

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

---

VOL. LIX.

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

---

VOL. LIX.



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

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

---

1927

LONDON:

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

## PREFACE.

---

IN an age when things of the mind are asserting a new emphasis—the theoretical and practical being ever more intimately combined in the work of the world—there cannot but be a place of service and influence for such an organization as the Victoria Institute, concerned as it is with the progress of Science and Philosophy as they bear upon the highest interests of mankind.

Moreover, in an age when investigators show a tendency to rest content with the more superficial results of thought and research—to the more or less complete disregard of a Great First Cause and a Divine Revelation—there would seem to be a special demand for a Society designed to encourage and promote the profounder adventures of the mind, as expressed in the main Object of the Victoria Institute—in humble faith in One Eternal God, who created all things good, to combat the unbelief which now prevails among all sorts and conditions of men.

The papers that go forth in the present *Journal* of Transactions cover a ground that amply vindicates the claims made for the Victoria Institute. The opening Essay, by Professor J. A. Fleming, the newly elected President, will commend itself as a powerful utterance on a subject which may not be disregarded at the present time. The paper carries an authority which, though thoughtlessly challenged by the sciolist, will not be seriously questioned or ignored by those who lay claim to scholarship in the true sense of the word. The papers that follow make appeal along other lines. In one contribution it is shown that by his very nature man reaches out after God; and in another the argument for Theism derived from design as observed in Nature, is re-stated with telling force.

Several papers are concerned with Holy Scripture, in whole or in part: whether dealing with archæological investigations or

chronological problems, these present a strong constructive argument for Divine Revelation, and for Biblical teaching in regard to God and His ways with the race. Finally, the paper on "Woman's Place in Islam" raises questions bearing upon the work of world-wide evangelization to-day.

An important feature of this year's volume is the presentation at greater length of the Remarks of Members and Associates, made during the Discussions following the various papers. Whether long or short, these contributions sometimes throw a valued light upon subjects which, as introduced by the Lecturers, may leave un-noticed points of view that have a practical and urgent bearing upon the Warrant of Faith.

With a deep conviction that "a great door and effectual" stands open before the Victoria Institute and its work, the Council commend the claims and interests of the Society to its supporters, with the suggestion that they avail themselves of opportunities to enlist the sympathy of suitable friends in the more vigorous promotion of a work which bears witness to God and His truth in a manner specially demanded by the times in which we live.

JAMES W. THIRTLE,  
*Chairman of Council.*

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE ... ..	v
REPORT OF COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1926 ... ..	1
CASH STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR 1926 ... ..	6
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 21ST, 1927 ...	8
EVOLUTION AND REVELATION. BY PROFESSOR J. A. FLEMING, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. ... ..	11
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Dr. W. Woods Smyth, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A., Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste, Mr. F. C. Wood, Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., and Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O. ... ..	27
MAN AND HIS GOD: THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION AMONG PRIMITIVE PEOPLES. BY CAPTAIN T. W. E. HIGGENS ... ..	41
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony, O.B.E., Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. W. Hoste, Mr. Sidney Collett, Dr. A. T. Schofield, and the Bishop of Chichester ... ..	58
THE COMPARATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT NATIONS IN ITS BEARING ON HOLY SCRIPTURE. BY G. B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E....	65
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony, O.B.E., Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. G. Wilson Heath, Mr. Sidney Collett, Miss Hamilton Law, Lieut.- Colonel A. H. C. Kenney-Herbert, and Colonel H. Biddulph, C.M.G., D.S.O. ... ..	81
THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PHARAOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH. BY THE REV. G. A. FRANK KNIGHT, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.E. ... ..	96
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, M.A., Mr. Sidney Collett, the Rev. Dr. H. C. Morton, Mr. Theodore Roberts, Sir Charles Marston, Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., and Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E. 112	112
BABYLON IN THE DAYS OF HAMMURAPI AND NEBUCHADREZZAR. BY SQUADRON-LEADER P. J. WISEMAN, R.A.F. ... ..	121
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Professor Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S. ... ..	135
THE COMPLETED LEGEND OF BEL-MERODACH AND THE DRAGON. BY PROFESSOR THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S. ...	137
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., and Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E. ...	162

	PAGE
THE PREDICTIVE ELEMENT IN HOLY SCRIPTURE. BY THE REV. A. H. FINN ... ..	165
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony, O.B.E., Mr. Theodore Roberts, Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. W. Hoste, Mr. R. Duncan, M.B.E., I.S.O., Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay, and Major L. M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S. ... ..	178
THE PLACE OF WOMAN IN ISLAM. BY THE REV. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D. ... ..	190
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Robert Caldwell, Esq., F.R.G.S., Miss Hamilton Law, Mr. Avary H. Forbes, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Lieut.-Colonel Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., Mr. William C. Edwards, Lieut.- Colonel G. Mackinlay, and Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E. ...	210
ANCIENT SODOM IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE. BY THE REV. PRESIDENT MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D., XENIA THEO- LOGICAL SEMINARY, U.S.A. ... ..	217
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. Alfred W. Oke, B.A., LL.M., F.G.S., Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., Mr. William C. Edwards, and Mr. F. C. Wood ... ..	231
A RESTATEMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FOR THEISM FROM DESIGN. BY LIEUT.-COLONEL F. MOLONY, O.B.E. ... ..	236
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., the Rev. Dr. H. C. Morton, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. Theodore Roberts, the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., and Mr. William C. Edwards ... ..	246
THE RADICAL CRITICISM OF THE PSALTER. BY PROFESSOR R. DICK WILSON, D.D., OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, U.S.A. ...	254
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, the Rev. Charles Gardner, M.A., Dr. James W. Thirtle, M.R.A.S., the Rev. A. H. Finn, the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Colonel H. Biddulph, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., Mr. William C. Edwards, and Mr. Percy O. Ruoff ... ..	270
TIME AND ETERNITY. BY ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D. ( <i>Vice- President</i> ) ... ..	281
<i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., Mr. Percy O. Ruoff, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. Theodore Roberts, the Rev. A. H. Finn, Mr. W. Hoste, the Rev. J. J. B. Coles, M.A., Miss C. Tindall, Dr. W. Bell Dawson, and the Rev. John Tuckwell, M.R.A.S. ...	291
LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES, ETC. ... ..	303
OBJECTS, CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS ... ..	333



# VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

---

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1926.

READ AT THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, MARCH 21ST, 1927.

---

## 1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council herewith beg to submit to Members and Associates the 58th Annual Report of the Society.

The papers read during the past Session have evoked an unusual amount of interest, to judge from the discussions which have arisen round some of them. This has been notably so as regards the burning questions, of "Revelation," treated by Canon V. F. Storr, M.A., of Westminster, and "Evolution," by Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S. Such discussions have certainly tended in a very marked way to the elucidation and confirmation of the truth.

The Council have to announce with great regret the loss of Prebendary H. E. Fox, M.A., and of Professor Édouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., the distinguished Egyptologist of Geneva, Vice-Presidents, and also of David Anderson-Berry, M.D., LL.D. (member of Council), all of whom have contributed valuable papers to the Society.

They are glad to be able to announce that a successor has been found to the line of distinguished men, who have held office in the past as Presidents of the Victoria Institute, in the person of Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., Emeritus Professor of University College, London, who has been nominated by the Council to the Presidency of the Society.

2. *Meetings.*

Eleven ordinary meetings were held during the Session 1925-26. The papers published were :—

“Scientific Criticism as Applied to the Bible,” by GEORGE B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E., Consul-General at Milan.

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

“Notes on the Discoveries at Ur and Tel al-Obeid, and the Worship of the Moon-God,” by Professor THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S. (With lantern illustrations.)

