "life" is replaced

by "living substance." If this is done we are left free to reserve the word life for a further question. Are the characteristic properties of living substance due to specific influences that operate on the organic world and not on the inorganic world? If so, we must regard life as cause and living substance as effect. Then two distinct paths of enquiry open up before us. Following the first, we ask what living substance is and does; following the second, what is done to it. The first passes through the well-charted domain of the biological sciences, the second through country at present without maps or signposts.

I doubt whether Dr. Clark's question will ever be answered from a study of mind. This traditional approach has been attempted for too long with too little result. So I think the time has come to try another. One obvious objection to expressing the specific properties of living substance in terms of mind is that most of it has nothing resembling mind. Possession of mind may distinguish a few creatures from the rest of the animal and the whole of the vegetable world; it certainly does not distinguish the organic from the inorganic world.

Can a criterion be found that does this? Can we define a characteristic that is always shown by the organic world, even at its most vegetative, and never by the inorganic world, even at its most sublime? Does any observation prove beyond doubt that something is done to matter when it enters into the organic world that is never done to it in the inorganic world? Only if this can be done are we called upon to speak of life as cause and living substance as effect; only then may we accept the vitalist theory that living substance is due to influences from which lifeless substance is free. Otherwise we must agree with the materialist assertion, at least for the vegetative end of the organic world, that it is attributable to the unaided action of matter on matter.

I think there is such a criterion and that it has hitherto been missed only because we have been looking for it in the wrong place. My suggestion is that the criterion is to be defined in terms of probability. Let me explain.

In the inorganic world, as every physicist knows, things fly about, and jostle, and tumble, and eventually shake down to more or less permanent structures. One can observe certain events, such as the

movement of an electron from one orbit to another in an atom, and certain configurations, such as that of a rock salt crystal. There is a definite probability that a given event or configuration will occur. This can be calculated for very simple cases, and the frequency with which the event or configuration does occur in nature is found to be as predicted by mathematics. It is the firm and well justified belief of physicists that the mathematical calculations based on the theory of probability would always give results that agreed with observation in the inorganic world, even when the mathematics is too complicated for the human brain. In other words physicists work on the basic assumption that the inorganic world is not controlled by any selective principle, but that any event or configuration may occur there that can be attributed to a mere process of shaking down. The assumption is justified by their success.

On this assumption the probability that atoms of two kinds of atoms such as sodium and chlorine will become aligned in the configuration of rock salt crystals if small is still large enough to account for the quantity of these crystals to be found in nature. Physicists have no need to invoke a selective principle in order to explain their abundance. The probability that in shaking down under the unaided action of matter on matter atoms of hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen and oxygen will come into the specific pattern of a given chemical substance is far smaller; the larger the number of atoms that form the given pattern the smaller the probability; and if the pattern is a complex one in three dimensions the probability is smaller still. The probability that mere shaking down in the absence of a selective principle would produce, say, the pattern formed by the millions of atoms in a beach leaf is fantastically small. A small probability but not an impossibility; it is not precluded by physical laws. Mathematics might, *perhaps*, prove that one ought to expect one beach leaf in eternal time. But beach leaves are abundant in *our* time.

What is equally significant is that other configurations, physically equally possible, do not occur. This is why organic matter can never be attributed to a mere process of shaking down. The assumption that there is no selective principle is justified for the inorganic world, while there is overwhelming evidence of a very active selective principle in the organic world.

CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS (Dr. F. T. FARMER) said : I do not intend to make more than a very few remarks on the subject of this paper. I believe it is the duty of a chairman to be brief, and I know there are a number of people here who have contributions to make.

However, I cannot help saying how grateful I am to Dr. Clark for the very valuable paper he has presented to us. The subject of life is probably the most important that men have ever had to consider. Yet for all our closeness of connection with it, it has baffled the greatest intellects throughout the ages, and there seems little reason to suppose that it will ever do anything else. But to correlate the facts that we can understand, and give a balanced view of the whole situation; as Dr. Clark has done so ably, is perhaps the best that anyone could ask with our present limited knowledge.

The temptation to try and explain all phenomena in terms of physical laws has been very great. This is not really to be wondered at when we recall the tremendous triumphs of physics in interpreting the behaviour of material systems. We have been given a key, a *master* key, which turns out to be able to open an immense number of locks, and the view that we have been able to obtain as a result is indeed amazing ; it has certainly surpassed the greatest dreams of the early scientific investigators, and will continue to be a source of wonder as long as its progress is maintained. When we have such a key at our disposal it would indeed be contrary to all our principles of research not to try it in all the locks which we wish to undo. That is natural. But the shock of finding that here and there are some which it does not seem capable of turning should not be allowed to weigh so heavily on our minds as it has done on some people's. The key is our own making, and it is surely more scientific to recognise its limitations than to try all manner of devices to force it where it does not fit. Dr. Clark has done us a great service, I think, in showing how far the laws of physics are relevant to living objects, and at the same time how many of the qualities with which we are so familiar in living beings are just not of the class with which physics can deal, and demand a fresh approach altogether. As Dr. Clark says, a unification may come some day. But for the present, the Dual character of the Universe must be retained, and any denial of this is likely to close the door to further knowledge rather than to open it wider.

The Rev. A. W. PAYNE called attention to the Biblical phrase "the life is in the blood." Mr. Walter Powell also spoke.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. H. MARTIN CUNDY, M.A., Ph.D., wrote :—I was much interested in this paper, and in particular in the author's argument that the existence of mind involves a principle which is contrary to all other scientific generalisations. I think this argument is cogent and has never been satisfactorily answered.

I am, however, a little worried about the concluding remarks concerning the supposed quantitative aspect of life. The author was putting it mildly when he said the concept would be found unfamiliar. To my mind his analogies are misleading, but perhaps I have not quite grasped his argument.

Let me say at once that I do not dispute his conclusion. I am convinced that there is a clear-cut distinction between living and non-living, and that the apparent blurring of the distinction is due to lack of refinement both in recognition of the criteria of life and in the means of observation. It is the introduction of the idea of "quantity of life" which worries me, and I do not see its relevance.

The writer affirms that love, beauty and truth are intrinsically measurable. I deny this, in any normal sense of the words. A statement is true, or it is untrue. There are no degrees of truth. When we say that a book, or an argument, or a compound statement is *true*er than another, we mean one of two things: either that it contains more statements which are true, or that it is a closer approximation to the truth. In the latter case it is not *true*. It is obvious that if we say one object is "more living" than another we do not mean it is a closer approximation to life. We could say this of a robot or a machine, but not of anything we suspected of being alive. We can only mean that the object "contains more elements which are alive." Again we can speak of a man as more truthful, but surely "veracity" is the quality here predicated, and not truth. We mean merely that he more consistently tells the truth. What is here measurable is *frequency*.

In the same way, an action shows love, or it does not. When we say a man, or an action is more loving than another, we mean that

he or it applies the principle of love in more detail, with reference to more people or contingencies than the other. We could say then that an object was "more living" than another if it reacted as a living thing to more details of its environment. The case of beauty is more difficult, but I think can be subjected to the same analysis.

In none of these cases are there any grounds for speaking of a "quantity of truth" or a "quantity of love" or a "quantity of life." To speak of such a quantity we must show that it can be added or subtracted in the same object. There is only "more life" in 100 men than in one man, because there are more living objects.

Are 100 metre-sticks "longer" than one metre-stick? I think not. They are all the same length, that is all that can be said. If we place them *end to end* so as to measure, or to form, one extended object, then they are 100 times as long. But this is just what we cannot do with life. We can take 100 living cells together in a colony, but we have added the *living units*, not the "units-of-life." We cannot add life in the same object. I do not mean just that we are incapable, I mean the whole idea is inconceivable.

Life is like truth, and beauty, and love. It is a quality which is not capable of measurement, and therefore it does not belong to the world of physics or exact science. Living cells are additive in the same way as true statements or loving deeds are additive; but the life and the truth and the love are not additive quantities in any sense. From the same analogy we see that life is a quality which is either possessed or not possessed by any given object. There are no degrees of life. (There may, of course, be different *kinds* of life.)

This is, of course, an analogy and not an argument. I am merely at pains to point out that it seems to me wrong to think of life as a measurable quantity, and thus expect it to be brought into the realm of science. I reach the same conclusion as the writer of the paper by thinking of life as above and outside the realm of the exact sciences, instead of thinking of our uncertainty as due to our lack of refinements of measurement. This uncertainty relates only to the recognition of the criteria of life, not to life itself.

DR. L. RICHMOND WHEELER, Ph.D., M.Sc., F.L.S., wrote: This

is an interesting and scholarly paper, and I am in general agreement with Dr. Clark's conclusions, particularly that dualism is not disproved by modern (or ancient) monistic theories.

But the Nature of Life is a very big subject to be tackled in a short paper, or in still shorter comments, and I think Dr. Clark has weakened the vitalist position unnecessarily by taking definitions of life based on single propositions only, and then accepting the materialist thesis that each one of them, taken singly, has failed.

Nor does his previous treatment in *School Science Review*, 1940, p. 1,117, throw much further light on this crucial matter. For example, he quotes, apparently with approval, the statement by Lotka that chloroform "feeds" on shellac and ejects "undigested" glass, and that this and similar phenomena are homologous with the complex processes by which organisms absorb, digest, and build up into their own varied substances the quite different matters they obtain from the inorganic environment or from vegetable substances previously elaborated in that way. But, does chloroform elaborate (or degrade) chloroform from shellac? I submit there is no homology whatsoever between simple physical aggregations such as solutions and the anabolism performed by plants and animals.

Biogenesis remains an unbroken law of Nature, supported by millions of experimental facts. Viruses exist and reproduce only where there is living substance to support them: Hopkins, Kenneth Smith, and other experts say viruses cannot be looked on as links between the living and the non-living in our present state of knowledge.

In addition to the two criteria of nutrition and biogenesis, many more can be given as differentia between organisms and non-living matter. Where several of these occur, life is present; where only one or two, and those usually in feeble analogies, such as the growth of crystals by aggregation of particles of their own composition, life and its many mysteries are absent.

Dr. JULIAN S. HUXLEY, wrote: I fear I cannot be present on April 16th, and also find myself unable to comment on Dr. Clarke's paper, as to do so adequately would take far too much space. I would like, however, to draw attention to one point. Dr. Clark discusses the question of measuring life quantitatively. He seems,

however, to leave overlooked the point that many biologists would regard "life" merely as a convenient word used to denote the ensemble of living organisms and their properties. Life as an actual entity then has no more real existence than *e.g.*, did the "caloric" of the 18th century as a substance. If so, "life" cannot be measured (though evolutionary progress may be).

Mr. TITTERINGTON writes: Dr. Clark has confined his discussion to the distinction between the living and the dead, or not-living. But we use the term "living" in various senses. We say that a tree is living, and that an animal is living, but that a stone is not living. But when we say that an animal is living, we do not mean the same as we do when we say this of a tree; we recognise a discontinuity between the life of a vegetable and of a animal, in the same manner as we recognise a discontinuity between the vegetable and the stone. But just as it is not an easy matter to determine precisely where to draw the boundary line between dead matter and living, or to define exactly what it is that constitutes the difference, so it is not always easy to say whether a given organism is an animal or a plant, or what it is that makes an animal an animal. An animal exhibits reflex action, but so do some plants, such as the sensitive plant and the sundew. In the higher forms of life we recognise feeling, volition and at least some rudiments of reason, but not so in the lower ranges. A sea anemone (perhaps this may not be a very good example) seems to feel, but can we be sure that the reflex action we observe is fundamentally different from that of the plants we have cited?

I forbear to speak further of the discontinuity between the animals and man "made in the image of God," but as regards that between plant and animal, it would be interesting to hear what Dr. Clark has to say, if it is not trespassing too far outside the limits he has set himself.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am most grateful to all who have taken part in this discussion. Many of the points raised are most interesting, but there is only space to allude to a few of them here.

Professor Kapp (whose deeply interesting book, *Science versus Materialism*, 1940, should be consulted for further details of his views) suggests that living and non-living substances ought to be distinguished, not by the presence or absence of mind, but by the presence or absence of a "selective principle" working against the probability laws. He holds that in this way alone can we explain the fact that plants are obviously alive but equally obviously devoid of mind.

Now a selective principle need not necessarily be present in objects, such as machines, which are constructed in defiance of probability laws. A selective principle (in this case a mind) is necessary for the creation of an original design, but not for the mere existence of the object designed nor (so far as I can see) for its reproduction if it is capable of reproducing itself. So if we postulate a non-mindlike selective principle present in living substance, I do not see why a machine should not also be regarded as living. We have the added difficulty that a selective agent which is not a mind is quite outside anything of which we have experience, and is, indeed, unimaginable. On the whole, the traditional distinction between mind and non-mind would seem to offer fewer difficulties. Nevertheless Professor Kapp's suggestions are well worth exploring further.

Dr. Huxley thinks I have overlooked the fact that many biologists use "life" as a convenient word "to denote the ensemble of living organisms and their properties." He then concludes that "life" has "no more real existence than" the 18th century "caloric."

I regret that I cannot follow this reasoning. I neither doubted nor overlooked (*see* p. 67) the fact to which Dr. Huxley draws attention. To say that "life" is unreal because it describes organisms that are "living" does not, as I see it, throw much light on the matter. I do not understand in what way "caloric" illustrates Dr. Huxley's point. It was once supposed that hot bodies differed from cold ones by the presence of "caloric" and it was hoped that this caloric would one day prove to be measurable. The physical entity which distinguishes hot from cold bodies was later identified with the kinetic energy of molecules and this *can* be measured. So the factor which distinguishes hot from cold bodies is measured in degrees of temperature or in energy units per molecule instead of in grammes

of a material substance. The mistake 18th century scientists made was to suppose that caloric would prove to be measurable in grammes, but in my paper I have made no assumption as to the units in which "life" might prove to be measurable. The postulate of an entity which distinguishes hot from cold bodies was a piece of sound physical intuition. No one would think of saying that heat (or caloric—call it what one will) "has no real existence" because it denotes "the ensemble of hot substances and their properties." Dr. Huxley does not explain why he argues in this way about life.

I think Dr. Wheeler's criticisms are due to a misunderstanding. I do not for one moment wish to suggest that the simple physical phenomena that Dr. Wheeler mentions are truly analogous to living processes, far less do I wish to weaken the vitalist position by the use of such analogies. I have rather been at pains to show that *even if* the materialist is allowed to "get away with" all these bad analogies, the existence of mind will still, ultimately, make his case indefensible.

I am most grateful to Dr. Cundy for his thought-provoking criticisms of my remarks about the quantitative aspects of love, beauty, truth and life. I am sure that his disagreement with what I have said is largely my fault. I omitted to state that measurement always involves an operation. 100 metre rules have no more length than one such rule unless we *also* specify that they shall, in imagination if not in reality, be joined end to end. When we speak of a kilometre or a light year we have an operation of this kind in mind as, indeed, we always have when we think of any measurement whatsoever.

Bearing this point in mind, it seems to me that Dr. Cundy's objections could be applied equally well to purely physical qualities—as indeed he has himself realised in the case of length. One might argue, for instance, that since 100 batteries contain no more potential than a single battery, the whole idea of measuring potential is inconceivable. But this conclusion would be wrong.

The question is—can we *conceive* of operations which would render elements of love, etc., additive within a single mind? It seems to me that we obviously can. In this case of love and beauty such conditions are fulfilled spontaneously in our minds every day of our lives—in the *growing* love we feel for our friends, in musical and artistic appreciation, etc. It is an over simplification to say that

we either do or do not perform an action out of love for another person. There *are* degrees of love. As for truth—if truth simply means true statements, Dr. Cundy's objections are partly justified—but I did not intend to confine the word within these narrow limits. Dr. Cundy, however, concludes that by "more alive" I can only mean "contains more elements which are alive." I do not see why he should object to this. We can measure electric charge and mass by the number of elements (electrons, atoms) of these which a body contains. Similarly if the life of an organism turned out to consist of an integrated group of life elements, life would have as much right to be called measurable as electricity or mass. Even the integration of the elements might also be measured by a probability (*Cf.* entropy).