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

“Modern Science in the Book of Job,” by Lieut.-Commander VICTOR L. TRUMPER, R.N.R. (ret.), M.R.A.S.

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

“A Philosophic Exponent of Latin Culture : Alexandre Vinet, Protestant Divine and Literary Critic (1797-1847),” by Professor F. F. ROGET, of Geneva.

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

“Revelation,” by the Rev. Canon V. F. STORR, M.A., Canon of Westminster.

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

“The Problem of the Septuagint and Quotations in the New Testament,” by the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.

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

“The Qur'an and its Doctrine of God,” by the Rev. H. U. WETTBRECHT STANTON, Ph.D., D.D.

W. Coldstream, Esq., B.A. (late I.C.S.), in the Chair.

“Religion and Science,” by ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

Major Lewis M. Davies, R.A., F.G.S., in the Chair.

“Evolution,” by Major LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

Alfred W. Oke, Esq., B.A., F.G.S., in the Chair.

“The Silence of God : How is it to be Explained ?” by Professor HOWARD ATWOOD KELLY, M.D., LL.D., and the Rev. D. M. M'INTYRE, D.D.

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

3. *Council and Officers.*

The following is the list of the Council and Officers for the year 1926 :—

## President.

## Vice-Presidents.

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

## Council.

*(In Order of Original Election.)*

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

## Honorary Treasurer.

Sir George King, M.A.

## Honorary Editor of the Journal.

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

## Honorary Secretary, Papers Committee.

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

## Honorary Secretary.

William Hoste, Esq., B.A.

## Auditor.

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

## Secretary.

Mr. A. E. Montague.

4. *Election of Council and Officers.*

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

Sydney T. Klein, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S., John Clarke Dick, Esq., M.A., and W. E. Leslie, Esq., who offer themselves and are nominated by the Council for re-election.

The Council also nominate Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., as President of the Institute, Prof. Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., and the Right Reverend Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., as Vice-Presidents; also the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., William C. Edwards, Esq., Robert Duncan, Esq., M.B.E., I.S.O., and Dr. Louis E. Wood as Members of Council.

### 5. *Obituary.*

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

D. Anderson-Berry, Esq., M.D., LL.D. (a Member of Council); the Rev. David Baron; the Rev. L. G. Bomford, M.A.; Stanley V. Coote, Esq., M.A.; Mrs. Cumming-Brown; the Rev. Dr. John De Witt; Sir Francis C. Danson, J.P.; the Rev. Prebendary H. E. Fox, M.A. (a Vice-President); Alfred Holness, Esq., F.R.G.S.; George H. Judd, Esq., F.R.G.S.; the Hon. Louisa E. Kinnaird; Miss Longdon; Col. H. G. Macgregor, C.B.; Prof. Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D. (a Vice-President); John H. Nelson, Esq., M.A.; Prof. Cyril Parker, M.A., D.Sc.; the Rt. Hon. Lord Teignmouth; G. de Laval Willis, Esq.

### 6. *New Members and Associates.*

The following are the names of new Members and Associates elected up to the end of 1926:—

MEMBERS.—Thomas Fitzgerald, Esq.; G. Wilson Heath, Esq., M.R.I.; Dr. T. E. Nuttall, F.G.S.; Captain H. L. Penfold, M.Inst.C.E.; the Rev. S. B. Rohold, F.R.G.S.

LIFE MEMBER.—Mrs. Herman V. Hilprecht.

ASSOCIATES.—John Ashworth, Esq.; the Rev. Alonzo L. Baker; Laurence T. Chambers, Esq.; Miss Marion H. Cooper; Miss L. E. Cotesworth; W. N. Delevingne, Esq.; the Rev. Louis Foster; Dr. R. P. Haddon; the Rev. George Jones; the Rev. E. J. Nash; George Phare, Esq.; Major W. J. Rowland; Percy O. Ruoff, Esq.; W. H. Seymour, Esq., M.D.; Percy J. Sowden, Esq.; H. K. Airy Shaw, Esq., B.A.; James Stanes, Esq.; Mrs. Duff Watson.

LIFE ASSOCIATE.—Miss Agnes M. Naish.

LIBRARY ASSOCIATE.—Princeton Theological Seminary.

### 7. *Number of Members and Associates.*

The following statement shows the number of supporters of the Institute at the end of 1926:—

Life Members	...	...	...	14
Annual Members	...	...	...	101
Life Associates	...	...	...	50
Annual Associates	...	...	...	294
Missionary Associates	...	...	...	13
Library Associates	...	...	...	28
				<hr/>
Total	...	...	...	500
				<hr/>

8. *Donations.*

Miss E. H. Bolton, £2; the Rev. Charles Boutflower, 5s.; Archibald Greenlees, Esq., £2 2s.; G. Wilson Heath, Esq., 8s.; Miss A. M. Hodgkin, £1 1s.; Miss E. F. Staley, 2s. 6d.; Dr. Louis E. Wood, £3 3s.

9. *Finance.*

The income of the Society has been slightly lower this year, and the expenses of printing higher owing to the length of some of the papers and the abnormally long discussions in some cases. It is hoped that ways may be found of rectifying this in the current year. The Council would be glad of the co-operation of all Members in bringing the work of the Society before those of their friends who would be desirous of becoming members. If the membership could be raised from 500 to 600 the problem would be solved.

10. *The Gunning Prize.*

The subject for this triennial competition, limited to Members and Associates of the Institute, was—

“CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES.”

What may we gather from His attitude and instruction?

What are the implicates involved in these, and in His use of the Old Testament Scriptures?

If His ministry called for the New Testament, in what way and how far did He pre-authenticate it, and enable a true doctrine of the Canon, and view of inspiration to be propounded?

The prize-winner will be announced, it is hoped, on June 13th, on the occasion of the Annual Address.

11. *Conclusion.*

In conclusion, the Council would thank all those who by their presence and active sympathy have contributed to the success of the past Session. It is not always easy to choose the best subjects for papers, nor to find the right lecturers to deal with them, and naturally the Council does not make itself responsible for every view expressed, but there is always an opportunity for those present to show a truer conception, based on arguments from Scripture, History, Archæology or Philology. Unanimity to have any weight must be based on independent consideration and research, not on “toeing the line” to some leader. The Council heartily invites the considered participation of Members in the discussions, as preferable to these being limited to one or two regular voices.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

JAMES W. THIRTLE,  
*Chairman of Council*

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31<sup>ST</sup> DECEMBER, 1926.

EXPENDITURE.				INCOME.					
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To Rent, Light, Cleaning and Hire of									
Lecture Room	....	....	....	73	1	6			
„ Salary	....	....	....	200	0	0			
„ National Insurance	....	....	....	3	13	8			
„ Life Assurance	....	....	....	1	4	10			
„ Printing and Stationery....	....	....	....	335	6	10			
„ Expenses of Meetings	....	....	....	4	6	0			
„ Library Purchases	....	....	....	0	15	0			
„ Postages	....	....	....	36	19	0			
„ Audit Fee	....	....	....	3	3	0			
„ Fire Insurance	....	....	....	0	12	0			
„ Bank Charges and Sundries	....	....	....	4	7	6			
				663	9	4			
				£663	9	4			
							470	8	0
								10	0
								49	6
								529	14
								133	15
								£663	9



# THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

OF THE

## VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 21ST, 1927, AT  
3.30 P.M.

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

The notice convening the Meeting was read by the Honorary Secretary, and then the Minutes of the last business Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, that as the Report had been circulated, with the Balance-sheet, among those present, it should be taken as read. He then called on the Auditor to make some remarks as to the financial position of the Institute ; and he drew the attention of the Meeting to the fact that the expenses of printing had advanced during the year. After one or two questions by Messrs. Lance-Gray and Rudd had been answered, the Chairman remarked that the financial position of the Institute had the earnest attention of the Council ; that in great part the rise in expenses was due to the length of the discussions, which it was inadvisable to limit beyond a certain point, as in them often lay a very appreciable part of the value of the paper. He was able to announce that, through the kindness of a Member, a sum had been placed at the disposal of the Council which would go a long way toward meeting the deficit.

*Resolution No. 1.*—The CHAIRMAN then moved :—

“ That Mr. Sydney T. Klein, F.L.S., Mr. John Clarke Dick, M.A., and Mr. W. E. Leslie, retiring Members of Council, be re-elected ; that Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., be elected as President of the Institute, and Professor T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., and the Right Rev.



Bishop J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., as Vice-Presidents; and that the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., Mr. William C. Edwards, Mr. Robert Duncan, M.B.E., I.S.O., and Dr. Louis E. Wood be elected as Members of Council. Also that the Auditor, Mr. E. Luff-Smith, be re-elected at a fee of three guineas."

The CHAIRMAN then read a statement as to the gentleman whom the Council had nominated as President:—

Dr. John Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S., who has been nominated as President, is not only eminent as a scientific investigator and teacher, but has taken for many years a deep interest in matters connected with popular education, and especially in Christian Evidential work. He is a distinguished graduate of the Universities of Cambridge and of London. He has just resigned the Chair of Electrical Engineering in the University of London, held by him for forty-two years, and during the last fifty years he has been closely connected with the introduction into Great Britain of the three great inventions: the Telephone, Electric Lighting, and Wireless Telegraphy. He has contributed very largely to pure scientific research, and has received high recognition for it, such as the Fellowship of the Royal Society, the Albert Medal of the Royal Society of Arts, the Hughes Medals of the Royal Society of London, and election as an Honorary Member of numerous learned societies. He is the author of more than twenty scientific books which have had a world-wide circulation, and of a hundred scientific papers in the "Transactions" of various scientific societies. He is an Honorary Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; a Fellow of University College, London; and Emeritus Professor in the University of London. He is a Member, and for some years Manager, of the Royal Institution. His book, *The Evidence of Things Not Seen* (S.P.C.K.), has had a very large circulation; and other Evidential publications, such as his addresses at Browning Hall, on "The Supreme Intelligence in Nature" and on "Science and Miracles," and his recent paper to the Victoria Institute on "Evolution and Revelation," are a proof of his great interest in the subjects which the Victoria Institute was formed to consider and promote.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. W. HOSRE and carried unanimously.

*Resolution No. 2.*—Moved by Mr. W. C. EDWARDS and seconded by the Rev. R. WRIGHT HAY :—

“ That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1926, presented by the Council, be received and adopted, and that the thanks of the Meeting be given to the Council, Officers, and Auditor for their efficient conduct of the business of the Victoria Institute during the year.”

This was carried unanimously.

*Resolution No. 3.*—Moved by Mr. ALFRED W. OKE and seconded by Mr. W. HOSTE :—

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

This was passed by acclamation and the Meeting was then declared closed.

## 692ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 6TH, 1926.

AT 4.30 P.M.

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

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections since the last Meeting :—As Members : Dr. T. E. Nuttall, F.G.S., the Rev. S. B. Rohold, F.R.G.S., Thomas Fitzgerald, Esq. ; and as Associates : The Rev. George Jones, Mrs. Duff Watson, W. A. Delevingne, Esq. (late I.C.S.), and the Rev. E. J. Nash, M.A.

Before the formal proceedings were begun, the CHAIRMAN announced, with regret, the decease of Professor Edouard Naville of Geneva, a Vice-President of the Institute, and one who had contributed valuable papers to the Society. The audience signified their respect for the deceased by rising in their places, on the proposal of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN introduced Professor J. A. Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., to read his paper on "Evolution and Revelation." He described the Lecturer as a gentleman of altogether exceptional scientific attainments, one who had made contributions of material importance to most recent developments of Wireless Telegraphy and Radiography.

---

### *EVOLUTION AND REVELATION.*

By PROFESSOR J. A. FLEMING, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

IT can hardly be denied that in the last half-century, or even less, a very great change has taken place in the attitude of the public mind towards scientific speculations on the great problems of the beginnings of the material Universe, and the origin of the human race. At the earlier point of that period popular thought and opinions on these matters were very widely based on time-honoured interpretations of statements in the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis, and any attempt to modify them was esteemed impious and dangerous.

At the present time the pendulum has swung to a large extent in the opposite direction. The immense practical achievements

of scientific research and invention have given an authority and weight to scientific hypotheses and theories which is sometimes in excess of that justified by ascertained facts. Popular expositions have familiarized most persons with the ideas covered by the term Evolution, but have not always been careful to point out where actual knowledge ends and speculation or hypothesis begin. At the same time, another influence has come into operation which has tended to weaken the authority of that ancient and revered literature we call the Bible, and that is the gradual diffusion of ideas regarding it which have resulted from a purely literary treatment commonly called the higher criticism. It is difficult to justify the term "higher," and some of it might perhaps more aptly be termed destructive criticism.

It is unquestionable that the collection of Hebrew and Jewish writings collectively termed *the Bible*, and deeply felt by untold multitudes to be not solely the product of human intelligence, has exercised an inexpressibly great influence upon our race. There must be something very peculiar and unique about a collection of writings emanating from one small family of mankind, which has made it possible and urgent to translate it into every language spoken on this earth, to circulate it by millions, and publish vast libraries of other books expounding it and enforcing its teaching. It is a literature which has caused the sacrifice of countless lives of the best of the human race in defence of the right to possess it, read and distribute it, and which excites in its readers either the greatest reverence and attachment, or else indifference or aversion.

This collection of books is in itself a phenomenon, and one that is a continual challenge to mankind to explain. There are in fact three closely connected problems which perpetually present themselves to the human intelligence and pressingly invite to a serious study of them. The first of these is the origin of, and source of, the order in the material Universe; the second is the true origin, nature and destiny of the human race, predominant now over all other races of living beings on the earth; and the third great problem is the origin and source of power of this unique literature, the Bible.

The welfare of the human race is essentially bound up with a study of, and obedience to, the resistless uniformities and invariable processes we call the laws of Nature, and, speaking generally, this study is embraced in the term Science. At the same time, innumerable facts proclaim that human beings are

something more than mere masses of organic matter controlled by chemical or physical laws, or even intelligent animals, and that the well-being and progress of the human race is inseparably connected with the development and nourishment of certain ethical and spiritual faculties which especially distinguish the human from the animal races. Where that is neglected or prevented moral decay invariably sets in, and a disintegration which affects the very foundations of the structure of human society.

It is, however, an unquestionable thing that the unaided intellect of man—who has been able by his astronomy to plumb the vast abysses of stellar space, and by his microscopes and physics to explore the infinitely small things of nature, even to the structure of atoms—finds a far more difficult problem in the mystery of his own nature and origin, and the origin and mode of production of that physical Universe he is able to examine. So far as he has been able to find answers to these questions, the explanations to which he has been led by the light of his own unassisted reason seem to be at variance with the answers given to them in the books we collectively call the Bible, which in other respects makes such a powerful and authoritative appeal to the deep-seated convictions of human nature. As the conclusions arrived at on these problems of origin have important consequences in reference to religious beliefs, ethical standards, and objects of human pursuit, little excuse is required for making a brief re-examination of their relative validity.

The majority of persons take their opinions on difficult subjects ready-made from those they deem special authorities, and hence, when once a certain view of a subject has been broadcast and widely accepted as the right or fashionable one, it is very difficult to secure an unbiassed reconsideration of it.