Of course, *strictly speaking*, physical quantities are never really *numbers* since all measurement consists of a manipulation of numbers. So ultimately all measurement, other than that of numbers, is inconceivable. I think this fact lies at the back of Dr. Cundy's objections. Nevertheless I do not see that he has brought forward any reason for doubting that love, beauty and life are any less potentially measurable than the quantities with which physics deals.

859TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1, AT 6 P.M. ON APRIL 30TH, 1945.

THE REV. A. M. STIBBS, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Rev. G. W. Bromiley, M.A., Ph.D., to read his paper entitled "The Biblical Doctrine of Divine Revelation."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which Mr. W. M. Powell and Mr. A. E. Hughes took part.

Written communications were received from the Rev. Principal P. W. Evans, B.A., D.D., and Alexander Fraser, Esq.

The following elections have been made: Kenneth N. Walker, Esq., M.A., F.R.C.S., Member; Miss Ruth M. Filmer, B.Sc., Member.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF DIVINE REVELATION.

By the Rev. G. W. BROMILEY, M.A., Ph.D.

CHRISTIANITY is not primarily a system of religion, a human work, but faith in a revelation, a work of God, attested by the record known as the Bible.* Attempts have, of course, been made to substitute the religious for the revelational aspect: the most destructive and radical in the modern period, when Protestant theologians, influenced by the European thought-movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, tried to absorb the Bible revelation into the immanentist-naturalist philosophies, accepting Christianity only as one religion with others, a product of the intellectual and emotional faculties of man. Such men as Herder, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Harnack, Rashdall, all worked along these lines. But always Christianity has had to come back to the elementary fact that its roots are

* Religion, definable in many ways, has to do with human thought, emotion, conduct and ritual in relation to God. The word is seldom used in the Bible, which is the record of revelation, the divine work in relation to man. Religion without revelation, being a work of man, is necessarily tainted with sin. But religion is also the natural response of man to the work of revelation. Where God is revealed and God is at work, it is possible to attain in response to pure religion, of which the highest expression is a life of holiness and of love. Christianity is revelation first, since its foundation and power is in God, but in so far as man must respond, it is also, secondarily, religion.

in God, not man, that God has revealed Himself to man, as Scripture witnesses. The first aim of the theological revival of the present, led by the great thinkers Barth, Brunner, Lecerf, Niebuhr, has been the reinstatement of Christianity as revealed message rather than religion, the creation of God rather than of man. The modern world has no greater need than that Christianity should be understood again and preached as the revelation of God, and the Bible honoured, not as a literary or historical record, which it is incidentally, but as the living Word in which God Himself is known.

The controversy between revelation and religion, between the approach which stresses God's work and that which stresses man's, is central today. The greatest danger is that the advocates of a humanised Christianity should adopt the concepts of faith whilst giving to them a new meaning and setting them against a new background. It was in this way that the rationalistic Neology, and later Herder and Schleiermacher with their romanticised theology, sought at once to overthrow and to retain Christianity as a revealed faith. When we speak of a divine revelation it is necessary that the exact meaning of the term should be brought out, and its relation to Scripture clarified. The word revelation, "unveiling," can be used in many senses. The immanentist can speak of a revelation through Scripture as well as the Transcendentalist. Many cry out that the message of the Gospel should be translated into the terms of modern thought, but the true need is that the revelation of God should be proclaimed in opposition to the philosophical misunderstandings and perversions of it prevalent in theology and science. If the plant is to emerge in its full beauty and strength, parasitical growths must be cleared away.

It is not possible in a single paper to lay down even the outlines of a theology of revelation, but what can be done is to indicate the general lines along which the divine revelation must positively be proclaimed, and, without apologetic, to show the points at which opposition to current philosophies must arise. To give to this survey incisiveness and comprehensiveness, the Biblical doctrine of revelation will be stated in a series of concrete propositions, with some general illustration from Scripture, and a discussion of the more obvious liberal misconceptions. If a dogmatic defence cannot be undertaken, the risk of an over-simple and dogmatic presentation is worth running.

The basic proposition in a Christian theology of revelation is

that revelation is not a revealing of God *by* man, but a self-revealing of God *to* man. Speak of the revelation, or "making known" of God, and there is, grammatically, an ambiguity. Is it the unveiling of God, with God as Object, or God's unveiling, with God as Subject? But the ambiguity is superficial, because, Scripturally, both meanings are correct. God is both Object and Subject: it is God who is revealed and it is God who reveals. There is perhaps the suggestion (the "*si integer stetisset Adam*" of Calvin) that in the days of innocence a definite act of revelation was unnecessary, that man, as man, had the knowledge of God and could walk and talk with Him intimately by nature. Even then, however, God was self-revealed in nature and in the spirit of man. But with the Fall the garden became a memory and God a mystery. Traces of God could be discerned, but in His innermost Being He was the Unknown God, the *Deus absconditus*. Not that God veiled His face. The sin of man obscured His face. Only God Himself could pierce the veil of sin. If, then, God is to be known by sinful man, He must by a definite act make Himself known. The knowledge of God depends upon the act of God.

Of this act Scripture is the record. Nothing could be more misleading and mischievous, except for the student of comparative religion as such, than to treat the Bible as a partial record of the human quest for God. Scripture testified rather to the divine quest for man, affecting, without doubt, the history, emotions and aspirations of the race, but not understandable as such. When Eden lost its springtime light and bloom, Adam fled, but God began to seek. When the Judgment of the Flood was impending, Noah did not awake to the knowledge: God warned him. Abram had his own way of life and worship, his own thoughts of God, in Ur, (unsatisfactory) perhaps, and his thought developed in Haran and Canaan, but what mattered was that God called and led and blessed him. The sheep do not seek the shepherd, but the Good Shepherd comes to seek and to save that which is lost. The religious background of these acts is interesting, the growth of insights important, but the acts of God are more than background and insights. A crib is interesting and important, but, for anyone but a professional manufacturer of cribs, to investigate the crib and to ignore the baby is to betray a pitiful lack of proportion. And for anyone but a student of religion in his capacity as such, to trace the

story of a religious growth and to ignore the story of the revealing work of God is the height of folly.

Revelation is inevitably interwoven with religion, but the two are not one. Religion is the work of human and sinful faculties. Apart from, and even in response to, the revelation of God, it is sinful and idolatrous, and easily lends itself to corruption. Faith can point to many a triumph, but religion has many a story of shame. Faith in the revelation of God is religion, but secondarily—the earliest believers had faith within the context of another religion. Thus whilst faith in God's revelation does issue in the highest and purest religion, the primary, the basic thing in Christianity is the faith itself, the humble acceptance by man of the living Word of the living God.

Revelation is a self-revelation on the part of God. But this means the second proposition: that revelation consists, not in a process, but in an act, or a series of acts, supernatural in character. Post-renaissance thought has been enslaved by the pseudo-scientific understanding of movement as growth, of which the philosophical concept of an immanent God is the counterpart. Romantics, Idealists, Naturalists, joined forces in subjecting physical, historical and spiritual life to the same laws of organic development. Process, progress, evolution became the slogans of the age in its understanding of history and life, of religion and God.

In Christian doctrine the reaction has been two-fold: first, an attempt to harmonise the concept revelation with an immanentist-evolutionary view of the universe—the very misleading notion of progressive revelation; second, an attempt to resolve the contradiction between the natural and the divine by the elimination of the supernatural. In each case the understanding of God in immanentist and not transcendent terms is the basis: God is reduced from Creative Subject to immanent spirit, revealed only in natural law and growth, and, in the more daring writers (*e.g.*, Hegel), realising itself only in the creaturely world, and attaining for the first time to self-awareness, or consciousness, with the emergence of man.

The attempt to re-write Hebrew history in accordance with evolutionary notions of what ought to have happened, is of a piece with this movement, witness its exclusion of all supernatural, transcendent acts on the part of the free Creator. The Hebrew record must be amended to form a story of continuous growth. The religious conceptions of the Hebrews reflected in it must be

grouped, and the records themselves regrouped, to fit in with a scheme of progressive development from primitive animism to the final exalted monotheism. The term revelation is still used, but it describes a progressive comprehension of truth, a gradual clarification and deepening of concepts, an elimination of the primitive and crude; God-inspired, God-directed, but the work of the human soul. It is revelation because it is the work of the spirit of God immanent in man, but it is revelation as a natural process, not as a supernatural act.

The matter is complicated because, of course, religious concepts, as man's reception, do necessarily intermingle with the divine revelation, and the revealing acts of God do have their place in the ordinary course of history. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for instance, built their altars in accordance with the custom of the age, and perhaps, in the frailty of their human understanding, they did share some of the religious thoughts of their neighbours. In the Mosaic code, again, there are provisions similar to those in heathen codes. During the troubled times of the occupation the Hebrews fell into quite open idolatry, adopting the customs, ceremonies and beliefs of Canaan, and this persisted under the kings, in spite of the prophetic witness. But this was all incidental, the historical setting, the human reception, not the revelation itself. God revealed Himself to man within the context of historical movement, now progressive, now retrogressive, but the revelation itself was from without. Receiving is relative, the revelation absolute. The revelation does not consist in the thoughts of those who received it, but in the supernatural acts of transcendent Deity, Calling, Deliverance, Prophecy, Miracles, Incarnation. Because revelation and religion interlock and intermingle, to form an historical whole, we must not be confused, by the immanentist equating of God and man and denying of sin, into thinking that they are identical.

Again, God does make Himself known generally, in nature, history and conscience, all created by Him. But the Biblical revelation in nature is not that of God immanent in law, but of creative power expressed in law. Natural law, historical movement, conscience, these reveal God. Had man remained innocent they would have sufficed. But sinful man is blind to the transcendent God thus immanent in the world. Confounding Creator and creature, he gives to creature the honour due to the Creator. Only as the new revelation of Love enlightens his eyes can he learn again to exclaim with the Psalmist "The

heavens declare the glory of God," to perceive the hand of God upon the nations, to hear the voice of God in the soul. Sinful man, surveying nature, sees gods, demons, forces, immanent spirit, the play of mechanical powers, the self-realisation of divinity; surveying history, he sees a meaningless jumble, or the cycle of recurrence, or evolutionary ascension, or a movement of growth and decay; surveying conscience, he sees blind instinct, or social morality, or a purposeless, hidden testimony. God is still revealed, truly, but without the new and transcendental acts in nature, history and conscience (the plagues of Egypt, the Red-sea deliverance, the Law-giving at Sinai), there are neither eyes to see nor a heart to receive. But once God is known in judgment and grace, He is known too in the lily that grows and the sparrow that falls, in the battle that is won and the voice that speaks within. And He is known, not as the law of creation, but as the law-giving Creator, who, even as Hidden God, is Lord.

Revelation in the Bible is the self-revelation of God, transcendent, not immanent. By its nature it is supernatural, even when it is given through the natural. Eliminate miracle, and revelation, redemption, even creation, as well as the Bible, are eliminated. Pantheists argue that the distinction between natural and supernatural is artificial, and with some truth. They wrongly conclude that all is natural. On the contrary, all is miracle. The creation itself and natural law are, ultimately, miracle, as is God's transcending of creation and natural law. Revelation is miracle from first to last. Deny this, and God is denied. Sinful man, surveying the creation of God deranged by sin, is pleased to call it natural. But the truly natural is not this sub-nature, in which the perfect laws of God shine through the clouds in preservation, but the Will of God, expressed either in those laws or in others beyond the petty ken of man. Man is the denier of nature, not the supernatural God. Imagine God as a spirit tied down to this world deranged by sin, and the race is condemned indeed to a horrible perdition. But apart from the prior revelation in and through creation, God the Lord has revealed Himself in grace in acts of power, supernatural, in that they transcend the ordinary laws of creation, truly natural, in the sense that they are the fulfilment of the Divine Will. And in these acts God is revealed as the God of grace, who is truly immanent because He is Incarnate, yet in that immanence itself, transcendent.

A third proposition naturally follows: The revelation which is God-given, if it consists in supernatural acts, is a particular revelation. Truth which is revealed is not abstract and timeless, for all men to grasp whenever they can or choose, as are, for instance, the truths of mathematics. It is historical and concrete. It is not something which is there, but something which happens, and which has all the "once-for-all-ness" of the event. Revelation, as the act of God in history, has the singularity proper to the historical act. Man cannot now know God through the age-long witness of nature, history and conscience, which have some permanence, even if they are constantly renewed. This revelation does persist, as Scripture testifies, leaving man without excuse. But man cannot receive it. There is need for something more than this general display of wisdom, power and righteousness. The Bible revelation begins where this general revelation is broken off, with the failure of sinful man to perceive it. The Bible is the record of the new and particular revelation of God to sinful man, in judgment and in grace.

But if this revelation is particular, historical, concrete, unique, an event, it is quite different from abstract truth, which might be diffused through a variety of religious systems. Apply the word "comparative" to religions, and an interesting anthropological study results. Christianity can be classified with the rest. But apply it to revelation and the result is nonsense. There is perhaps a sub-stratum of truth in almost all religions, handed down from the earliest times when man knew God in the general revelation in nature. This is not surprising. Nor is it surprising that man has overlaid that truth with the idolatrous extravagancies of his own sinful fancy. But there can be no question of a diffusion of revealed truth through the religions, nor of a gradation of revealed truth. The false premises of much comparative study is that there is some degree of revelation in every faith, and in Christianity the highest degree, thus far. This is an erroneous assumption which vitiates much work otherwise of great historical value. Religion is general, because it is the work of man, and, although the quality of religions differs, the needs which prompt them are, roughly, the same the world over. But revelation, the revelation of grace, is one and absolute, a final event, which admits of no comparison with the fancied theophanies of paganism. The Bible does not claim that faith in God is superior to belief in pagan gods, because God is one, and His revelation is one, and all else is nothing.

The series of God's redeeming acts culminates in an historical life, the Incarnate life of the Son of God. Here the work of redeeming grace reaches its climax, in an absolute and exclusive work of God which marks out Christianity from all the religions : the Virgin Birth, the life of love, the death upon the Cross, the Resurrection and the Ascension into Heaven. If this is the Word of God, then all other revelations are excluded, " I am the Way, the Truth and the Life ; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

God reveals Himself ; He reveals Himself through acts ; His revelation is absolute, particular. In the three propositions which follow, more detailed truths with regard to the form, the reception, and the content of that revelation must be stated. Urgent and vexed questions are raised, especially with regard to the relationship of the absolute revelation to the necessarily contingent and relative historical nexus, but any detailed discussion is impossible. The main need is that the outlines of Christian teaching should be drawn up in opposition to modern views which threaten to obscure the pure truth of Scripture.

The fourth proposition is : That the revelation of God, which consists in a series of transcendental acts, comes to man in the form of historical events, which are recorded and attested in the written story of the Hebrew race.* The revelation of God may be spoken of with a threefold reference, as regards its outward form. The primary reference is to the acts or words of God, such as the Flood, the Call of Abraham, the Red-sea deliverance, the Fire at Carmel, the Word of the prophets, the teaching, the life, the death and the Resurrection of Christ, the descent of the Spirit. These are the unveiling of God in the original sense. It is through these deeds and words that God has made Himself known to individuals, families, nations, all nations. But there is a secondary reference, to the witness by which this primary revelation is mediated. The record of these acts and words is also, secondarily, the revelation of God. God caused this record, Holy Scripture, to be made. God inspired the authors. God causes the events of which it speaks to happen

* The question is sometimes asked : Why the Hebrew race ? Why Abraham ? Various reasons might be given, but the only true reason is that this was the Sovereign Will of God, which, since revelation is purely of grace, man has no claim to question. Why did God create man ? Why did He cause grass to be green ? Why did He act in one way and not another ? these are all boasting and foolish questions, which man has neither right to ask nor power to answer.

to the seeking soul in every age. Detailed questions as to the Bible's reliability and authenticity, and the nature of its inspiration, cannot be discussed here, but the problem is that of the Incarnation itself, of the transcendent revelation of God in the contingent world of history, and it is no essential problem to the one who has received the revelation. The final guarantee of Scripture is the activity of God the Holy Ghost through the written page. The term revelation may, finally, be used with an even wider reference, to cover all Christian preaching and teaching which is based upon the written witness and empowered by the Holy Ghost. It is through this spoken word, based upon Scripture and speaking of the primary acts, that God ordinarily makes Himself known to the soul. The divine act, which is the basis, is not thereby excluded. Preaching is a proclamation of those acts of which Scripture is the perpetuation, a heralding of what God has done and said, an extending of the exclusive and absolute act to all humanity, a quickening of the historical past to the living present.

This doctrine of revelation as the Word revealed, written, preached, excludes many conceptions of the modern age. Mysticism in the pure sense, in which the emotional intercourse of the soul with God is revelation, independent of concrete acts or words, is negated. The message of God may come *through* individuals, chosen vessels,* and it must be received *by* individuals, but the revelation itself does not consist in the *experience* of the individual: it is from outside, *objective*, an *act* of God, and, as such, not exclusive to the mystical type. Again, a religious individualism pure and simple is excluded. The religion of a man may be his own, but it is not thereby true. Each man must make the revelation of God his own, by the Holy Ghost, but the revelation itself is given, attested and proclaimed, and if a man prefers his own thought to that revelation, then however sincerely he may hold to it, it is idolatrous and erroneous. True and living knowledge is only possible where God Himself speaks from without: all feeling, all thinking which has not this basis is delusion. Misconceptions with regard to the written record are also repelled: on the one hand the error of an over zealous, and thus unwise faith, which would treat the

* It might well be argued by mystics that the individuals chosen are mystical types, but the point is that the revelation of God is not the experience, nor is it peculiar to the individual. It is something—a word—from God, given through the individual to all.

Bible itself, not the acts and words which it attests, as the primary revelation ; on the other, the error of humanistic pride, which, understanding the world anthropocentrically, would treat the Bible as the story of a religious quest, the religious record and literature of a nation, revelation not as written testimony to the work of God, but as manifestation of the divine spirit in humanity. Let the scientist, historian, literary critic, study the Bible as literature, history, science—by all means. But let him not wander from that study into speculative theology. And let him remember that if the Bible is science, history, literature, it is also, and supremely, the record of the revealing acts of God. And when the minister of the Gospel studies the Bible humanistically, let him remember that the true secret of the Bible can only be known when it is read with humility and faith as revelation. Finally, a true understanding of revelation in its extended sense as propagation, dispels false ideas with regard to the nature and function of preaching. Preaching, as revelation, is not topical chatter, the airing of commonplace views upon current affairs. It is not discussion, oratory, devotion even. It is the heralding of news, the proclaiming of the acts of God, testimony to what God has done. Less urgent matters, devotion, instruction, application to contemporary problems, have a place ; but if the primary nature is realised, the pastoral problem loses its edge. Men cannot spare the time to listen to the prattle of fellowmen, but they must pay heed to a living testimony to the great acts of God, which means to each soul life or death.

Not everyone, however, does receive the revelation of God in power. This is not a limitation of God's redeeming love, but a plain fact of experience. Christ Himself, we read, taught in parables, so that only those who perceived as well as saw, who comprehended as well as heard, might receive His word. A fifth proposition must be made then : That the revelation of God, which consists in outward acts, attested by Scripture and proclaimed by witnesses, cannot be known by the individual except there is the inward testimony of the Holy Ghost and the movement of repentance and faith.

A twofold problem arises : The relationship of the revelation of God, as history, to history as such, which may be known of all ; and the tension between revelation as objective fact and as subjective truth. The former problem involves the whole question of Scripture as God's work and man's, of miracles as transcendent and yet historical events, of the Incarnation, the

two natures of Christ, of the death and empty tomb which were atonement and resurrection. It is too large to discuss here. A few words might, however, be profitably said upon the second, and, (since the two are fundamentally one), this would also help to indicate the lines along which the first must be tackled, and at the same time to bring out the great divergence which exists here between much philosophical theology and the teaching of Scripture.

Revelation in Scripture is an objective reality. It consists in concrete facts of history, concretely attested, not in emotions and intuitions, as Schleiermacher would have it. A pure subjectivism, which destroys absolute authority, is thus negated. But revelation and the witness to it, as concrete facts of history, have the apparent contingency of such facts, and their true meaning as revelation is not immediately or on the surface clear. With a little wresting they are susceptible of explanation purely as history. They have the character of the incognito. Faith alone can pierce the incognito and see through to the true reality. Thus Christ was a religious teacher, but faith sees more, the Lamb of God. The cross was an execution, but faith sees an atonement. Easter was an empty tomb, a riddle (hallucination, fraud, mistake ?), but faith knows a resurrected Lord. A pure objectivism is thus also avoided. Revelation does not come as a fact or series of facts which all can learn, although it rests upon and consists in facts, but as an act of God which sifts the heart : for only in penitence and faith can it be received.

A few Old Testament examples might help to make this plain. There are the given facts by which God is known : the plagues, the law-giving, the overthrow of Jericho. These are all historical events. The historian may, if he so choose, deny the transcendental and miraculous character, and treat them solely as historical events : the plagues, a series of natural disasters, culminating in widespread assassination ; the law-giving, a volcanic eruption ; the fall of Jericho, an earthquake. So long as fancy explanations and evasions of awkward facts are avoided there is clearly room for investigation along purely historical lines. But once let the principles of objective research so enslave a man, once let him become so obstinate in his denial of the obviously supernatural, that he cannot see in the historical events the redeeming finger of God, then not only does he miss the point, but he also reveals that he himself is unrepentant and devoid of faith. The revelation is not above the history and the

natural phenomenon. The union between the two is, as it were, hypostatic: both are fully present in the one event. So complete is the union that although all men can see the history, as all men can see Jesus the Man, faith alone sees in the history the revelation, as faith alone sees in Jesus the Man, Jesus the Son of God. The revelation, objectively given, must be subjectively received.

This teaching corrects three major errors of the age. First, the error of orthodoxy, which, accepting the supernatural, but obliterating the purely historical character of the acts, understands the revelation of God only as supernatural, objective fact. That is why barren orthodoxy comes to teach the faith as a list of events and a system of beliefs, and to read the Bible as a text-book of supernatural happenings, independent of ordinary literary and historical associations. Orthodoxy of this type clings to a pedantic view of inspiration, suspects every attempt to understand the revelation of God as history, insists upon the acceptance objectively of objective facts. Whatever its justification in the defence of the Bible against the cavilling of unbelief, it is not based upon a true understanding of the word and work of God, and it frustrates the inward activity of the Holy Ghost, who seeks to quicken the revelation to living spiritual knowledge.

A far greater error is that of denying to revelation all objective character, which usually results in the separating of the so-called eternal content of religion from the contingent and relative historical form (which is not in this view revelation in any sense), and the degrading of the Bible to a purely secular level. This is the peculiar error of the modern age, characteristic of the rationalistic Neology, of Romantic Immanentism (Herder and Schleiermacher), and of contemporary liberalistic mediation. The terrible peril which lurks in it is this: That if revelation is made purely subjective, and divorced from the events in which it is set, then divine truth is left without foundation: the outward acts of God are accidental and contingent events, and truth is a generality. Recent years have made us familiar with the consequences: a purely human study of the Bible as ("unreliable") literature and history; the treatment of Christ as no more than teacher, hero, genius or martyr; comparative study of religion; undermining of the authority of faith and morals; a false and deluding religiosity; ultimate failure to understand either revelation or history.

A third error, which appears in some extremists of the Barthian reaction, is that of retaining a true, objective revelation, whilst denying the particular historical witness of Scripture. This apparent contradiction rests upon the violent separation of the revelational element in Scripture from the human. At root it is thoroughly subjectivist. Scripture is seen as a human book, a fallible record of historical events. But to the individual soul at individual moments the Holy Ghost chooses to use this record as the Word of God. The record is not the revelation in itself: it *becomes* the Word. Thus the relationship between the revelation and the events recorded in Scripture is precariously and arbitrarily retained, but without a true objectivism. The truth is that as Christ is always truly Man, yet truly God, so revelation is at all times truly history, yet truly revelation. Not everyone perceives this. Many study the Bible and miss the revelation, as many study Christ and miss God. But the fault is not with the Bible, or with Christ. It is with the individuals. If, in the power of the Spirit, there is a change it is a change in the men, not in the revelation or in Christ. This man sees in Christ only a good man. But Christ is still God. He does not need to become God. The man himself needs to learn to see God in Christ. If the revelation is to become a subjective reality, it must be by a change in the human subject, not in the revelation. The objective reality of the revelation is a constant.

To sum up: objectively, revelation exists irrespective of human understanding or reception; subjectively, it comes to life in the individual as the Holy Ghost illumines the given facts, and faith appropriates the redeeming work. Christ died for men, whether they believe or no. That is the objective reality. Christ died for me, as my eyes are opened to see beyond the good man crucified to the Lamb slain, and as I by faith receive the atoning work. That is the subjective truth. Stress the one to the exclusion of the other, and the result is either barren orthodoxy, or baseless emotion. See the proper relationship, the proper tension, and the wonder of God's revelation is partly known, the God who is above history revealed in history, contingently, yet according to His own purpose, veiled to unbelief, revealed in the plenitude of love and power to the penitent and believing.

What then of the content of revelation? No study, however brief, can omit a word upon the substance of the divine message. What is it that God makes known through those acts of power

which culminate in the Incarnation of the Saviour? The answer to this query, in a sixth and final proposition, is: That the content of the Divine revelation is the righteousness, the power, the redeeming love of God, set forth in One who is both God and Man, to the conviction of the sinner, to the pardoning and cleansing of those that believe.

God is not revealed as progressive spirit working in and through the race. He is not revealed as spark immanent in the human soul. He is not revealed in the nobility and dignity of man. He is not revealed as the weak father of a fractious humanity. He is not an intangible, poetry of the poets, truth of the philosophers, goodness of the moralists. He is not the law or spirit of nature, the vital upward thrusting of individuals and species. Many of these things may be comprehended in God, but God in His self-revelation through particular acts tells us something quite different from these imaginings of humanists, romantics and scientists.

The God of the Bible revelation is the Creator God, transcendent in majesty and power. He is the God of righteousness, against whom the race has sinned, so that His work in creation is veiled. He is the God of mercy, of love and redemption. He is the Incarnate God, not a liberalised historical figure, but the Christ of the Gospels, who bore the sin of man, who loved to the end, to refuse whom is self-condemnation, whom to know is life eternal. He is not the God revealed to some chosen ones in secret, but the God whom all can know, whom none can fathom. The revelation of God, majestic and yet simple as the God revealed, is not an academic thesis calling for approval, a philosophy engaging the mind, but earnest compelling truth, calling for decision.

When the revelation of God comes to the soul, earthly considerations fade. The issues are eternal; the soul is at grips with that which means life or death. It is right that there should be a proper understanding of revelation. It is good that theologians should seek to clear away false conceptions, ideas, interpretations, which hinder a right perception. But when the content of revelation is considered, it is fitting that the voice of the theologian should cease, and the voice of God Himself alone be heard. The content of revelation can only rightly be known by him who receives that revelation in the word of Scripture or of preaching, which is the word of power. And when he does receive it, then before the simple and stupendous fact of it,

argument perishes and the intellect is silent, and the heart of man can only answer, each heart for itself, in the cry of despair which is the cry of faith : " Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief."

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

The Rev. Principal P. W. EVANS, B.A., D.D., wrote : Dr. Bromiley's acute and valuable paper on " The Biblical Doctrine of Divine Revelation " merits deep consideration, but I am compelled to write rather hurriedly. Probably many of my difficulties would be removed by a fuller and more balanced statement.

Page 83, paragraph 2. While Scripture is undoubtedly to be received as primarily due to the divine quest for man, there seems no reason to limit to the student of comparative religion the view of the Book as also a partial record of man's quest for God. Acts xvii, 26 speaks of such a quest as part of the divine purpose, and in the Psalms and Job we have examples of it. Admittedly, this quest for God is itself inspired and guided by earlier revelation and communion.

Page 84. " Religion is the work of human and sinful faculties." Not necessarily so, for the Revealer is at the same time the Creator Spirit within, co-operant with man's quest for God.

Page 84. " The very misleading notion of progressive revelation." The phrase has often been misapplied, but that calls for correctness not for denial of the truth implied. Some have suggested that we should speak of " progressive apprehension on man's part," and that is valuable as guarding against the idea that God changes as the centuries pass. Surely, however, God has revealed Himself with growing fulness from time to time, and Dr. Bromiley admits this in his first paragraph on page 88, where he speaks of a " climax " and a series of redeeming acts which " culminates." Revelation progressed at such crises as the rise of the eighth century prophets, and pre-eminently at the Incarnation. Those who accept the idea of " progressive revelation " are certainly not wholly immanentist in theology ; indeed, Dr. Bromiley practically concedes the progressiveness for which I should contend on page 85, where he speaks of God revealing Himself to man within the context of the historical movement, " now progressive, now retrogressive."

Indeed, the closing sentences of paragraph 2 on page 85 seem to me to express in too absolute antithesis what the author probably intends to state only comparatively. Is the revelation accomplished unless it becomes part of the thoughts of those who received it? It is a two-sided process, and whilst God certainly initiates it man, some man at least, must receive it, or there is no revelation.

Page 86, second paragraph, at beginning: "Revelation in the Bible is the self-revelation of God, transcendent, not immanent." Is He not both? By the phrase "Revelation is miracle from first to last," does the author deny a place to what is natural? If so, he is sundering God's world. It is a false antithesis to assume that, unless we subscribe to a wholly supernatural view of revelation, we "imagine God as a spirit tied down to this world deranged by sin." Does the phrase "truly immanent because He is Incarnate" deny divine immanence previous to the Incarnation? Both immanence and transcendence must be accepted, and the measure of each is the other—wholly transcendent, wholly immanent.

Page 87, first paragraph. Some qualifying word such as "sufficiently" should be inserted before "know." If there is "perhaps a sub-stratum of truth in almost all religions," that truth is truth, however man came by it, and to suggest that it is handed down from "the general revelation of nature" surely classifies it as revealed truth. The alternative to styling it "revealed truth" is to regard it as man's discovery of truth. Was the Holy Spirit idle through the non-revelational centuries?

Page 93. "Objectively, revelation exists irrespective of human understanding or reception." This is surely only a half-truth. Revelation essentially implies a Revealer and one to whom something is given or made clear.

As suggested at the beginning, Dr. Bromiley's point of view probably suffers from compression and antithetical statement, but I would like to add appreciation of the many good qualities of the paper, especially the references to preaching on page 90 and the statement about exaggerations or denials of objectivity on page 93.

Rev. ALEXANDER FRASER, wrote: I am incapable of criticizing this paper from the point of view of scholarly attainment . . . with

the overwhelming part of it I seem to be in complete agreement. However, when Dr. Bromiley comes to illustrate his position in the teaching of present-day theologians and other modern applications of his position, I am afraid he is in such bad company as to raise serious doubt as to the desirability of this paper for any evangelical purpose.

(1) He speaks of the following great thinkers of the theological revival of the present, among whom are Barth and Niebuhr.