At the present time one very generally accepted opinion as to the origin of the physical Universe and of the human race is that it has been brought about by an Agency called Evolution. The term Evolution is generally used to imply a gradual development from the simple to the complex, or from the general to the specialized, form as contrasted with sudden creation. But it seems also to be employed by some writers as a term to denote an active operative cause, in such phrases as Evolution does so and so, Evolution has produced an eye, or an ear, or a brain. If the word Evolution is taken to be a name for a Process, it is one which is convenient and unobjectionable; if, however,

it is used to connote a producing Agency, impersonal, self-acting and sufficient by itself as an explanation of the countless complexities of Nature, then it is wrongly employed. To say that Evolution alone has produced a highly specialized organ such as an eye or ear, with obvious design, adaptation, and purpose, is as much nonsense as to say that the spontaneous action of pieces of wood or metal has produced a photographic camera or an electric telephone.

It is perfectly admissible to contend that Evolution in the first sense of the term, viz., a gradual development, is the method of creation, but the thesis we shall attempt to uphold in this short paper is that even then it does not dispense with the necessity for a perpetually active Directive Intelligence, but, on the contrary, all Growth requires Guidance, and the ultimate sources of both Growth and Evolution are the thought and will of an ever-acting Supreme Divine Intelligence, and not impersonal, un-self-conscious energies or forces. In short, this physical Universe is a Thought rather than a Thing, and Thought implies and necessitates a Thinker.

Let us then consider some of the matters on which modern views are supposed to contradict older opinions in the light of ascertained scientific knowledge. The book of Genesis opens with the statement, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." That assertion implies that if we could go far enough back in time we should arrive at events which were not the mere physical or natural consequences of a previously existing state, but that there was a discontinuity due to operations by a self-conscious Power quite independent of the Universe of things. In opposition to this view, the opinion has not uncommonly been held that the physical Universe never had a beginning, or, at any rate, that we cannot ascertain its origin beyond attributing it, in Herbert Spencer's phrase, to some Unknowable First Cause, or that, in any case, it is, philosophically speaking, not more difficult to admit an uncreated infinite past duration for the Universe of things than to admit it for a Creator. The question really is: Are we to look for the Final Cause of all things to a Thought in a Mind not our own, or to a self-ordering quality in that external Universe which is the cause of thought in our minds? There are, however, some arguments which can be presented in support of the opinion that there must have been a beginning, or even many beginnings, to the physical Universe, in the sense that events then took place which

were not the result of physical or biological agencies now in operation but to some Cause entirely different.

Our examination of this physical Universe has led us to see that there are apparently four actualities corresponding to four fundamental concepts in our own minds, which a more searching analysis has reduced perhaps to two. These four are Matter, Energy, Space, Time. Without attempting to give definitions which shall satisfy a critical philosophy, we can for present purposes define Matter as the permanent source of our sensations, or perceptions; we can feel it, see it, smell it, etc. All changes in Matter involve something called Energy. Thus, if a mass of matter is set in motion, whether as a whole or by vibration of its atoms, we have to bestow energy to it. All phenomena in Nature involve changes in the form of energy, and all transformations of energy take place by exact numerical equivalents. We have learnt by experience that we can neither create nor destroy Energy or Matter. Hence they are said to be conserved, and the conservation of Energy and of Matter are the fundamental laws of physics and chemistry. Nevertheless, all energy is not in a form in which it is available for further transformations. At each transformation some energy passes into the form of diffused low-temperature heat, and is then non-available. This principle was called by Lord Kelvin the Dissipation of Energy.

If, then, the laws of Conservation and Dissipation of Energy hold good for the whole physical Universe, we can at once conclude that it is not infinite in past-duration, but had a beginning, since if there can be no spontaneous production of energy, and if all changes involve dissipation of Energy, then, if it had been infinite in past-duration, all the energy would long ago have passed into the form of universally diffused low-temperature heat. But it has not done so. Hence these laws imply not only that the physical Universe had a beginning, but that it had a Source from which this Energy was originally derived—in other words, it had a Creator. This argument will hold good even if Matter can be converted into Energy.

Another argument might perhaps be derived from the rotational Energy in the Universe. All the masses of matter on a large scale in stellar space are, as far as we can find, in rotation. Our earth revolves on its axis, and revolves round the sun. The satellites all revolve round the planets. The sun revolves on its axis. Binary stars revolve round each other. Now it is a

fundamental principle of dynamics that a body cannot change its own angular momentum, or moment of momentum, by actions inside itself ; it can only be done by some external torque or twisting force acting on it. All the stars we have been able to measure are found to be in motion, and the inference is that the stellar Universe as a whole may have a resultant angular momentum, or rotational energy. But it cannot have imparted this to itself. There must have been some event in the far past of the nature of a beginning at which this rotational energy was imparted to it from an external source.

When we pass from the consideration of purely physical to biological processes, we find in the same way scientific arguments for a beginning. All living things, animals and plants, are built up of small units called cells, and the cell in its simplest form is a small mass of material called protoplasm. This substance has four properties or powers, (i) spontaneous motion, (ii) absorption of suitable nutriment from some surrounding medium, (iii) growth or increase of some kind and (iv) sub-division or multiplication constituting reproduction. In other words, Motion, Nourishment, Growth, and Reproduction, or Generation, are the characteristic properties of living substance. In the majority of cases the cell has the power of surrounding itself with non-living material, and the interior usually comprises a very complicated structure called the nucleus.

If a cell of living protoplasm has an electric shock administered to it, or is exposed to too high a temperature, it becomes "dead," that is, loses its above-named specific qualities. No one at present knows exactly what change then takes place in it when it passes from the living to the dead state. Furthermore, the most elaborate researches have not shown us how we can produce living protoplasm from non-living or dead matter. The most assured result is that every living organism has been produced only by a previously living organism. All attempts to prove or produce spontaneous generation have failed.

Rigorous research epitomizes itself in the maxim *Omne vivum ex vivo*. Hence the production of living matter involved a "beginning" of some kind, in that it was not the result of mere physical and chemical actions. To say that if we went far enough back in time we might find the conditions under which organic but non-living matter passed into living matter, is pure speculation and hypothesis ; the verdict of scientific research at present is that it is not possible for us to do it now, and that



it does not happen spontaneously at present. Therefore, the Life in the Universe, like the Energy, involved a beginning and a Causative Agent.

But there is a third manifestation in the Universe which indicates strongly the action not merely of a Causative Agent but of a Supreme Intelligence, and that is the Order presented in it. The free interaction of merely physical forces produces only the greatest possible disorder. In a volume of gas such as our atmosphere, the free collisions of molecules cause the motions of all of them to be distributed in every possible direction and with every possible speed—some fast, some slow.

If at any time we could find gas atoms in an enclosed vessel moving all with equal speed in the same direction, we should consider it called for careful examination as to the reason of it. The pebbles on a beach rubbing together and dashed by the waves are of all possible shapes and sizes and arranged in the greatest possible disorder. If we were to find them arranged in regular heaps all of the same size and increasing by regular increments from heap to heap, nothing would persuade the most ignorant person that this orderly arrangement was the result of chance.

The trees in a forest or jungle present the greatest disorder in size, species and position. If we find some long avenue of trees of all the same kind arranged at regular intervals, the deduction would be irresistible that this was not the result of mere physical agencies, but of an intelligent order-making mind.