(2) I greatly question his first full paragraph on page 93 as being a sound evangelical statement. One cannot be too careful about throwing stones at orthodoxy these days, even if it should be accounted "pedantic" and "barren," because by so doing he gives great comfort to the enemies of Christ. The unbelieving modernists of Union Seminary could write a book on that paragraph.

3. I cannot personally accept his statement on the same page that "Christ is always truly Man, yet truly God." It seems to my non-theological mind that the teaching of Philippians 2, 5-11 indicates that the humanity of our Lord was an *assumed phase*, an incidence, and that He was before and afterward truly God. Here again is a matter of throwing a sop to the modernist by undue emphasis upon His humanity. Peter settled this question in his first great sermon on the day of Pentecost when he said: "Therefore know assuredly, that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Acts ii, 36).

Rev. A. M. STIBBS thanked Dr. Bromiley for his paper, and expressed warm appreciation of his able treatment of the subject.

REPLY TO PRINCIPAL EVANS.

From the many interesting points raised by Principal Evans, two important issues arise. The first has to do with the place of religion within revelation. In the paper the false view repudiated was that which merges revelation into religion. It is, of course, quite true to say that the receiving of revelation is part of revelation itself, and that the Holy Spirit is active in the religious subject. A revelation not received, although it has a certain objective reality, ceases in the strict sense to be revelation, and faith itself is the work of God.

So far so good. But some very real distinctions do need to be made. First, it is only in the sphere of the objective revelation that the Holy Spirit works. Natural religions are thus only God-inspired in so far as they are related to the revelation in nature and conscience, and the substratum of truth is often small, and overlaid with distorting accretions—which means that it often has the form of half-truth. Second, the religious response, although it is the work of God, is worked out in, by and through men who are sinners, and in this way it falls short of the perfection of the revelation objectively considered, which, although given through men too, is in a more particular sense a work of God. It is at this point that the confusion of the revelation with the response to it must be guarded against, since many thinkers refuse to admit any revelation apart from the immanent work of the Holy Ghost in religious subjects. There is something received (which is perfect), as well as a receiving (which is not wholly perfect). Jesus Christ, the acts of God, the normative witness of Scripture are as the thing given perfect in a way in which the work and theology of the Church are not, although these latter are also in truth directed and inspired by the Holy Spirit. Third, the revelation, or thing received, is of far greater importance than the human receiving of it—at any rate it is primary, just as the quest of God for man is primary, not the quest of man for God. Both have a place, but the latter is subordinate to, indeed is part of the former. The error of much theology is that it reverses this relationship. The whole question of immanence and transcendence is involved. Of course, God is immanent—did not Jesus Christ become Man?—*but not in such a way that His transcendence is negated*. If God is active in man, He is also active outside of man. If He reveals Himself within man, it is from outside of man. If He speaks through man, it is a voice from beyond man. If He works in and through nature, the works themselves are above nature. If Jesus is man, He is none the less God.

The second has to do with the alleged progressiveness of revelation. In so far as God reveals Himself within the time process, of His own choice there is necessarily a “successiveness” in revelation. It is not wrong then to speak of the story of revelation, its unfolding, its culmination. It is not even wrong to use the term progress, so long as it is made quite clear that there is no development from

the inferior (in Genesis) to the superior (in the Gospel), *i.e.*, so long as the term is not used, as normally, to express judgment: Two points call for notice. 1. There is a sequence of revealing acts, and at different times different attributes of God are no doubt more particularly revealed—power, justice, one-ness, faithfulness, wisdom, love. This sequence, in so far as it is regarded from the point of view of the human subjects, may even be regarded as a kind of schooling, with a general drift of progressive apprehensiveness on the part of the scholars—this can easily be exaggerated, since Abraham knew God in a way in which many Christians clearly do not! But 2. It is the same God in His fulness who speaks at all times and to all, and all His attributes are expressed even if one is more particularly emphasized. The revelation is the revelation of a Person through His acts and words, and if it is successive, generally to the race, privately to individuals, it is still the One Person who is known, and He is always fully and perfectly there, even although it is only one aspect of His character that the subject or pupil knows through any one act. Jesus Christ is the final act in the sequence, because He is the express image of the Godhead, and in Him all the attributes are present and made known. Notice, however, that there is still successiveness in the display of them and particularly in the disciples' general and individual apprehension of them. But this is quite different from the progressive revelation (from totemism to monotheism and so forth) so often imagined by students. At all points God is known, and known truly.

REPLY TO MR. FRASER.

Mr. Fraser's stricture on the Christology of page 93, paragraph 1, is, I think, based on a misapprehension. The whole paragraph has to do with Christ in the flesh, with the historical life of the Son of God, and the "always" means simply that at all times during the earthly life He was truly man, *i.e.*, He did not now cease to be man and act as God, or now cease to be God and act as man. Whether there is any sense in which Jesus Christ can be considered as eternally Man is a different problem, and does not come within the scope of this paper. Mr. Fraser's fear of any criticism of orthodoxy,

even of a dead, barren and pedantic type, is I believe exaggerated and even unwise. Historical examples of such an orthodoxy are by no means uncommon. Where it is not recognised and corrected it has two disastrous results. It destroys spiritual work, which is far more important ultimately than the holding of a meticulously correct set of beliefs—this is not a disparagement of theological exactness! It provokes a reaction which will almost certainly be extremely unorthodox. Thus modern liberalism and rationalism are to a large extent consequences of the hardening of reformed theology in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

860TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1., AT 6 P.M. ON MAY 14TH, 1945.

SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.LITT., LL.D., IN
THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., R.A.F., to read his paper entitled "Archæology and Literary Criticism of the Bible."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which the Rev. A. W. Payne, Dr. Hart-Davies, M.A., D.D., and Mr. Tresise took part.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By AIR COMMODORE P. J. WISEMAN, C.B.E., R.A.F.

THE importance of literary and archæological criticism of the Bible is mainly derived from the importance of the Bible itself. The estimate men have of the Bible must ultimately depend upon their opinion as to its trustworthiness. It cannot, therefore, be reasonably asserted that no matter what may be the accepted verdict regarding its integrity, its value to men can remain unaffected. It is generally conceded that, in the moral and spiritual sphere, the Bible has been—and in some quarters still is—the greatest formative influence we possess. Substantially it is also agreed that the primary reason why the Scriptures have had this supremacy is because they have been regarded as being, in some way or other, an authoritative revelation from God to man.

During the last century the trustworthiness of this "revelation" and "authority" has been the subject of considerable detailed investigation, and this should be welcomed, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific spirit by those having the spiritual and mental qualifications for the task.

There can be no question that the conclusions arrived at by criticism are largely dependent upon the proper scientific use of the instrument. Literary criticism can scarcely be called an exact science; its pre-suppositions are not necessarily self-evident truths, as for instance those that form the basis of

mathematics. Pre-suppositions are inevitable in all sciences, but in the case of Literary or Higher criticism there is probably a greater danger of these pre-suppositions being moulded by personal assumptions and tendencies of thought than in almost any other branch of science. But prejudiced criticism cannot be met by the rejection of all investigation ; it can only be countered by better and more just criticism.

The terms Literary, Higher, and Archæological, criticism, including even the word criticism, have been frequently used in an ambiguous and confusing manner. By criticism we mean judging and defining the qualities of a writing. By *Higher* criticism, the examination of writings as a whole, the enquiry into the origin, character, authenticity, and authorship of documents ; the endeavour to answer such legitimate questions as : When was the record written ? By whom ? To and for whom ? Where written ? In what manner ? For what purpose ? By *Lower* Criticism we mean the investigation into the integrity of parts or passages ; that is, the determination of the correct text. *Literary* Criticism broadly includes both Higher and Lower Criticism. Higher Criticism is generally confined to an examination of the *internal* evidences, including the historical notes available in the Old Testament, while to archæological criticism is assigned the investigation of the *external* evidences. It is, however, more than questionable whether the results often produced by an examination of the internal, to the exclusion of external or archæological evidences, can possibly be sound. The reason why in the case of the earlier books of the Old Testament, Higher Criticism was confined to internal evidences will be readily understood when it is remembered that external or archæological evidences scarcely existed one hundred years ago.

Thousands of books have been written about the results produced by Higher Criticism, and in many of these an attempt is made to assess the revised value which may be placed upon the Bible, consequent on this criticism. But only a few of these writers have been able to introduce new questions of principle ; most have contented themselves merely with the process of repeating the hypotheses produced a century ago by such leaders as Hupfeld, Kuenen, Graf, and later Wellhausen. Unfortunately, agnostic elements dominated the mental attitude of these leaders, and an etiological outlook seems to have controlled their view of the Scriptures. It is therefore not at all surprising that in some quarters there was a tendency to confuse the *instrument*

with the *results* which were produced by its use, and to protest not only against the conjectural results which seemed so disastrous, but also against the name and legitimate use of this form of critical inquiry.

The value of Higher Criticism must be very limited, unless the critic has an adequate knowledge of the literary methods and activities of the age in which he is dealing. This means that he should be competent, not only in literary, but in archæological criticism. It is, however, indisputable that archæological or external criticism was not possible when the main conclusions of the sceptical theories were originated, because the material for it simply did not exist. The essential qualification for competent criticism being inexistent, judgment had to depend upon internal evidences only. It should be borne in mind that the main contentions of the agnostic section of the Higher Critical school (which drastically re-distributed the dates and order of the Old Testament writings) were announced while these critics were in almost complete ignorance of any contemporaneous literature; in early days some were even sceptical that any could have existed. Archæological research has since provided us with a considerable literature reaching back to Patriarchal times.

For this reason, I submit that without a knowledge of the background provided by archæology, the Higher Critical conclusions of a century ago may be far from scientific or accurate. Were these theories premature? Can they still be maintained? In order to avoid generalities, I wish to illustrate the effect of the use of the twin methods of literary and archæological criticism from the life of one who was an expert in both, and who wielded a great influence, Dr. Sayce, late Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, the centenary of whose birth takes place this year. I propose to do this not from private conversations, but from his own written statements, especially in view of a recently published allegation that, in a private conversation, he made statements which involved the abandonment of the position he had maintained with growing strength up to the latest of his many published books. I was in Iraq when he visited it just before he died, and can say that there is no warrant whatever for an alleged change of view on the questions at issue, and this defence is due to a great reputation.

To his generation Sayce was a perplexing problem, and even now the main trend of his work is not as clearly understood as it

should be. Few would challenge his competence, even his supremacy, in his own field of criticism. He was one of the ablest Hebrew scholars of his time : at the age of 29 he was a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and at 31, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. His life covered the growth and propagation of the Continental critical theories.

Excavation in Mesopotamia began two years before he was born. Botta had then unearthed an Assyrian palace ; the year of Sayce's birth, Layard commenced his excavations at Nineveh. But at this time excavators were scarcely concerned with the discovery of *written* documents ; they were engaged in a search for the huge, human-headed bulls with wings, and other great monuments. The main reason for the apathy in regard to written records was the inability of scholars at this time to decipher with certainty the curious wedge-shaped inscriptions found on tablets and monuments.

The bent of Sayce's mind was revealed quite early in his life ; the Assyrian discoveries, which had just then commenced, captured his imagination. During his school-days he acquired a knowledge of the cuneiform script. His remarkable memory enabled him to retain the complexities of the syllabary. I have a letter written by him later in his life referring to the difficulties usually experienced by most men in memorising the Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian forms of the cuneiform syllabary, in which he says : " What I remember is the mental photograph of a printed page which consists of cuneiform characters, with their phonetic and ideograph equivalents." This ability served him well in all his reading. When he was 27 he published his *Comparative Grammar of the Assyrian Language* ; moreover, he wrote the first grammatical sketch of the Sumerian language ever attempted, based on a seal inscription from Ur of the Chaldees.

During this same period, Higher Criticism also cast its spell on him. Before he entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1865, the " German theories," as he called them, had become widely known. From the beginning he regarded himself, and later came to be regarded, as a champion of these views as to the method by which the Old Testament was compiled. Hupfeld had published his dissection of Genesis into fragments,* and Sayce was attracted by it. Colenso had issued his first volume in criticism

* *Die Quellen der Genesis.*

of the Pentateuch,* and it created a considerable and angry controversy. In Sayce's case it fell on fertile soil, and he writes: "I began to look forward to the day when I could champion his cause."† This he did a few years later, when "he saw his sixth and last volume through the press."‡

The Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford had been held by the celebrated Dr. Pusey for 54 years. Sayce was now in middle life, aged 37, and he wrote "For some years past he (Pusey) had assumed that I should be his successor, and had more than once told me so."§ Moreover, many influential people sought to secure the appointment for him, among them Liddon, who showed him the letter from Gladstone, the Prime Minister, in reply, which read: "I have a great respect for Mr. Sayce's talents and learning, but under no circumstances could I give him an ecclesiastical appointment."|| Sayce explains the reason for the Prime Minister's antipathy: "I was now regarded as one of the leaders of the 'German' critical theology at Oxford, and knew that he (Gladstone) considered me to be 'unsafe.'"¶

The man who was considered unsuitable because he was a leader of the Continental school of critical theology, gradually found that his archæological researches made him more and more orthodox, until he became known as an outstanding champion of the conservative school, and an aggressive critic of the prevailing destructive critical attitude towards the Old Testament. Writing of this episode,** he says: "Little did either Gladstone or myself then foresee that the time would come when Driver (who was given the appointment) would be the protagonist of 'German' higher criticism, and I should be regarded as the champion of orthodoxy."

Probably the greatest single event which altered his attitude to the Old Testament was the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. The significance of this find was revealed by him in a paper read before the Victoria Institute in 1889, though it is not generally realised how great was his part in it. An old peasant foraging among the refuse heaps at Tel el-Amarna, on

* The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.

† *Reminiscences*, Sayce, p. 22 (cited by kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan).

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

§ *Op. cit.*, p. 213.

|| *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

¶ *Op. cit.*, p. 213.

** *Op. cit.*, p. 214.

the Nile, came across some tablets; but even the dealers in Egyptian antiquities were unaware that they had any value, because they were offered so cheaply. My own experience is that when a peasant is prepared to sell cheaply, they are probably genuine; when the price was high they generally proved to be forgeries. Let Sayce tell his own story: "The only winter which I did not spend on the Nile was the one when the famous cuneiform tablets were found by the fellahin at Tel el-Amarna. . . . the whole collection would have passed into my possession intact; as it was, there was no one in Egypt who was acquainted with cuneiform, and the antika dealers regarded the tablets as so many worthless bricks. Most of them were thrown into sacks and carried on donkey-back to Ekhmin. There M. Frenay, who acted as an agent of the Louvre, bought a few, thinking, as he told me, that they might turn out to be of interest, and one of these was sent to the Louvre and shown to Oppert, the Professor of Assyriology. Oppert was old and blind, and pronounced it to be a forgery. The result was that no more were purchased by Frenay; the tablets were again carried on donkey-back along the banks of the Nile to Luxor. By that time more than a third of them had been destroyed or mutilated, to the incalculable loss of science and history. Next to the historical books of the Old Testament, the Tel el-Amarna tablets have proved to be the most valuable record which the ancient civilised world of the East has bequeathed to us. What we now have is an index of what we should have possessed had the collection been preserved uninjured and intact."*

When he reached Egypt in the following year he was told about these tablets. A few had been offered to the Cairo Museum, and Grebaut, the Director of Antiquities, asked Sayce's opinion about them. Those in the possession of the French School of Archæology were brought to him, and he says: "These I copied, and wrote at once to Grebaut, telling him that there could be no question about their genuineness, and that he should, if possible, secure every one that had been discovered. I was unable to assign a date to the tablets, as those I had copied contained no indication of their age, and the form of the script was new, and so could not be compared with anything previously known; in a letter to the *Academy*, however, I ventured to suggest the age of Nebuchadrezzar, which soon turned out to be

* *Op. cit.*, p. 251.

some eight hundred years too late. But at that time we were under the spell of the "Higher Critics," who were confident that there could have been no Semitic literature before the epoch of King David."*

The event proved to be the turning-point in Sayce's life. He wrote: "The discovery of the Tel el-Amarna correspondence suddenly threw a new light on the whole subject and revolutionised my view of it. It was henceforth plain that the assumption of the late date of the literary use of writing was false and that already in the Mosaic age education was widespread and literary works were being produced and an active epistolary correspondence carried on to an even greater extent than in the Middle Ages. The excavations of Schliemann and his followers had shown us that Homeric tradition was founded upon historical fact; the sceptical criticism which had divided the Homeric poems among a variety of unknown authors was already discredited; it was now the turn of the East. After 1888 it was no longer possible, except for the ignorant, to maintain that literary works such as we find in the Old Testament could not have existed in the Mosaic era. The main support of the so-called literary analysis and criticism had disappeared. Henceforward the character and credibility of a Hebrew document must be settled, not by the assumptions and subjective fantasies or ignorance of the critic, but by archæological research."† We should notice that these statements were made not in the clash of a contemporaneous discussion, but were written down in the cold light of later years when reviewing his life's work.

It will now be seen how far he had moved from the position he had taken up in his earlier years. His explanation is‡: "I myself had now come to be regarded as a representative of the so-called 'Orthodox' party and a defender of Holy Writ. It was in vain that I protested against being classed as a theologian, and explained that I dealt with the Old Testament simply as an archæologist. Just as the archæological discoveries in the Mediterranean had given a death-blow to the 'critical' theories about Homer and the early traditions of Greece, so similar discoveries were now giving the same death-blow to the theories about the Old Testament and its contents which had been imported from Germany. Subjective fancies must make way

* *Op. cit.*, p. 258.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 272.

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 303.

for the solid facts of science which were at last being recovered. One after another the foundations upon which such theories had been built had been shown to be baseless; first came the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets and its revelation of the use of writing in the pre-Mosaic age; then that of the legal code of Khammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham; and finally that of the Aramaic papyri of Elephantinê. With hardly an exception, the archæological discoveries of the last thirty-five years in the Nearer East have been dead against the conclusions of the self-appointed critic, and on the side of the ancient tradition."

In 1880 some boys who were playing in a tunnel adjacent to the Pool of Siloam, near Jerusalem, accidentally discovered some writing on the roof. Its existence became known to Dr. Schick in Jerusalem, but he was not a Semitic scholar, and consequently was not aware of its precise value. Sayce happened to be in Jerusalem in 1881 and, on being told of it, immediately made his way to the Pool, and by the light of a candle, while he was sitting in mud and water, made a copy which, on being translated by him, was found to be the oldest example of Hebrew writing discovered; so this famous inscription became known to the world through him. It records how the rock beneath Zion was tunnelled simultaneously from the two ends in order to bring the waters from the spring outside the city within the walls; that the workmen from opposite ends met "pick to pick." This is the work referred to in 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, carried out in the reign of Hezekiah.

When in 1891 a Chair of Assyriology was created at Oxford, he accepted it, and for the 33 years he occupied it he was known as an unrelenting opponent of the Higher Critical conjectures.

There is much in the Old Testament about the Hittites; but, until excavations commenced, nothing was known about them other than that stated in the Bible. Dictionaries had not a single historical extra-Biblical reference. Yet in the account of the Syrian invasion of Israel in 2 Kings vii, 6, we read of the Syrians saying: "Lo the King of Israel hath hired against us the Kings of the Hittites and the Kings of the Egyptians have come upon us." One distinguished scholar had written: "its unhistorical tone is too manifest to allow of our easy belief in it." "No Hittite King can have compared in power with the King of Judah, the real and near ally who is not named at all . . . nor is

there a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history."

It was Professor Sayce who was the first to reveal their historical character, and to show how great a power they were. In the reign of Rameses I they had struggled with the Egyptians, then the supreme power in Western Asia, and, at the time referred to, were a power somewhat similar to the divided kingdom of Egypt, and a greater military power than Judah.

In his *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, he took a middle position. It commences with the statement: "I am well aware that the pages which follow will satisfy neither 'Higher Critics' nor their extreme opponents, and that every effort will be made to dispute or minimise the archæological evidence which they contain." In his next publication, issued in 1894, we find him as the first contributor in a series of essays called *Lex Mosaica*. Without exception, all the other essays were written by leading scholars who were unquestionably opposed to the prevailing higher critical attitude. He begins his contribution, entitled *The Archæological Witness to the Literary Activity of the Mosaic Age*,* with: "The end of the nineteenth century is witnessing the ebb of a wave of historical scepticism which began more than a century ago. It has spared nothing, sacred or otherwise, and in its progress has transformed the history of the past into a nebulous mist. But the ebb had already set in before its tendencies and results had made themselves felt beyond a limited circle of scholars, and before its spirit and principles had influenced popular thought. Hence it is that we can speak of its ebb at the very time when the negations of the so-called 'higher criticism' are the most widespread and influential, and the assertions of its adherents are the most positive and arrogant."

In 1904 he published his *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*. Its very title shows how far he had travelled away from his old attitude of "champion of German critical theology."

I have already referred to the pre-suppositions which often prejudice a just investigation of the Bible. We have seen how Sayce gradually turned away from the sceptical approach; but it is very necessary to emphasise that while in his case there is abundant evidence of an early prejudice in favour of the sceptical type of criticism, there appears never to have been any mere prejudice

* *Lex Mosaica*, p. 3.

which determined his attack on the Higher Criticism, for he remained what is known as a "Broad Churchman" to the end of his day. This is important, because it is often asserted that only those who take a Fundamentalist point of view oppose the critical theories. In his case the reasons for his opposition to the Higher Criticism were based not on any pre-conceived acceptance of the Bible, but on the impossibility of reconciling the Higher Critical conjectures with the facts as revealed by archæological research.

Not long before he died he published his *Reminiscences*. In the closing pages reviewing his life's work he says: "My acceptance of the results of Schliemann's discoveries and my attitude towards the so-called Higher Criticism of the Old Testament after the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets brought upon me showers of controversy and abuse. The excavation of Troy and Mykenae and the discovery of the tablets were sufficient proof to me that merely subjective criticism of ancient literary documents was a worthless pastime. But it has taken a quarter of a century to convince the literary world in general of the truth of this."*

Has the literary world in general yet been convinced? There can be little doubt that when Sayce wrote in 1923, scholars had at least felt the insecurity of the old critical arguments; the basis of the sceptical criticism of the Old Testament had been undermined to such an extent by archæology that the rationalising conjectures could no longer be offered with conviction as reasonable and up-to-date criticism.

Unfortunately, it so happened that just when scholars felt most doubtful about the old critical conjectures, the general public began to believe the theories and to regard the Bible as largely unhistorical.

The position to-day is therefore very unsatisfactory, and a state of stagnation appears to have set in, for though the old sceptical ideas can no longer be maintained, there seems to be little or no attempt made to disavow or renounce them, and so clear the ground for better and less fettered criticism. The view which appears to prevail in some quarters is that the only feasible course to be taken in the dilemma is a middle one, involving a partial acceptance of the sceptical theories and a partial belief in the records as a revelation from God. However,

* *Reminiscences*, p. 474.

people are confused and perplexed when asked to believe that God revealed Himself in a corrupt way or by means of myth and legend.

It took fifty years for the destructive theories to permeate to the minds of the people of this country; how long will the reconstruction take? A widespread belief in the untrustworthiness of the Bible has been sown, and though in respect of scholarship the sceptical theories are all but dead, the results in the minds of the people are living and active. The harvest is being reaped for the seed of distrust sown. Is it not time that the public should be informed that the so-called results are neither assured nor modern, but doubtful, often disproved and largely obsolete?

In this connection under the new Education Act the Bible is to be taught in schools. Will teachers, using the now out-of-date text-books, tell children that some person or persons unknown copied parts of the Babylonian laws of Hammurabi and by a process of editing compiled the ten commandments? Will the teacher further say that the unknown person or persons falsely used the name of Moses and the background of God's revelation to him on Mount Sinai in order to secure the acceptance of the decalogue as authoritative?

The value of the Bible in the estimate of the present generation will depend upon how it is taught to regard it. Much remains to be done in clearing the ground of the debris of the century-old, obsolete and destructive criticism, and of ensuring a more discerning, scientific and constructive investigation.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. HART DAVIES warmly thanked Air Commodore Wiseman for his valuable paper and expressed the wish that it could be published and widely circulated in pamphlet form, because of the appalling ignorance both among the clergy and the laity of the remarkable results of recent archæological discovery and the undermining effect which they are bound to have upon what used to be called "the assured results of the Higher Criticism."

In reference to the precarious nature of a Criticism which is mainly based upon investigation of the content of literary documents to discover the source of authorship, he told the following illuminating story. When in 1935 the Victoria Institute awarded

him the Gunning Prize for the essay entitled "Biblical History in the Light of Archæological Discovery since A.D. 1900," the late Dr. Thirtle, a former editor of "The Christian," a sound Hebrew scholar, with a rich editorial experience, came to congratulate him upon his success. During the conversation which ensued, Dr. Thirtle, who had been one of the three judges appointed by the Institute to adjudicate, told him that after he had read his essay, he was convinced that he had recognised the author in the person of the late Dr. McIntyre, the then Principal of the Glasgow Bible Training Institute, whom he had known for many years and with whose style of composition he was familiar! A glaring example of the pitfall which awaits the critic who depends upon internal evidence and ignores the precise historical data such as archæological discovery has so richly supplied concerning so many records in the early books of the Bible.

The CHAIRMAN said: On behalf of the Institute I should like to thank Air Commodore Wiseman for his paper, which fully recognises the principle that scientific criticism must not be rejected in the study of the Bible. I should endorse most fully his observation that "prejudiced" (I should say rather "hostile") "criticism cannot be met by the rejection of all investigation; it can only be countered by better and more just criticism." I welcome also his vindication of a scholar who, though capable of inaccuracies and rash assumptions, nevertheless was nearly, and even forward, to accept the results of archæological discovery, even when they ran counter to his own previous beliefs. Hostile criticism in the 19th century did much to shake men's belief in the Bible, by showing that statements in it were irreconcilable with the evidence of natural science, and in some cases with modern standards of morality. What it really shook was the conception of the Bible, prevalent since the Reformation, which regarded the Bible as a revelation given once for all, and equally valid in all its parts and to all ages. Modern criticism has substituted for this the conception of a progressive revelation, and of a record of God's method of leading His chosen people from the beliefs and practices of a primitive tribe and nation, up through the higher teaching of the Prophets and culminating in the revelation of the New Testament. In the establishment of

this conception archæology has done great service. It has proved the antiquity of writing, thus making it clear that from at least the time of Moses the historical records of the Hebrews can rest on contemporary written documents. It has proved that codes of laws fully as elaborate as the legislation embodied in the Pentateuch were current among the surrounding peoples in and before the age of Moses. It has (in the documents discovered at Ras Shamra) given us a knowledge of the Canaanite religion, and notably of the worship of Baal, which sets the history of the Israelite kingdoms in a clearer perspective. And all through, from the time of the patriarchs, it shows the Hebrews, while sharing the primitive legends and practices of their neighbours, yet being all the time led along a higher level, its best elements holding fast to the monotheistic creed of their father Abraham, and growing from the worship of their tribal Deity, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to the conception, proclaimed by the Prophets, of the Almighty God of all the world.

But I do not want to go over again the ground so ably covered by Air Commodore Wiseman. I only wish to thank him for the instruction he has given us.

MR. CHARLES TRESISE said: Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief, as desired. I rise merely to second most heartily the vote of thanks to Air Commodore Wiseman, and to follow up a remark made by the mover by asking if it is not possible for this Institute or some other body to make, in some way, more widely known to the general public such archæological discoveries as we have been hearing of this evening and other confirmations of the reliability of Holy Scripture records. Apparently it takes about 50 years for such knowledge to convince the teaching profession and percolate through the Board of Education; consequently our children are now being taught in our schools and from many of our pulpits the late Victorian speculations which are still humorously known as "modernism." Something ought surely to be done to counteract this.

I was amused this evening to hear our old friend "the assured results of modern criticism" crop up once and again. Some years ago this chestnut appeared, not for the first time by many, on the front page article of one of our religious newspapers. One of my friends, who is something of a Hebrew and Greek scholar, wrote

asking if he might have a short list of these "assured results." The editor, who is a canny Scot, was not falling into that trap, however, and refused point-blank. "Sir," he wrote, "I conceive your question to be asked not with the idea of eliciting information, but of creating controversy." Now this was, of course, perfectly true, but one would have thought that if the results so often spoken of were so very assured the editor might have been glad of a little controversy on the matter to convince an enquirer.

Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in seconding the vote.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE, expressed his sincere thanks to the writer of the paper and heartily agreed that detailed investigation of the Bible should be carried out by those who have "the spiritual and mental qualifications for the task."

COMMUNICATION.

Sir CHARLES MARSTON wrote: I had the pleasure of knowing Professor Sayce well during the last few years of his life. So far from changing his mind about the inadequacy of the Higher Criticism, he became more emphatic against it.

It will be remembered that the only Book where he thought the Higher Criticism was valid was in the late dating of the Book of Daniel. I remember drawing his attention to the Elephantine Papyrus and its bearing upon this Criticism, and he replied—"If I had to write about the Book of Daniel again, I should put it far earlier." So even with Daniel, the Professor's view on the inadequacy of the Higher Criticism became more emphatic.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I wish to thank Sir Frederic Kenyon and all who have commented. There appears to be little criticism and much agreement. On the main theme of the paper—the conversion of Professor Sayce from a sceptical criticism of the Bible to a scholarly criticism of the critics of the Bible—there seems to be no valid doubt. I agree with the remarks regarding the "appalling ignorance" of the results of archaeological discovery, and also with those regarding the un-

intelligent repetition of that overworked phrase "the assured results of modern criticism." Not very long ago after a lecture on archæology, a Professor of Biblical Exegesis (who was then teaching these so-called "assured results") remarked to me that he "was unaware that there was so much to be said on the other side of the subject." I could but suggest that it was the duty of one in his position to be acquainted with the archæological evidence.

There is, I think, a clearer understanding today of the increasing fulness of the revelation of God in the Bible, but at the same time not a little misunderstanding regarding it. I suggest that the growth of Biblical revelation may be likened to the growth of a baby into manhood. Although in its earlier stages a baby is deficient of many of the qualities which are ultimately necessary, and in this sense is immature and incomplete, the baby is not necessarily faulty, though it is very limited. Few can have regarded the revelation to the patriarchs as in itself complete or final. It is admittedly preparatory and needed much to supplement it, and this amplification took place in the times of the prophets, and completely and finally through the coming into the world of our Lord and Saviour. Likewise, although God's revelation of Himself in earlier times was necessarily incomplete, it was not in consequence faulty or inaccurate.

As may be seen from the admittedly ancient narrative Genesis xiv, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was not merely a tribal God; in verse 22 we read that Abraham says "I have lift up my hand to *the Lord, the most high God the possessor* of heaven and earth." And it is of interest to note that the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against *Jehovah*." When we find advanced truth such as this in the early patriarchal narratives we cannot justify a transfer of these passages to a later period in history merely in order to make them fit into a preconceived inflexible theory of development. I agree that it is not any early section of revelation that is given "once for all" but the completed revelation.

861ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1., AT 6 P.M. ON JUNE 4TH, 1945.

F. F. BRUCE, ESQ., M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., to read his paper entitled "The Fourth Gospel."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which Wing Commander Anderson, Air Commodore Wiseman, C.B.E., Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray, B.D., and the Rev. A. W. Payne took part.