The result of our examination of all parts of Nature is to reveal a marvellous order, and numerical relation or inter-connection. This is nowhere more apparent than in studies of atomic structure made of late years. All the different materials we know are built up of collections of some 88 different kinds of atoms, and these last of groupings of two kinds of particles of electricity called protons and electrons. The atoms are constructed on the pattern of the solar system—a nucleus or sun with revolving planets or electrons. The simplest atom is that of Hydrogen, which consists of 1 proton and 1 electron in revolution round each other. The next in order is the Helium atom, with a nucleus of 4 protons and 2 electrons tightly bound together, and 2 planetary electrons revolving round it. Thus we go up step by step until we reach the atom of Uranium, with a bulky nucleus built up of 238 protons and 146 electrons, and a family of 92 planetary electrons circulating round it.

When we find articles of human manufacture, such as screws, or wire, or other things, made only in definite and regularly progressive sizes, we are convinced that this can only be the result of intelligent design. Those objects in Nature which arise from the action of physical or biological impersonal agencies, such as the size of hailstones or leaves on a tree, exhibit no such accurate similarity or regular progression, though a general likeness may be apparent.

The atom has all the appearance of being a manufactured article, to use a phrase of Sir John Herschel, and a standardized manufactured article implies a manufacturer controlling manufacture. Hence the Order, no less than the Energy and the Life in the Universe, give us powerful proof that there has been for each a beginning which must be traced up as a final step to a Supreme Intelligence and Creative Power.

That observed Order cannot be regarded as simply the creation or projection of our own minds. We ourselves, as intelligent beings, possess the power of order-making in various departments of activity, and we can therefore recognize order and disorder in the work of others like ourselves. In the Universe, in parts of it beyond our control, we also recognize an Order, and as that is recognizable only by virtue of thought in us, it must be the product of Thought beyond and above us, due to an Intelligence not ourselves.

But it is clear that not only have there been "beginnings" to fundamental things, but there has been a gradual development in progressive stages. Nothing of all that we can see makes, or has made, its appearance fully formed at once and suddenly.

We have to distinguish, however, two different developments. There is first that of the individual, whether animal, vegetable, or inorganic body, which we call, properly, Growth. Then there is the production of definite varieties of complicated structures or individuals by gradual changes, and to this latter process, as far as it exists, the term Evolution is commonly applied.

It is unnecessary to give more than a few moments' attention to the familiar subject of Growth. As regards forms of animal life in the initial stages, there is such close resemblance that it is difficult for a skilled observer to predict the ultimate result. In every germ cell or vegetable seed there is, however, unquestionably some pattern-producing power latent. The plant draws supplies of material from the atmosphere and the soil which

are built up into the most diverse forms and into organic compounds of great complexity, and yet constitutional difference, such as quinine, caffeine, india-rubber, indigo or sugar. That atoms of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, sulphur and nitrogen should thus spontaneously marshal themselves into complex molecules is unthinkable. The animal ovum in the same manner, given its proper nutriment, has a fixed law of development within certain well-defined limits, and builds up forms of living being constant to type.

The objection has always been raised that to divert even an atom from the path in which it is being urged by physical forces due to attractions or repulsions of other atoms, requires an expenditure of energy, and, therefore, that any such directional or guiding action would involve a violation of the law of Conservation of Energy. But there are ways in which guidance can be exercised so as to create order without any violation of that Law.

Imagine a large funnel full of coloured beads, and let the funnel lead into a perfectly flexible, frictionless pipe. Suppose the funnel held up at a high level and the beads allowed to fall under gravity down the pipe, they would make a disorderly heap on the floor and at the same time convert the potential energy of the elevated beads into its equivalent in low-temperature heat when they strike the floor. Next, let an intelligent person take hold of the flexible tube and bend it so as to guide each bead as it falls into a certain place on the floor depending on its colour. A bead pattern exhibiting an order might thus be formed on the floor in place of a disorderly heap, yet there would have been no violation of the law of Conservation of Energy.

It is therefore permissible to take the view that the power latent in every germinal cell or seed of development or growth, according to type, cannot be wholly due to impersonal agencies, but is a continual manifestation of Thought and Will which are attributes not of things but of Mind. This principle, that Growth requires Guidance, may be, and most probably is, operative in the inanimate things of Nature as well as in the animate.

Our astronomy has made us cognizant that stars, no less than vegetables and animals, have a growth and a life-history, a birth, maturity and decay. Our large telescopes show us in the nebulae vast masses of incandescent gas being whirled in spirals and condensing round one or more centres into infant suns. It has been shown that as such an incandescent mass

radiates light and heat, it first becomes hotter in itself and not cooler, then by degrees it contracts and cools, and finally ends by becoming a dark and invisible mass. A distinction is now made between so-called giant stars, which are enormous masses of incandescent gas of small density, and so-called dwarf stars which are dense and small. The giant stars are in the first vigour of gaseous youth and activity, the dwarfs are the ancient ones in a state approaching senile decay.

No one, however, who possesses the smallest powers of serious thought can have looked at the starry heavens in open country on a clear night, with even a small knowledge of astronomical science, without asking himself the questions: How comes it to pass that this Universe has developed along the lines on which we see it has? Is it by the merely fortuitous action of physical forces? Is it the only possible Universe, or can it be the product merely of a chance concourse of atoms? It is a mighty maze. Is it without a plan? It is perfectly certain that it has not always been as we see it now, and that the changes from simple to complex have been gradual, and therefore that Evolution, in the proper sense of the word, has been operative. To say, however, that Evolution alone has produced it or guided it to its present condition is equivalent to attributing to Matter a self-arranging power, to bestow upon it the qualities of Mind, and to make a creative deity out of that which is merely the name for an observed process or effect.

The Biblical idea is infinitely more satisfying and sufficient, in that it places the source of the thought-stimulating or thought-generating power which the external world has upon our intelligence in a Supreme and Independent Intelligence, which is not identical either with ours nor identical with the external world in a pantheistic sense.

The objection which scepticism has always raised to this view is, that we have no experience of mind or thought except in association with a complex material-organism called brain, and that when the human brain is injured or defective the thinking power or intelligence is to that degree also injured, and when the brain is destroyed the thinking power seems to disappear. Without attempting any discussion of this psychophysical parallel, as it is called, it may be sufficient to say that we are unable to find the foundations for a sound philosophy except by recognizing a distinction between Object and Subject, between a thing perceived and a perceiving personality. The

brain is the instrument of thought, but it is not in itself the Thinker.

The distinction is closely analogous to that between the musician, his musical instrument and the music. The musician is limited in the music he can produce by the perfection or imperfection of his musical instrument. If this last is injured beyond a certain point he can produce no music, but if he is given another instrument he can make music, perhaps even better than before. The instrument, however perfect, can make no music by itself.

May we not then say that the whole material creation is the brain of the Supreme Thinker ? It is that by which He manifests His Thought to subordinate thinkers such as ourselves, but the creation is not to be identified or confused with the Creator. If then we see that changes in the Universe take place in general very slowly and not by sudden jumps, we may be entitled to say that Evolution is the method of creation, but we are not entitled to elevate Evolution into the position of a self-acting creative deity.

The battle concerning Evolution and Creation has always been most fiercely fought in connection with the subject of biology, and especially the production of animal and vegetable species. All forms of animal and vegetable life are grouped into subdivisions according to form and structure. The smallest group which propagates true to one form or type is called a species, and for the most part these species are very distinct from each other. Nine times over in the first chapter of the book of Genesis it says of animals and plants they are to propagate "after his kind" or "after their kind," as indicating a production and preservation of distinct life-forms. It is, however, a familiar experience that the progeny of one pair or the successors of one plant differ slightly whilst otherwise generally similar. We can by cross-breeding or cross-fertilization create varieties sometimes very diverse, as in dahlias, roses, pigeons and dogs, etc., but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go, and, if the parents differ much, as in the case of the horse and ass, the progeny is sterile. The question, then, which has for a century or more been keenly debated is : How did these different animal and vegetable species arise ? Did an elephant, or a giraffe, or tiger make its first appearance quite suddenly in a place where it was not a moment before, and continue ever after to breed "after their kind," or have these species arisen by very gradual changes from few and primal forms or even one form of primitive life ?