Written communications were received from Dr. Cawley, Major H. B. Clarke, and Brig.-General Harry Biddulph, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

The following elections have been made: Rev. James Hominuke, B.Sc., M.A., B.D., Fellow; Frederick F. Bruce, M.A., Member; Christopher Elliott, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Member; Walter L. Emmerson, Esq., Member; Miss C. Hussey, Member.

The Rev. S. Runsie Craig Memorial, 1945.

In accordance with the terms of the Trust the Council have selected for the 1943 Memorial the paper on "The Fourth Gospel," read before the Society on June 4th, 1945, by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., as affording strong confirmation of the genuineness of "the Faith which was once for all delivered to the Saints."

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D.

THE question of the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel has been one of the storm-points of New Testament criticism for over a century. The Tübingen School, which took its rise with F. C. Baur in 1831, assigned it to the second half of the second century (about A.D. 170), and P. W. Schmiedel at the beginning of the present century maintained that about A.D. 140 was the earliest possible date for it. Such datings excluded not only the authorship of the Apostle St. John, but also that of any eye-witness of the events recorded, such as "John the Elder," mentioned by Papias. It was represented as a pseudonymous work, produced more than a century later

than our Lord's life, quite unreliable for historical detail, and embodying a theology of post-apostolic character, profoundly tinged with Gnosticism.

Even scholars who assigned it an earlier date and a far higher value still hesitated with regard to its authorship. Thus Dr. Streeter, in his valuable work, *The Four Gospels* (1924), argues strongly for the authorship of the Elder John, regarding the attribution to the Beloved Disciple in xxi, 24, as a later addition and a mistaken attribution. He assigns the Gospel to about the years 90-95 A.D. On the other hand, the great English scholars, Lightfoot, Westcott, Sanday, and Salmon, have steadily maintained the authorship of the Apostle, with a date between A.D. 80 and 95.

It seems opportune to review the problem of authorship in the light of the recent discoveries which have gone far towards settling the question of date. These discoveries are two papyrus fragments, very small in size but very significant in their content. One is a fragment of a manuscript of the Gospel itself, acquired with a parcel of other papyri by the John Rylands Library at Manchester from Professor B. P. Grenfell in 1920, and identified by Mr. C. H. Roberts, who published it in 1935. It is only a scrap of papyrus, measuring $3\frac{1}{2}$ by $2\frac{1}{4}$ in., bearing on one side parts of ch. xviii, 31-33, and on the other parts of xviii, 37, 38. Its importance lies in the fact that it is written in a hand which papyrologists agree in assigning, on purely palæographical grounds, to the first half of the second century. Since the text on the back follows directly on that on the front, it is evident that we have here a portion of a leaf of a codex, not of a roll, and we have other evidence of the use of the codex form by Christian scribes at this early date. It need hardly be added that, small as the fragment is, it suffices to prove that a copy of the Fourth Gospel was in existence in Egypt in the first half of the second century; and this alone is enough to demonstrate the falsity of the assertions of Baur and Schmiedel.

But it does not stand alone. Earlier in the same year as Mr. Roberts' publication, Dr. H. I. Bell and Mr. T. C. Skeat, of the British Museum, published some fragments, purchased in the preceding year, of three leaves of a papyrus codex containing a narrative of our Lord's life differing from the four canonical Gospels and not identifiable with any other known work. Here again it is the age of the manuscript which gives it its special significance; for this again is confidently assigned by the leading

papyrologists to the first half of the second century. The extant leaves contain four episodes in our Lord's life. One (unfortunately much mutilated) evidently contains an incident not recorded in our four Gospels. One is a version of the healing of the leper recorded by all three Synoptists (Mk. i, 40-42, Mt. viii, 2-3, Lk. v, 12-13), told in the same simple, straightforward style, quite unlike the later apocryphal gospels. Another is similarly a version of the temptation of our Lord by the craftily designed question as to the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar, recorded in Mk. xij, 14, Mt. xxii, 16, Lk. xx, 21, but incorporating also Mk. vii, 6, 7 and Mt. xv, 7-9 (" Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men "). These passages show decisively a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, or of the documents which underlie those Gospels; but the remaining incident bears equally clearly the colour of the Fourth Gospel. It runs as follows:—" And turning to the rulers of the people he spoke this saying, Search [*or* Ye search] the scriptures, in which ye think that ye have life; these are they that bear witness of me. Think not that I came to accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. And when they said, We know well that God spake unto Moses, but as for thee, we know not whence thou art, Jesus answered and said unto them, Now is your unbelief accused. . . ." Here three passages of the Fourth Gospel (v, 39, v, 45, and ix, 29) are combined, with their distinctively Johannine style. It follows that before the middle of the second century the Fourth Gospel was sufficiently well known to be excerpted and combined with passages from the Synoptics in a record of our Lord's life which circulated in Egypt.

If then this Gospel was known in Egypt (and that not merely in Alexandria, but in the provincial cities or villages whence these papyri are derived) by a date which cannot be put later than A.D. 130-150, it may be taken as certain that the Gospel itself must have been produced at least a generation earlier. Such a conclusion would be drawn as a matter of course in the case of a secular work, and it would be hypercritical not to apply the same reasoning to the Gospels; and this brings us as near as makes no matter to the traditional date in the neighbourhood of A.D. 90. Especially would this interval be none too long if (as general tradition asserted) the Gospel was written in Asia

Minor, since some time would be needed for its circulation in Egypt.

We are now, therefore, in the position of being able to examine the internal evidence of authorship from the basis of an assured date. Let us look, therefore, with a fresh eye at this internal evidence. First, there is the explicit testimony at the end of the book (xxi, 24) : " This is the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things, and we know that his testimony is true." And the disciple who is thus declared to be the author of the book is described (xxi, 20) as " the disciple whom Jesus loved, which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee." The " disciple whom Jesus loved " is universally identified as St. John, and the conclusion is indeed irresistible ; for only the twelve apostles were present at the Last Supper, and the inner circle of apostles consisted of Peter, James, and John, of whom Peter is excluded as the other interlocutor in this conversation, while James was dead long before the Gospel was composed. We have therefore what amounts to a direct statement that this Gospel was written by St. John. It is true that these last verses appear to be a post-script added by some person or persons other than the author of the book. Now if this addition had been made as late as A.D. 170, or even 150, its authority might be questioned. Pseudonymous works claiming to be written by apostles began to appear by then or not much later. The Second Epistle of Peter is probably one such work ; the so-called Gospel of Peter is certainly one, written before A.D. 190. But the matter is very different if this attestation was written about A.D. 90, in the life-time of St. John or very shortly after his death.* Such an attestation could not have been made when, if false, it was immediately open to authoritative contradiction.

We have therefore a direct contemporary affirmation that this Gospel was the work of " the beloved disciple," who can only be the Apostle St. John. And, as has frequently been noticed, the narrative is full of indications that it is the work of an eye-witness. Take first the numerous instances of the reference of particular words to a named speaker. In the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand, where the Synoptists have merely

* Even this alternative is almost excluded by the context, which quotes the saying that this disciple should not die, and proceeds to say, in the present tense, " this is the disciple which testifieth," etc.

“They” (or “The disciples) say unto him,” St. John has “Philip answered him” and “Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, saith unto him” (vi, 7, 8); and at the end of the following discourse, “Simon Peter answered him” (vi, 68). In the story of Lazarus, it is Thomas who says to his fellow disciples, “Let us also go that we may die with him” (xi, 16). In xii, 21, 22, Philip and Andrew are specifically mentioned; and in the long discourse which occupies chapters xiii-xvi, particular words are attributed to Peter (xiii, 6-9), the “disciple whom Jesus loved” (xiii, 25), Peter again (xiii, 36-7), Thomas (xiv, 5), Philip (xiv, 8), Judas (xiv, 22). Again, after the Resurrection there is express mention of Thomas (xx, 24-9), Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel and the sons of Zebedee (xxi, 2), the beloved disciple (xxi, 7), and Peter again in the final scene (xxi, 15-22). Such specific references, written a hundred and twenty years after the event, might be regarded as an attempted dramatisation; but in the lifetime of those who were or might have been present they would be intolerable. So also the fullness of detail in the narratives of the calling of the disciples, the feeding of the five thousand, the discussions with the Pharisees and other questioners, the raising of Lazarus, the Crucifixion and Resurrection, gives the impression of an eye-witness, and is hardly credible as an effort of dramatic imagination. The topographical detail, also—“Bethany beyond Jordan” (i, 28), “Aenon near to Salim” (iii, 23), Jacob’s well at Sychar, near to the parcel of growth that Jacob gave to his son Joseph (iv, 5), the pool of Bethesda (v, 2), the boats from Tiberias (vi, 23), Solomon’s porch (x, 23), the place beyond Jordan where John baptized (x, 40), Bethany, about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (xi, 18), the city called Ephraim in the country near to the wilderness (xi, 54), the brook Cedron (xviii, 1), the place called the Pavement (xix, 13)—all this is surely more natural as the work of a man writing his own reminiscences than as research or invention over a century later, and some eighty years after the destruction of Jerusalem and the practical evacuation of Palestine by the Jewish community.

The difference in tone and style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is sometimes urged as a reason for separating them widely in date. But since it is now clear that the separation cannot be great, another explanation must be sought, and it is not hard to find. The Synoptics were writing down the records of oral tradition, which would naturally embody the plainer and

simpler teaching of our Lord, suited to the comprehension of the common people, and more easily kept in mind and handed on by word of mouth. St. John, on the other hand, was writing down (or dictating) his own reminiscences, often of more special and intimate discourses, and no doubt coloured in expression by the style which he had formed in the course of a long life. Just as there is much of Plato's style in the teaching of Socrates as he has recorded it, or of the style of Thucydides in his record of the Funeral Oration of Pericles, while we yet believe that we have in them the substance and much of the actual utterances of Socrates and Pericles, so we may find in the Fourth Gospel the intimate teaching of our Lord, treasured in his memory by the beloved disciple who heard it, and written down at the end of a long life in the literary style which he had formed for himself, and which we find also in the Epistles which are unquestionably his personal utterance.

The argument that the Fourth Gospel represents a later form of theological doctrine, and specifically one coloured by the form of thought known as Gnosticism, also falls to the ground if the first century date of the Gospel is established. It is futile to argue that the style is too late for St. John if the only alternative is that it is by a contemporary of St. John. It must be accepted that this form of thought and expression existed in the last decade of the first century, and, if so, why not in the mind of St. John as well as that of another ?

Some writers, influenced by the difference in style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, have hesitated to accept the latter unreservedly as representing the teaching of our Lord. But, in fact, if the reasoning in this article is sound, the testimony of the Fourth Evangelist, though later in date, is more direct than that of the Three. They give in the main a collection of the oral tradition of the generation following our Lord's life on earth, and (together with the speeches recorded in the earlier chapters of Acts) represent the teaching given to the general public by the first Christian missionaries ; while St. John gives us at first hand his own recollection of " that which we have heard, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." If John the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel, it is the direct evidence of the most intimate associate of our Lord, recording some of His deepest and most vital utterances, which had not passed into the oral tradition. In the course of a long life

the phraseology may have acquired something of a personal tincture, but it cannot be doubted that the substance had been repeated throughout that life without material change.

Thus the internal evidence, derived from the study of the Gospel itself, seems wholly consistent with the tradition which ascribes its authorship to the Apostle, the son of Zebedee. That tradition was firmly established in the Church, at any rate from the time of Irenaeus. Eusebius, who was fully acquainted with the literature of the early Church, including much that is now lost to us, treats it as certain.

There are, however, some considerations on the other side, and this examination of the evidence would not be complete without taking them into account. They relate to (1) divergent testimony as to the date of St. John's death, (2) the authorship of the Apocalypse, (3) the personality of "John the Elder."

The general tradition of the early Church was that John, the apostle and evangelist, outlived the persecution of Domitian and died at Ephesus. This is attested by Eusebius, who quotes Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus about A.D. 195 (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 31, *cf.* iii, 18), and Irenaeus, about A.D. 175-200 (*ib.*, v. 8). A fifth century author, however, Philip of Sidé, states that, according to Papias, John, like his brother James, was killed by the Jews. He does not say that he was killed at the same time, which indeed would be irreconcilable with the record in Acts, but it would presumably (though not necessarily) have been before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. This evidence, however, is far too slender to stand against the general tradition. Papias himself, who is spoken of as a companion of Polycarp and fellow-disciple with him of John, cannot have been born much before A.D. 70. He *may* have attributed the Apostle's death to the Jews, but he cannot have put the date much earlier than the traditional one. Moreover, if the identification of "the beloved disciple" with St. John be accepted (and it seems irresistible), it is impossible to imagine anyone in the last decade of the century solemnly affirming that the Gospel was the work of one who had died more than twenty years before.

A more serious problem is connected with the authorship of the Apocalypse, which in our Bible bears the title of "The Revelation of St. John the Divine." No two books could be written in Greek of such totally different character as the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. The Gospel is written in good Greek with a distinct literary style. The Apocalypse is

written in Greek which has no literary merit (our Authorised Version gives it a quality which the original does not possess), and is often quite ungrammatical. At one time, when it was believed that the Apocalypse was written at the time of the Neronian persecution, the discrepancy was sometimes explained away on the ground that between A.D. 65 and 90 St. John had learnt to write good Greek. Since in A.D. 65 he would have been well over 50 years of age, so complete a change of style is in the last degree improbable; but the explanation becomes impossible if, as is now generally held, the persecution referred to in the Apocalypse is that of Domitian, about A.D. 95. Nor is it admissible to argue that the style of the Gospel is that of a disciple, writing to his master's instructions, since the style of the Epistles is identical, and it cannot be supposed that the apostle would have employed a disciple to put his letters into a literary style totally unlike his own language.

It must therefore be taken as certain that, whoever wrote the Apocalypse, it was not the author of the Gospel. The author of the Apocalypse gives his name as John, but does not call himself an apostle, and says nothing to identify him with the beloved disciple. The testimony of the early Church is divided. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus refer the book to St. John, which is good second century evidence from writers who, though born and educated in the East, spent most of their writing life in the West; but Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century argues strongly against it on the ground of the diversity of style, and says that the identification was rejected by "some of those before our time," one of whom at least appears to have been the presbyter Caius (about A.D. 200). Jerome says the Greeks of his time did not receive the book as canonical, and it was not accepted by the Syriac Church. On the other hand it was generally accepted in the West. The early Church therefore speaks with an uncertain voice; but it is observable that the apostolic authorship is most questioned in the East, where the book had its origin. It seems therefore rather perverse to refuse apostolic authorship to the book that claims it, and to allow it to the book which does not claim it and to which it was not allowed in the place of its birth. There are those to whom any view is preferable to the traditional one; but that is not scientific criticism. It is no more "scientific" to accept unsound evidence for a non-traditional view than for a traditional one. Science consists in weighing evidence impartially.

Some, however, have sought to find a solution of these problems by reference to a certain "John the Elder," who is named by Papias, in a passage quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii, 39), as a disciple of the Lord (other than St. John, whom he has already referred to among the apostles). Some scholars accordingly suggest that he was the author of the Apocalypse, which was only attributed to the apostle at a later date, and primarily in distant lands, which had never heard of John the Elder. It may be so, but it is impossible to prove it; and, as Dionysius remarks, there were many people who bore the name of John. Dr. Streeter, on the other hand, maintains that John the Elder was the author of the Gospel, and that yet another John ("John the Seer") was the author of the Apocalypse. He has one plausible argument in the fact that the writer of the Second and Third Epistles, whose style is similar to that of the First Epistle and the Gospel, describes himself as "the Elder"; but on the whole his argument seems to me singularly unconvincing.