Speculations such as those of Lamarck, Erasmus Darwin and others, on the production of species did not obtain wide acceptance, but in 1859 Charles Darwin published his book on *The Origin of Species*, which at once opened a new era. Darwin's theory, briefly explained, was as follows : There is an enormous fertility amongst the majority of animals and plants. A single fish may lay a million eggs, or even many million, and the same of insects of some species. The means of subsistence are, however, limited and often difficult to obtain. Hence arises a struggle for existence. Accordingly the slight variation in the progeny of a single pair renders some of them better adapted to their surroundings and better able to obtain the necessary food ; they survive and procreate, and the rest and majority die off.

Darwin's theory of the survival of the fittest and of a natural selection was eagerly taken up by a number of biologists as an explanation of the origin of species. It was, and is, supported in some cases by finding intermediate forms of animals gradually leading up to specialized forms, as in the case of the horse. In course of time objections began to appear to this theory, and it was seen that much can be said against it. It would, however, be quite impossible in the short limits of this paper to summarize even in the briefest manner the arguments for and against the Darwinian theory of the origin of species, or the modifications of it such as that associated with the name of Mendel.

Although most of our eminent naturalists express their belief that some form of Evolution has governed the development of living beings as against sudden creation, there is also a very widely spread conviction that this theory of Evolution is insufficient, taken by itself, to explain everything. That this opinion is gaining ground is evident from statements by some eminent naturalists. At the meeting of the British Association at Oxford during this year (1926), Professor H. F. Osborn, in discussing "The Problem of the Origin of Species as it appeared to Darwin in 1859 and as it appears to-day," said, "The word 'creation' must certainly be linked with the word 'evolution' to express in human language the age-long origin of species. Were Darwin alive to-day he would be the first to modify the speculations and conclusions of 1859."

The animal and vegetable kingdoms present themselves to us, not as a disorderly collection of species, but as an harmonious whole in relation to each other, and especially in relation to the human race dominant over both. The animal and vegetable

kingdoms are in many respects complementary to each other. The oxygen of the air is necessary to maintain animal life, but the products of animal respiration, viz. carbon-dioxide, are inspired by vegetation—the carbon is fixed and, as oxygen, returned to the air.

What process of mere Evolution can have given us the countless products of vegetable life, such as quinine, nux vomica, salicine, morphia, and the great range of natural drugs which minister to human requirements? Without india-rubber, gutta-percha, petrol, paraffin, alcohol, sugar, and innumerable products of vegetation, modern human requirements could not have been met. How is it that these substances have appeared in correspondence to human wants?

In the same manner the products or functions of animals susceptible of domestication are far in excess of their own needs for survival in the struggle for self-existence. There are a large number of facts and arguments which show that the theory of natural selection and survival under the pressure of self-preservation is not sufficient to account for relations of a special and useful character between the animals and plants and between these and humanity as we now find them. No theory of natural selection will explain, for instance, the beauty of the external world, the immense varieties of its flowers, trees, vegetation and animals, or its inorganic beauty, its sunrises and sunsets, mountains, seas and clouds, all harmoniously related to each other and to human needs. It is clear, then, that Evolution as well as individual growth requires Guidance, although there may be a certain mechanism at work in the production of the variety. A special machinery may have been devised which operates according to certain regular laws in the production of species, but its working has been controlled by a Directive Power which views the single event in relation to the whole.

Then, in conclusion, we must briefly consider the theory of Evolution in relation to the human race.

Many of the biologists who have accepted an Evolutionary theory for the production of animal and vegetable species have gone on to apply it in an unrestricted manner to the evolution of the human race.

They maintain that just as the anthropoid apes have been evolved by natural selection from lower forms of mammals, so the genus *homo sapiens*, or intelligent man, has likewise arisen by Evolution from some form of anthropoid or simian ancestor.

The search for intermediate stages of development has therefore been ardently conducted, and a few, but very few, fragments of skeletons have been found which are held to support this theory.

It is of course impossible to deny the general similarity of bodily structure in the anthropoid apes and in man. Nor is it possible to deny the possession by the higher animals of self-consciousness, memory, a certain degree of intelligence in adaptation of means to an end, in addition to the wonderful instinctive acts which characterize them.

On the other hand there are marked differences between them and the lowest of the prehistoric types of men of whose works any evidence remains. The chief characteristic of *homo sapiens*, or rational man, is his self-educative power and progressive intelligence.

Though some animals can be taught to do non-natural acts in imitation of human beings, no animal would teach these things to itself or continue to practise them when left alone. No animal by itself has ever been known to produce fire for warmth or cooking, construct a tool, plant and cultivate edible vegetables or grain, decorate its person or dress, or make drawings of other contemporary animals, yet these were all achievements of human beings in such prehistoric ages that we have no record of the first accomplishment. The usual evolutionary theory of this is, that man "acquired" a larger brain, began to live on the ground in place of trees, formed social communities in self-defence, and so on. Intelligence is not, however, necessarily proportional to size of brain. The intelligence of ants and even other insects seems quite on the level of that of many of the larger mammals.

Also, if the brain is the mere instrument for the manifestation of thought and not, taken alone, its producing agency, we seem bound to admit for animals a certain immaterial psychical possession or power which is the controlling and guiding agency in bodily activity. If this is so, then that which distinguishes man from the brute is not merely the possession of a more highly organized brain, but of a higher form or type of psyche, or soul, or hyper-material endowment of self-conscious, thinking personality.

There is no evidence whatever that the few fragmentary bony remains which have been found, called by anthropologists *Eoanthropus*, *Pithecanthropus*, *Homo heidelbergensis*, *Neanderthal man*, *Homo rhodesiensis*, etc., all of them very imperfect



remains, had the progressive human type of intelligence rather than the static animal or anthropoid-ape type. We have no means of knowing how far we are justified in calling these remains the evidences of an evolutionary transition from apes to man. Even leading biologists admit the uncertain, questionable character of much of the evidence for the existence of such transition.

The evidence that we do possess is much more consistent with the view that there was a "beginning" or creation, as asserted in the first chapter of Genesis, of the psychical or rational man by the bestowment of some special super-material endowment, or soul, which justified the use of the phrase "in the image of God created He him."

It is the psyche which is the true seat or source of the thinking power or intelligence. If we deny this proposition, then we are forced to admit that mere collocations of atoms of matter in a certain form called brain-tissue can become conscious of their own existence and possess originative or ordering power. But, as we all know, there are two accounts of the Creation of Man in the book of Genesis. The higher critics have adopted a view which originated with Astruc in 1753, that the book of Genesis is a patchwork of narratives by various authors and editors which are distinguished amongst other things by different names for the Supreme Being, translated in our Authorized Version, God, Lord God, The Almighty. It would be quite beyond the limits of this short essay to discuss this theory. Those who wish to know what can be said against it may be referred to a little book by a Dutch theologian, Dr. A. Troelstra, on *The Name of God in the Pentateuch*, translated into English by Canon E. McClure (S.P.C.K.).

The higher critics would, however, assert that the Biblical account of the creation of the Adamic race in the second chapter of Genesis is a mere variant by a different author or authors of the account in the first chapter. The evolutionist would assert that neither of them are to be taken as literally true, and that man originated by natural processes of evolution from the anthropoid apes. But it is necessary then to explain from this latter point of view how the human being acquired that feeling or intuition that physical death is not the end of his personal existence. The burial customs of even prehistoric times bear witness to this almost universal conviction.