It is full of arguments of the type of: "We must then infer that," "This suggests that," "Surely all this looks like," "It is not unlikely that" Polycarp "would have listened" "He may have read," etc. It assumes (without any evidence) that Irenaeus was only a few months in Smyrna and that when he heard Polycarp describe his intercourse with "John and the others who had seen the Lord," he never realised that he was talking of John the Elder, not John the Apostle; which is much as if a young Liberal in London in the early years of this century should have heard much talk about "Gladstone" without realising that it was Mr. Herbert Gladstone that was meant, not the great W. E. G. A conclusion which rests on an accumulation of such "probabilities" (or improbabilities) is surely very insecure. Streeter's quotation, *Homines facile id quod volunt credunt esse*, cuts both ways.

I believe, therefore, that with the evidence now available an impartial critic would come to two conclusions: first, that the Fourth Gospel was written not later than the last decade of the first century; and secondly that, if that is so, the evidence in favour of the authorship of St. John the Apostle far outweighs the evidence against it. I believe, further, that this result should re-assure those who fear or resent the application of criticism to the Scriptures, by showing that in the end the position of the Scriptures will be stronger, not weaker, than before.

DISCUSSION.

F. F. BRUCE, Esq., M.A., said : It is with great satisfaction that I have listened to Sir Frederic Kenyon's masterly survey of the evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is customary to dismiss the external evidence as "wholly elusive," and yet it is in truth extraordinarily strong. Taking it along with the *prima facie* sense of the indications in the Gospel itself, we cannot lightly evade the conclusion that the Fourth Evangelist was indeed John, the son of Zebedee. The implications of this conclusion for the historicity of the Gospel are obvious.

The difficulties raised by the comparison of this Gospel with the Synoptics weigh heavily with many, and they cannot be adequately dismissed in a few words. The chronological discrepancies can be adjusted (*cf.* G. Ogg, *Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, 1940.) The distinctive character of our Lord's teaching in the Fourth Gospel has been recognised by Jewish scholars, such as Israel Abrahams, as preserving a genuine aspect of His teaching not found in the Synoptics, although the *logion* of Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 is a noteworthy exception. This aspect persists in the "Odes of Solomon," in the Epistles of Ignatius, and (in substance if not in style) in some of the Oxyrhynchus Sayings. Our Lord's different procedure in revealing His Messiahship, as between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, can largely be explained by the differing political conditions of Judæa and Galilee.

The relation of this Gospel to the Apocalypse is a vexed question. The earliest evidence for the apostolic authorship of the latter is also remarkably strong. In addition to the explicit statements of Justin and Irenæus (and we must remember that Justin was in Ephesus about 135), we have the evidence of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue to Luke's Gospel (c. A.D. 170), which ends : "And later John the Apostle, one of the Twelve, wrote the Apocalypse in the isle of Patmos and afterwards the Gospel." Professor C. F. Burney, in his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922), p. 149, points out that "if the Gospel is a translation from Aramaic, the criterion of Greek style as differentiating the two books at once falls to the ground. On the other hand if the Gospel was written in Aramaic prior to the author's arrival in Ephesus somewhat late in his life, and

he then adopted Greek owing to the exigencies of his new surroundings, such Greek as we find in the Apocalypse would not be surprising." I myself am inclined rather to regard the Greek of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles as John's own Greek, and to account for the curious Greek of the Apocalypse by its being a deliberately and excessively literal translation of an original Semitic writing. Just as Paul heard the Heavenly Voice address him in his mother tongue on the Damascus road, so the apocalyptic visions may well have been communicated to the Seer of Patmos in his native Aramaic, written down by him in that language and translated into Greek by another. An interesting examination of the language of the Apocalypse along this line will be found in Professor C. C. Torrey's *Documents of the Primitive Church* (1941).

The identity of authorship of the Gospel and Apocalypse has also been denied because of their divergence of viewpoint. This argument can be exaggerated. If one and the same English poet could be the author of two such apparently diverse portrayals of Christ as those of the hymns "Jesu, Lover of my soul" and "Lo! He comes with clouds descending," the case against common authorship cannot be maintained by simply setting the mysticism of the Gospel against the apocalyptic of the Revelation—or, shall we say, the "realized eschatology" of the former against the "futurist eschatology" of the latter—as if the two could not exist together in one and the same mind.

But enough of this matter. Whatever our conclusion may be, Sir Frederic Kenyon has earned our gratitude by his convincing demonstration that the critical approach to the Scriptures, undertaken in the true scientific spirit, serves only to reveal more clearly the trustworthiness of the foundation records of our faith.

It gives me the utmost pleasure to express our sincere gratitude to Sir Frederic for his very valuable paper, and to propose that he be accorded a hearty vote of thanks.

The Rev. G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, B.D., asked for explanation of two difficulties: 1. The Synoptic Gospels appear to show that Jesus was reluctant to make known His Messiahship to the people at the beginning of His ministry; compare, *e.g.*, His silencing the demonic attestation to Himself, as also the charge to the disciples

after Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi not to reveal that He was the Christ. In the Fourth Gospel there appears to be no such reserve or gradualness of apprehension as to the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus. John the Baptist announces Him as the Lamb of God, the first disciples immediately recognise Him as the Christ, and the discourses centre largely around His person.

How are these two representations to be reconciled ?

2. The author accounts for the differences in the respective traditions (Synoptic and Johannine) of our Lord's teaching by postulating that the former gives the oral tradition of the teaching, while John gives his personal reminiscences. That which John has recorded, being more complex and intimate than that passed on by word of mouth, could in the nature of the case have hardly found a place in the oral tradition.

My difficulty is, that these conditions were precisely those which presumably caused the formation and circulation of the document "Q"; this contains the more profound and connected teaching of our Lord contained in Matthew and Luke, being too complex to form part of the oral tradition. It is nevertheless homogeneous with the rest of the Synoptic tradition, whereas the Johannine teaching is not. Moreover, it is thought by many that "Q" consists of the recollections of Christ's preaching set down by the apostle Matthew. If that were so, it is not legitimate to offset the personal recollections of John with the less intimate record of the Synoptists, as Sir Frederic does on page 121 ("The testimony of the Fourth Evangelist . . . is more direct than that of the three"). I am, therefore constrained to feel that the suggestion put forth by our esteemed author is not adequate to meet the facts. Would he kindly enlarge on his own views, so briefly set out in his address ?

I would add that these two difficulties which I raise are met with in almost every essay on the Fourth Gospel, usually to the detriment of its authority, yet a satisfactory solution of them is hardly to be met with. Westcott's contention, that the situations and persons addressed in the Synoptics are different from those of John's Gospel, is only partly true ; the discourse in John 6 is set in Galilee after the feeding of the Five Thousand, addressed to the common people, and is still "Johannine."

Wing Commander F. ANDERSON, said : In discussing the difference in style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, the lecturer states (page 121) that St. John gives us at first hand his own recollections of "that which we have heard, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." I would suggest that he has here touched lightly upon what is in fact the strongest internal evidence for both the date of the Gospel and its authorship. John is writing of something that he has both heard and seen, and draws particular attention to this by repeating the statement in inverse Order. 1 J. 1, 1 "heard" "seen" verse 3 "seen" "heard. The writer of The Revelation uses the same expression, but in the opposite order : Rev. 21, 8 "saw" "heard," "heard" "seen."

This "parallelism" of expression provides the key to the structure of both books. The structure of the Revelation is as follows :— Introduction (1, 1). The Son of Man in the midst of seven lamp-stands (1, 8), followed by the letters to the seven churches (2, 1). The Lamb in the midst of the throne (4, 1) followed by the seven sealed book of judgment (6, 1). Conclusion (22, 10).

The same characteristics are found in the Fourth Gospel. It is found that it is constructed so as to show the Lord first as the light of the world, and then (from 11, 46) as the Lamb of God ; which is precisely the same theme as that of the Revelation. This similarity of design provides an adequate explanation of John's choice of incidents and discourses.

It is submitted, therefore, that the internal evidence confirms the lecturer's conclusions as to the date and authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but contradicts his view that "whoever wrote the Apocalypse, it was not the author of the Gospel."

Mr. G. J. E. ASKEW argued in favour of the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE regretted the author's reference to 2 Peter. He thought similarities between the Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse indicated common authorship.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. Dr. CAWLEY wrote: In my judgment, this paper is of particular value, since it confirms the long-held contention of conservative scholars that the day would come when the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel would be amply vindicated.

For the last few years we have noticed how scholars within this field have had to draw nearer the conservative position, convinced that any extreme presentation of its data had become out-moded. But no one ever dreamt that such a vindication of Johannine authorship was about to take place.

The trouble all along was that both conservative and extreme critics were working practically on internal evidence, with our subjective bias often clouding judgment. But now this scrap of papyrus must necessarily make all the difference, with the result that many other New Testament scholars will be as happily dogmatic as is the lecturer. Its value, therefore, is beyond all price, and will have wide repercussion throughout the whole field of Johannine criticism, with great effect upon other New Testament research work.

Furthermore, this paper comes in an hour when the authority of the Bible is being re-asserted in a remarkable degree. In face of all the fresh evidence before us at the present hour, it is not too much to say that the whole critical position is, as it were, in the melting pot, with no one able to say what the final issue will be. Certainly, on quite a number of great points, it is a good day for conservative scholarship, and a growingly serious one for extreme criticism.

It is fitting, therefore, that so outstanding a Christian and scholar as Sir Frederic Kenyon, is prepared to lay the latest findings on the Fourth Gospel before the Institute. It is difficult to express adequately our thanks for facts so cogently set before us, and for the lucidity of the entire argument. The cumulative effect of the paper leads one to feel that conservatives may await the future with sober confidence, a matter of profound gratitude, especially when we recall earlier years.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore the lecturer's *caveat* that in no wise ought we to be antagonistic to the application of critical methods to the interpretation of Scripture. Truth in the end prevails over every untenable theory. Our attitude, therefore, should be that whoever searches the Scriptures with a sincere mind is a friend, at least potentially, not an enemy.

Brig.-Gen. H. BIDDULPH, wrote : I should like to have Sir F. Kenyon's opinion on the following suggestions as to the divergent styles of language and grammar, exemplified in the Gospel and the Revelation.

The apostle John was a Galilean fisherman ; and as we know the Galilean spoke a very uncouth Aramaic. John's education must have been slight and his knowledge of grammatical Greek extremely scanty.

His gospel must have been dictated to a fairly literate amanuensis, who (as is customary in the East) would clothe the spoken word in his own language and in good grammatical style. When, however, we come to the exile on Patmos, we must envisage him as being deficient in every literary help and with no amanuensis. In order to record his vision he must perforce have recorded it in his own uncouth and illiterate Greek. Assuming all this to be approximately correct, difference in style and grammar would not necessarily mean diversity of authorship.

Major H. B. CLARKE, wrote : I should like to suggest that the difference in style may well be due to the difference in subject. Men who have received such a vision as the Apocalypse are hardly likely to write in the same manner as the Gospel and Epistles.

I would draw the lecturer's attention to one fact, that the three first chapters of the Apocalypse are directly addressed to the Seven Churches of Asia. In view of the tradition that St. John worked and died at Ephesus, one of the seven, I submit that no such work as the Apocalypse would have been received for a moment unless the author were recognised as an Apostle. Yet the book, as the lecturer admits, was recognised as canonical as early as the time of

Justin and Irenaeus. Naturally there were adversaries to this view, having regard to its contents.

As regards the point of his being described as "the Elder," I would refer to 1 Peter 5, 1, where the writer also describes himself as "an elder," and yet in chapter 1, verse 1, also expressly claims his apostleship.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I have little to add by way of comment on the discussion. Such difference of opinion as is indicated relates mainly to the authorship of the Apocalypse. I find it difficult to accept the explanation that the style of the Gospel and Epistles is that of an amanuensis. I cannot conceive a disciple venturing to transmute the Apostle's reminiscences into the highly individual style of the great discourses in chapters vi-viii, xiv-xvi. With regard to the argument from early attribution of the Apocalypse to the Apostle, it is significant that this evidence does not come from Asia Minor, but from the West; on this point I can only refer to my original paper.

But my main thesis was the confirmation of the traditional attribution of the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John; and I am glad that the strength of the evidence for this seems to be generally appreciated.

862ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1., AT 5 P.M. ON JUNE 25TH, 1945.

AIR COMMODORE P. J. WISEMAN, C.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the President, Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A.; to deliver his Presidential Address entitled "The Bible and Present-Day Developments."

The following elections have been made: G. J. E. Askew, Esq., Fellow; Mrs. E. B. Titchener, Life Member; A. D. Norris, Esq., M.A., D.Phil., Member; R. Harkness, Esq., Associate; Rev. D. T. Poole, Fellow; S. J. Wooldridge, Esq., Member; Prof. A. C. Schultz, Ph.B., M.A., B.D., Th.D., Member; G. C. D. Howley, Esq., Member; Rev. C. F. H. Henry, M.A., Th.D., Life Member; J. M. Houston, Esq., Associate; George H. Ramsay, Esq., Life Fellow; Robert L. Woolley, Esq., Member; J. Eynon-Tiffin, Esq., Member; Stanley G. Browne, Esq., M.B., B.S., F.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., D.T.M., A.K.C., Life Member.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

"*THE BIBLE AND PRESENT-DAY DEVELOPMENTS.*"

By SIR CHARLES MARSTON, F.S.A.

THERE is a prophecy in the Old Testament of a Famine, not of bread, nor of water, but of hearing the words of God (Amos, 8-11). As we study our Bibles, we sometimes wonder whether such prophecies have been fulfilled, or whether the time is now ripe for them. Because we actually live in this age, there is no need to dwarf our imaginations in estimating its importance. The time may be ripe now for *anything* to happen; our trouble is that we lack perspective by which to judge. What will future historians have to say about us? We may suspect that there has been a good deal fundamentally at fault. But little light comes upon underlying causes, from our Preachers, or from the Press, or through the Radio.

There is a saying that people are prone not to see out of the wood for the trees. I suggest that the brilliant discoveries of this Age have dazzled us. And that we have been eager to accept not only the facts but the conjectures made in the name of Science, without appreciating what this involved, or the limitations of scientific knowledge about the deeper issues of life.

So far as the Bible is concerned, I have endeavoured in my books to point out that the discoveries made by the Science of Archaeology during the past twenty years are all in favour of the authenticity of the Old Testament. Authorities on the manuscripts of the New Testament like Sir Frederic Kenyon are equally favourable in their verdict on that Book. In addition then to the traditional belief in Holy Scripture, we have these modern external endorsements of Science to further sanction the authority which the Bible had held in this country.

Nevertheless the Bible, and what is associated with it, is being treated as old fashioned and out of date by a considerable part of the community. In the course of this address, it will be seen that judging by the utterances of present-day leaders of Science, it is the so-called scientific outlook that has really become "old-fashioned," and "out of date," and is breaking down in the face of the new evidence that has come to light this century.

In order to observe the chasm that exists between our traditional faith and what may be called the present day outlook, let us start with fundamentals. No one can take exception to the use of the first Commandment—

"Thou shalt have none other gods beside me"

as a fundamental Bible statement. Now everywhere, all through the ages, the Sciences of History, Archaeology and Anthropology tell us there has practically been a universal belief or recognition of one or more deities. On Good Friday, for example, we pray specially for Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics. But they all believed in some God or gods. It was left to the last century to develop a belief in no god at all, and in effect to declare that everything just happens! And the strange thing is that our Churches either ignore or make ineffective attempts to combat these ideas. Let us consider how they affect present-day religion.

The modern preacher usually takes as his subject some incident connected with the Life of The Lord Jesus Christ on earth. He takes for granted that his audience believe in God the Father, and all that is implied by that Faith. He takes for granted that his audience believe in the Supernatural as well as the Natural. He ignores the fact that a large proportion of the so-called educated population really only believe in the Natural. So it has come about that such a text as :—

“He that cometh to God must believe that HE IS and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek after him.” (Heb. xi, 6.)

is treated in a conventional way, and the implications involved in a real belief in the existence of the Deity are shunned.