Again, the theory of Evolution affords no clue to the origin of that almost universal human idea that there is a Supreme

Personal Controlling Power in the Universe, and that human conduct has to be harmonized with its commands. Even in the debased forms of polytheism and idolatry we have evidence of a decayed or distorted remnant of this instinct or intuition. Further, there does not seem to be any sufficient proof that merely tribal interests have produced by evolution that moral sense and conscience which weighs up actions and employs the terms "right" and "wrong" with regard to them.

Those tremendous words, God, Immortality, Duty, had a significance for mankind from earliest ages, but the theory of the ape-origin of man affords no clue to the reason for it. The evolutionary theory pays attention chiefly to the material development of brain and the unitarian or self-preservative actions and powers of body, but there is a psychical element in man which dominates the material one, and one which clearly involved a new beginning or creation by bringing into existence something which was not previously present.

The second chapter of Genesis may therefore be considered as the record of the appearance of this psychical man having an element in his constitution breathed into him by his Creator by which he became, not merely a living body, but a "living soul." If we are compelled by scientific arguments to admit the existence of beginnings or creations with regard to Matter, Energy, World Order, Life and self-conscious Intelligence, in each of which stages there was an upward leap not the result of agencies previously operative, then we may be prepared to go a step further and admit that the stage from Self-Consciousness to God-Consciousness was not automatic but an independent act of Creative Power. It is here that Biblical Revelation parts company with Evolutionary theory.

The Bible says that psychical man was an independent creation capable of knowing right from wrong, capable of communion with his Creator, and subjected to a test of obedience in which he failed. The whole of the rest of the Biblical narrative is the record of the special Divine methods for undoing the result of this failure and of the high destiny of this restored psychical man.

The Evolutionary theory regards moral evil as mere imperfection which time may be trusted to remove. It repudiates any idea of a "fall," to use a theological term, and traces back the origin of present mankind and existing anthropoid apes to a common simian ancestor of vast antiquity.

No valid reason, however, has been given why one branch of this simian family should practically have remained stationary in powers whilst the other has so astonishingly advanced, nor does that theory give us any convincing proof that future progress of humanity will be upwards rather than down.

Experience has negatived decisively the former expectation, that intellectual progress by part of humanity is necessarily accompanied by increase in the general harmony and stability of social life, or progress in those qualities which make for moral and personal excellence in the individual.

The theory of Evolution is powerless to explain the past or to inspire hope for the future of humanity. The only solid and secure progress that can come is from the teaching and truths laid down for us in the inspired writings which, in spite of all attacks upon them, remain to multitudes a revelation from the Creator of the Universe and the Father of human Spirits. In that revelation man is regarded, not as an improved monkey, but as a son of God, and taught to realize that when bodily death removes from him the links which connect him with the animal races, his true personality may yet have a more abiding tabernacle, "a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN: It is with peculiar pleasure that I move that the cordial thanks of the Institute be given to Dr. Fleming for the paper to which we have listened. Leaving on one side subsidiary issues, the Professor has conducted us along lines of observation and thought which, in my judgment, yield an argument that is unanswerable for the truth of Divine Revelation.

During two generations now past, some of us have witnessed a remarkable shifting of emphasis in regard to the words Evolution and Revelation. Men who sixty years ago accepted Divine Revelation as a supreme fact, and tolerated as a second fact the theory of Evolution in the more speculative acceptation of the word, have at length given place to men who assign a dominating place to evolutionary doctrine in its more questionable aspects, and show a disposition to accommodate an indifferent conception of Revelation to conditions that tend to explain the Universe apart from God,

and to place the Book of Genesis in a class with the mythology of ancient days.

Now, at length, however, the pendulum is swinging back. It is being seen that Evolution as a theory has been invested with powers and faculties that belong to the Evolver. In the words of Professor Osborn, quoted on p. 22 of the paper: "The word 'creation' must certainly be linked with the word 'evolution' to express in human language the age-long origin of species"; and in the words of the distinguished lecturer to whom we have listened: "Evolution as well as individual growth requires Guidance"; "its working has been controlled by a Directive Power" (p. 23).

We have, I am sure, followed with profound satisfaction the facts and arguments by which Dr. Fleming has shown that the theory of Evolution does not "fill the bill." Indeed, when applied to the facts of history and life, it leaves many questions unsettled; and as has been shown, we are compelled by scientific arguments to admit the reality of beginnings, or creations. Here comes in the thought of Creative Power which lies at the base of the Biblical Revelation, and of any assumption corresponding with Biblical Revelation. Without such Revelation, or such assumption, we cannot reach a consistent understanding of the Universe, even in any degree; but with it we can follow on to learn the first lessons of a God-conscious existence.

We shall, I am sure, agree in the vote which thanks Dr. Fleming for showing with such clearness that we are not in a world of chance: all around us there is manifestation of Thought and Will, which are attributes, not of things, but of Mind (p. 19); and as we ponder the problems of Nature, we are (as many have said) "thinking again the thoughts of God." Such a theory of Evolution as is defensible in science and philosophy depends on Guidance, and Guidance comes from "the Creator of the Universe and the Father of human spirits." This is the teaching of Divine Revelation, and, while the speculative theories of Evolution are still in the melting-pot, Divine Revelation is slowly reasserting its old position, and encouraging us to build on the implicates of Holy Scripture as they relate to life and godliness. We may no longer tolerate the tendency to invest a theory of development with powers and faculties that belong to Him who, as Creator, is behind all Matter, all Energy, all World-order,

and all Life and Self-conscious Intelligence, as the lecturer has so plainly shown this afternoon. In these circumstances I call for a cordial vote of thanks.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

Dr. W. WOODS SMYTH said : I welcome Professor Fleming's paper in great part. He tells us truly that matter and physical energy are neither infinite nor eternal, and, therefore, must be dependent upon a Being which is Infinite and Eternal—that is, God. He points out that Evolution alone cannot account for the cosmos, and adds a creative factor. You know the lines,

“ There's a divinity that shapes our ends,  
Rough-hew them how we will.”

Professor Fleming's creative factor is that divinity, and Evolution only “ rough-hews them.” He speaks of a “ directivity,” but we must be careful about attributing directivity to the Creator here, in view of the very many unfit, which Evolution destroys. The inadequacy of Evolution justifies the Victoria Institute in their hesitation hitherto to accept it.

I have elsewhere shown that, apart from the Bible—apart from the Genesis story of Eden—Evolution, as regards man, is a failure, as held by thorough-going Evolutionists. The goal of Evolution is completed adjustment to environment—a goal demanded, according to Herbert Spencer, for endless life and perfect happiness. But the environment is infinite, and infinitely changing ; therefore the goal is impossible unless we believe the literal truth of the story of Eden—that man was there placed in correspondence with the Infinite God, by and through whom he was perfectly adjusted to his environment, however great, however changing. The Critics and Modernists have very much belittled the Genesis story of Eden, yet I defy you to find, in the whole range of scientific and philosophic literature, anything to equal it for its majestic fidelity to the facts of Nature. They call it a myth. Making an individual, as Adam, the head of a new race, as it has occurred in Nature millions of times, is science and not myth ; isolating him in Paradise—as isolation is an important factor of evolution—is science and not myth. Giving

him a food-test—since, according to Darwin, Wallace and Spencer, a food-test was at the basis of all progressive development of life, by the struggle for existence, that is, for the means of existence, namely, food—here again we have science and not myth. Giving him life while, by the Word of God, he adjusted himself to that test, and death if he failed—these also were science and not myth. The very image of the Fall recorded in Genesis has occurred in Nature many millions of times, from failing to adjust. Therefore the story of Eden has the sanction of science out and out.