I remember the days when it was thought a mark of learning for a man to affirm that he only believed what he could see. People still reject the reality of the Unseen associated with the Bible, although they readily accept it when associated with Science.

Again we have St. Paul's statement to the Athenians :—

“In him we live and move and have our being.” (Acts xvii, 28)

affirming the Transcendent Nature of the Deity, and His Imminence to each of us. It may reverently be suggested that the æther of space, which we use daily in broadcasting, is a standing witness to the Immanence of the Deity. But people overlook the association.

And lastly, our Lord's Revelation to His Disciples :—

“Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father; but the very hairs of your head are all numbered.” (Math. x, 29 and 30.) (Luke xii, 6.)

These sentences testify to a Divine Care for the whole Creation, from the sparrows to the very hairs of our heads. Such reminders are precious in these present days of trouble. They lift us up, as it were, into an atmosphere where we would fain dwell. Yet small account is now taken in our conventional lives of the implications such statements carry with them.

All this mental opacity began with the materialistic suppositions of the last century. My 1943 Address quoted a celebrated Scientist, a Nobel prize winner, who defined these suppositions as follows :—

“The scientists of the nineteenth century blundered in supposing that they had found a fairly consistent and universally applicable scheme of interpretation of the physical world, a set of laws in conformity with which all phenomena everywhere must take place.”

Such was the standard of knowledge half a century ago. Despite

all that has since been discovered, it is still largely the standard of knowledge of so-called educated people. They have not even yet realised how futile this attitude has become in the light of to-day's scientific Evidence. In order to demonstrate this concisely, one has only to refer to what Sir Arthur Eddington wrote before this war :—

“ We have turned a corner in the path of progress, and our ignorance stands revealed appalling and insistent.”
(*Vide* “ The Nature of the Physical World ”.)

While, since the war began, Sir James Jeans has written :—

“ We are still like children playing with pebbles on the seashore, while the great ocean of truth rolls unexplored beyond our reach.” (*Vide* “ Physics and Philosophy.”)

This statement fully endorses the words of Sir Arthur Eddington. I have neither seen nor heard of any references to them elsewhere. Are they so unimportant ? Or should they not in the interests of Truth be broadcast far and wide ? For a great part of our educated classes are under the impression that through Science we have reached a standard of knowledge out of all proportion, greater than is really the case. So instead of there now being little room left for Bible Revelation, there is more need for it ; even as there was two hundred and fifty years ago when Sir Isaac Newton first wrote the words which Sir James Jeans has re-affirmed. The fact of the matter seems to be that in tacitly accepting the nineteenth century outlook, historians of the future may affirm that we in the twentieth century were guilty of a great act of credulity. For these words of Sir Arthur Eddington and Sir James Jeans, two of our greatest modern scientists, render the purely materialistic scheme of interpretation of the nineteenth century futile, its supposed laws inadequate, and its assumption of complete knowledge ridiculous. Yet these last century ideas continue to be treated as the basis of knowledge at the present time. The Deity was so left out of that nineteenth century scheme, that for the most part there are merely polite beliefs to-day that “ HE IS.” The idea of His Immanence is in a similar semi-moribund condition ; and it is imagined that His Care for His Creation would involve interference with the assumed uniformity of those supposed Laws of Nature, which according to these nineteenth century ideas were sacrosanct. Thus through assumptions of last century which were pure speculations, and limited us

to the finite, God has been denied the control of His Own Universe !

It has recently been asserted that the final blow to materialism was dealt by the discovery of ultra atomic corpuscles and the splitting of the atom. However that may be, phenomena, that do not accord with these 19th Century Laws of Nature, are no longer being laughed at, they are being recognised by men of Science. Indeed at least one distinguished authority declares that the ordinary actions of every-day life partake of the nature of miracles. Others who have studied the extraordinary manifestations of life, are reaching conclusions like those of Crookes, Richet and Lodge. Alexis Carrel of the Rockefeller Institute, New York, a most brilliant Scientist, who has recently died, affirmed that a negative attitude to miracles could no longer be sustained in face of the facts observed by science during the past fifty years.

Why in this century has there been such an ostrich-like disregard of History and Tradition ? Has it been because supposed laws "in conformity with which all phenomena must happen" are there conspicuous by their absence ? If we confine our observations on History to the immediate past, the result of the operation of the supposed laws "in conformity with which all phenomena must happen" has proved peculiarly disappointing to the German people. For consider their many years of most thorough preparation for this war ; of how they spared no endeavour to ensure its success. Consider further how we enabled Germany to bring about the natural result by our policy of disarmament. To-day, according to these natural laws, Germany should be occupying and governing this country, instead of our occupying and governing Germany.

After France fell, according to the laws of nature, the successful invasion of this country seemed inevitable. Then we had the miraculous escape of our armies from Dunkirk. And a whole series of events, culminating in the unforeseen attack of Germany on Russia, and the equally unforeseen attack of Japan on the United States. In this war, surely, the Supernatural has triumphed over the Natural. And the Revelation of the Bible is being amply vindicated over the supposed inevitable operation of natural laws of the last century. Let us hope that as a result of this war, men may arise who may be used to lead us out of the maze of our patchwork beliefs, and

unbeliefs, into a great revival of Faith in God. One feels that the mass of the people are ready for the message, but that unless we have Faith to renew and strengthen us, all material substitutes will be vain.

Let us consider the emphasis laid on Faith, in the Bible. Jesus Christ said :—

“ According to your faith be it done unto you.” (Math. ix, 29)

and again we read :—

“ He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.” (Math. xiii, 58)

a passage which suggests that a mass atmosphere of unbelief may actually counteract the faith of individuals. There has been a great falling off in the teaching, and the emphasis on Faith. Whether one reads the Old or the New Testament, the emphasis is there—and of a most marked character. Our Lord’s utterances on the value of prayer are equally emphatic, and indeed, the late Dr. Alexis Carrel, to whom I have already referred, at about the time this war began, compared the power of prayer with that of terrestrial gravity. I drew the attention of a distinguished prelate to this statement, and he replied “ That is what the Church Teaches.”—Why then is it what the Church so rarely preaches ?

There are other passages in the Bible to which, for some unexplained reason, reference is rarely made. They stress the presence and power of the Devil. These references are rare in the Old Testament, but the New Testament abounds in them, beginning with the Temptations of the Lord Jesus Christ after His Forty Days Fast in the wilderness. And other occasions are recorded in His life which indicate the continued presence of the evil one. Finally we are told that Satan entered into one of the Disciples, Judas Iscariot, to betray our Lord. (Luke xxii, 3.) There are a number of other passages which refer to the devil in the later Books of the New Testament. Thus St. Paul tells the Ephesians to :—

“ Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly place.” (Eph. vi, 11, 12.)

And St. Peter warns us :—

“ Be sober, be watchful, your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.”
(1 Peter v, 8.)

But the more numerous references to Satan, or the Devil, are in the Book of Revelation. This Book, which purports to deal with the end of the Dispensation, represents the culmination of conflict between God and the Devil. Satan and his hosts are cast out of heaven (Revel. xii, 7 to 9). And the passage warns us :—

“ Woe for the earth and for the sea ; because the devil is gone down unto you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time.” (Verse 12.)

I suggest that the Bible teaches that there exists an age-old conflict between God and the Devil, in which all Humanity is involved. And judging by the signs of the times, it has certainly culminated in the present period. Yet men and women steeped in the materialism of the last century ignore this conflict altogether. Why the Problem of Evil puzzles us is, we do not realise its intimate connection with this conflict between God and the Devil. Man became involved because God sought to create human beings who were free to love Him of their own accord, and so he gave them freedom to choose. The Devil took advantage of this opportunity, and has been doing so all down the Ages.

The Bible is a unique Book. Since the Reformation it has been closely associated with the religious beliefs of this country. People complain to-day that while we are engrossed in the study of material sciences, we have neglected the most important of all—the study of the Science of Man. The Bible is the Text Book of that Science. I recently listened to a broadcast debate between two Professors in London University on the subject of whether a limit should be placed on the investigations of Science, so as to stop wider methods of destruction. The one referred to the evidence of increasing depravity of human nature, the other seemed certain that after the war, Science would remedy it. The latter conveyed the impression that something would be invented that could cure Sin, the most widespread and fatal disease of all.

According to the Bible something was done nearly two thousand years ago to cure Sin. But it involved Faith. Jesus Christ Himself once wistfully said :—

“When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find Faith on earth?” (Luke xviii, 8.)

The work of the Devil all down the centuries seems to have been to undermine and destroy Faith. We in this country have now reached the time when despite our grievous shortcomings as a nation, both before and during this war, the Hand of God has preserved us from invasion and given us the Victory over Germany. What are we going to do now about Faith in God and His Son, Jesus Christ? The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has defined Faith as “The substance of things hoped for, the Evidence of Things Unseen.” We have reached the time when through Science, the Evidence of Things Unseen has become quite familiar to us, and along with it the appalling and insistent state of our earthly Ignorance has been revealed.

It may be suggested that the work with which I have been associated in connection with the Bible has caused me to take a prejudiced view of the so-called Philosophy of an out-of-date Science, and that it has not dimmed our national faith to the extent that has been suggested. Since the earlier part of this address was written my attention has been drawn to the following recent statement of a celebrated agnostic:—

“Here then is an age which is without beliefs in religion, without standards in morals, without convictions in politics, without values in art. I doubt if there has ever been an age which was so completely without standards or values. Upon some of the effects of this indifference and agnosticism I shall comment in later chapters. They are, I am convinced, disastrous. I have remarked that the modern generation suffers from a fund of unexpected seriousness. I now add that it suffers from a repressed need to believe. Its agnosticism, in short, is not only widespread, but wistful. Tell us what to think and how to act; tell us, in a word, how to be saved. Such has been the unspoken plea for the last ten years.”—(“Philosophy for Our Times”, by Prof. C. E. M. Joad.)

This striking description of a state of things said to exist in this country at the present time, reminds us of the prophecy to which reference was made in the opening words of this address. One wonders whether Professor Joad has unintentionally described the commencement of the Famine to hear the Words

of God. Has he not here voiced the inarticulate cry for the Spiritual? Is it not something that Jesus Christ expressed when he said—"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of God" (Math. iv, 4). The Mystery in Life has not been explained by our new knowledge, indeed, it grows ever deeper and deeper. Let us recognise the fact that materialism moves in a world of make-believe, and we need something more real than what it has given us.

In the past few years it has been repeatedly postulated that the faculty of the Mind is all important; one even hears so-called authorities deny the existence of the faculty of Intuition. Yet it may be suggested that Intuition, and all associated with it, is at least as important as Reason. And that the over-emphasis placed on mind has obscured and given only a one-sided view of human nature. As we read the reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society we sometimes wonder why the Bible has in the past made such a wide appeal to all races educated and uneducated. It may be suggested that the immediate cause of this universal attraction is that the Bible appeals to our intuitive faculties as well as our mental ones.

Professor Joad's words reveal that there is now a great opportunity for the renewed study and teaching of the Bible. Is the Minister of Education going to use it? Or is the new Education going to propagate the old discredited philosophy of the last century? What are our Broadcasting Authorities and "Brains Trusts" going to do? They rarely seem to go beyond the nineteenth century ideas of Life. What is our Press going to do? If Religion has not been popular among its Readers in the past, we gather from Professor Joad's quoted statement that it is likely to be much more so in future.

And let us be under no illusions about the Future. We shall need more Faith than we have at present, to carry us through the times that lie ahead. How many thoughtful men feel satisfied with to-day's outlook? How many feel that the new League of Nations is likely to be more successful than the old one? Has the effect of this war already so changed Mankind that the old jealousies, the old misrepresentations, no longer exist? Or are they already breaking out again?

In the middle of the war, the United States sent over here an official with whom I discussed some of the differences between our respective countries. I enquired how we were going to

reconcile them. He replied "By goodwill." That was about the best answer that could be made. But we have had small emphasis laid on "goodwill," even between our own citizens. Take this General Election for instance as an example. Yet goodwill is surely one of the foremost Christian virtues and we shall need them all in the days to come; for the Devil will still seek to betray us, and against him we are required to "put on the whole armour of God."

I conclude this address with a few words concerning the loss we have sustained in the death of my most distinguished predecessor—Sir Ambrose Fleming. He was a man who was illustrious because of his great scientific discoveries. Yet he had a profound Christian Faith, and would, I think, have endorsed all I have said in this Address. He did not believe in the theory of Evolution because it did not accord with all the Evidence. I remember that some eighteen or twenty years ago, a well-known Bishop said something to the effect that Evolution guaranteed that we were progressing to better times! What a mockery that sounds to-day, after all we have endured in the last six years. And may have yet to endure. It is much more in accord with prophecies in the Bible that are nineteen hundred and more years old. But with these prophecies there is Hope. We read that:—

"When these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads; because your Redemption draweth nigh." (Luke xxi, 28.)

What are these things?—"Wars and rumours of Wars,"—"Nation against nation,"—"Earthquakes,"—"Famines,"—"Pestilences," etc. And we are slowly passing out of the greatest wars in all History, with every prospect of famines and pestilences in their train. The Hope has nothing to do with Democracy, or Leagues of Nations, or Social Security. It concerns the Redemption of Human Nature, and the downfall of the Devil.

The events of the past six years must sooner or later have their repercussion on our real Beliefs. Are they going to restore our Faith in the Bible? Or will they carry this Nation further away into the wilderness of materialism which we have been travelling with such disastrous results? We have heard

so much of Democracy, as though in some mysterious way it is going to replace the Faith of our Fathers. I suggest that without that Faith, Democracy is going to prove a more inadequate form of Government than any that the world has experienced in the past. The new President of the United States, in his inaugural address, has rightly shown his appreciation of what has to be faced, and what is needed for it, by quoting from the Bible the words of the prayer of Solomon for Wisdom.

REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN.

Air Commodore WISEMAN, said : I am sure that you would wish me, on your behalf, to express to Sir Charles Marston, our thanks for his timely paper. The famine of which he has spoken—a famine which results in spiritual starvation of the people—is due, I submit, to the sowing of a corrupted seed which produces a false growth called “tares,” having the appearance of the real thing, but lacking the all important ears of wheat. Surely the last six years of war should have taught us that there can be no authoritative basis for life apart from “the hearing of the words of God”—the Bible. More than a century ago the corrupted seed that produced the harvest of this war began to be sown. German philosophy taught that the supernatural had little to do with the lives of men, that miracles were impossible, and revelation in the Bible sense impracticable. Later developments in this country assumed that God was so distant from the unfolding of His world and of man on it, that they had been left wholly to themselves and the process of evolution.

There is, I suggest, general agreement that what is wrong with this world of men, is not so much in the sphere of the material, as in the realm of thought. As this paper says, man’s ideals have been substituted for God’s thoughts. During the difficult year in this country, when we stood alone against the false ideologies, I noticed that even the atheists abandoned their philosophic position and reiterated—as though it was a necessary part of their faith—that right must triumph over wrong. In saying this they were, of course, greater than their creed. For no atheist can have any rational foundation in material things, apart from God, for such a trust, for this confidence can only be derived from belief in God who acts

righteously. Where this faith is lacking there is at all times a tendency to pessimism.

Further evidence of the famine due to the sowing of a false seed is to be found in many of our pulpits so that "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed." Instead of the word of God modern alternatives are often substituted. It is incontrovertible that the pulpit has been used as a medium by which the people have been indoctrinated with the German sceptical philosophy regarding the Bible. It is in this connection that we owe our thanks to Sir Charles Marston for his books, which have done so much to contradict the destructive criticism of the Bible.