In the struggle for existence the unfit died ; according to Spencer they were (he said) sacrificed for the good of the race, to take away the unfitnesses of the race—“ sacrifice ” is Spencer’s word. Admitting for the present, as written in Ps. cxxxix, that man was “ curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth,” that is, in the lower geological strata (the Hebrew verbs used in this psalm are those used in Genesis of the formation of man), we are in the presence of a creative-evolution ; therefore, as man climbed by sacrifice the great altar-stair that sloped through darkness up to God, he was created by a great ministry of the sacrifice of life. And, when he fell, no wonder that he is restored again by a great ministry of the Vicarious Sacrifice of Life. The creation of man, the Story of Eden, the Fall, the Sacrifice of Abel, the Moral Law, the Ceremonial Law for the remission of sins by sacrifice and shedding of blood : the coming into the human race of Christ, “ the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world ”—think of it all ! Our Lord’s accentuated utterance, “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you,” represents Him as going to Nature, “ red in tooth and claw ” ; His atoning sacrifice and death tells of “ the Blood of the everlasting covenant ” ; and even in Heaven itself you have the same word : “ Thou hast redeemed us to God by Thy Blood ” : all these are found in the realm of Modern Science as well as in the Bible, rendering Criticism and Modernism bankrupt.

Professor Fleming has not noticed that we regard the human line as not through the ape or monkey—as Darwin thought. “ The Blood Reaction Test ” shows the human line to have been apart, not only from the ape, but also from the lower animals. We have nothing to be ashamed of ; we are of the Blood Royal.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: While appreciating very much what was in the lecture, he was opposed to Evolution for two reasons—First, because it was pronounced to be *unscientific* by some of its former greatest Professors, such as Haeckel, who declared that “Most modern investigators of science have come to the conclusion that the doctrine of Evolution . . . is an error, and cannot be maintained”; while Professor Virchow, of Berlin, stated in his lecture on “The Freedom of Science”: “It is all nonsense. It cannot be proved by science that man descended from the ape, or from any other animal. Since the announcement of the theory, all real scientific knowledge has proceeded in the opposite direction!” Second, because it is unscriptural. Many of those who hold and teach the doctrine of Evolution plainly declare that it does not, and cannot, agree with the teaching of the Bible. For example, Sir Oliver Lodge, lecturing on Evolution less than twelve months ago, said: “The story of the Fall in the third chapter of Genesis was a *crude legend!*” While Canon Barnes, now Bishop of Birmingham, writing in *The Times* on the same subject, said: “In spite of the first chapters of Genesis, the stories of the special creation of man by God . . . have become incredible!” Also Dr. J. D. Jones, in his Presidential address to the Congregational Union last year, said: “Science, in reconstructing the history of the human race, told the story of a long ascent. They might quite frankly accept the scientific view. For, he said, Evangelicalism did not, in the smallest degree, depend upon belief in the opening chapters of Genesis, as being the literal account of actual occurrences” (see *The Times*, May 13th, 1925). This, Mr. Collett felt, made it quite impossible for him to entertain the theory of the evolution of man.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES said: As to the Neanderthal, African and other “intermediate” skulls or skeletons that have been found, they seem to me to count for less than nothing as regards Evolution. Savages live very like wild beasts, and are often surrounded by them, and from the time of Romulus and Remus there have been many cases of wild children who, by accident, robbery, or otherwise, having got into the clutches of bears, baboons or wolves, were brought up to bark and bite and run on all fours. In the *Morning Post* for December 6th, 1926, there was an account of two such

children rescued from the den of a wolf in India ; and writing on this, the Professor of Zoology at Cambridge, said : " I fancy adoption is not uncommon in wild nature. . . . It is quite possible that a wolf might feed and even steal a baby." It is perfectly natural, therefore, that Geology should furnish specimens of such monstrosities. But if the whole human race were evolved from ape-like ancestors, the crust of the earth should teem with countless millions of intermediate forms in every stage of development.

But why will scientists look only on the physical side of this great question ? for the mental and moral side is equally—if not far more—important. Alfred Wallace was most emphatic that there has been no intellectual advance in the human race. Again, if men were evolved from protoplasm—" a speck of palpitating slime"—their minds would not look back to the past with pride or affection, but rather with loathing and contempt. But the contrary is the case. The human heart is everywhere held to the past with an unconquerable attraction. Youth is no sooner gone than we lament its loss and wish it back. Our poets are never tired of hymning the praises of the past and sighing over a vanished Paradise and a lost ideal. Nor is this confined to Christian bards, for every poet from Hesiod to Tennyson who paints a Golden Age places it in remote antiquity.

If this sentiment were not " a touch of Nature making the whole world kin," it could not have been commercialized as we see it is in the sale-rooms, where old coins, old furniture, old prints, books, china, silver and curios of all kinds, fetch fancy prices, not because they are useful, but because they are old.

This remarkable feature of human nature is perfectly consistent with the story of the Fall in Eden ; but it is wholly contradictory to the theory of Evolution.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : Professor Fleming, in a reverent discussion of his subject, has presented an able, well-reasoned case for Evolution. There can be no doubt that a decided step forward has been taken beyond the position modern Evolutionists usually adopt, and a step approaching the Bible statement of Creation by the work of God the Creator. It would be a great advantage if the



argument for Revelation were presented in as closely reasoned a manner, so that the two views might be justly compared.

There is an important paragraph on p. 14 of the lecture. Professor Fleming, commenting on the words of the book of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," says: "That assertion implies that if we could go far enough back in time we should arrive at events which were not the mere physical or natural consequences of a previously existing state, but that there was a discontinuity due to operations by a self-conscious Power quite independent of the Universe of things." Does this mean that the forces of Evolution were operating prior to the events referred to in the opening verses of Genesis, and that at the time of the Creation described therein there was an intervention of God? If so, exception will probably be taken by many to such a view. However, a consideration of the opening verses of Genesis: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, and the earth *was without form,*" does seem to point to the fact that the first chapter of Genesis describes, not the Creation, but the re-forming of the earth out of existing material which was present owing to a prior creation, apparently in a state of ruin. How the earth came to be without form we are not told.

In a recent issue of the *Manchester Guardian*, a lecture by Professor J. C. Drummond, of University College, London, was reported, dealing with the part played by Chemistry in elucidating the doctrine of Evolution. Professor Drummond is reported to have said: "The bridging of the gap between the inorganic and the organic now presented no difficulties. But what of that other breach of continuity which seemed so much wider and more profound—the origin of Life. For my own part, I believe that as this apparently impassable gap is approached, the nearer we come to it the nearer we shall realize that it is an insignificant depression in the contour of the land, and that one simple experiment in bridging will enable us to pass from one side to the other. If you ask me to present you with any evidence to support my view I can, I fear, give you little or none that will carry any weight, but I ask you to permit me to speculate, as you have allowed my brother biologist to do for so long, if I give you an assurance that my efforts will be no more wild than his have often been."

Such a view as this does not carry weight with serious-minded men. The Bible presents the Creator as creating suddenly by His own Almighty Power. It is said of Christ that, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." It is by this revelation that I stand, in spite of any modern Evolutionist teaching to the contrary.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said: This paper contrasts very favourably with one read here lately by Professor McCready Price, who declared that the theory of Evolution could not be reconciled with the Genesis account of Creation. Professor Fleming, with better knowledge of the present attitude of Evolutionists, finds no such *impasse* between Scripture and the latest scientific account of Evolution. Dr. Fleming's main argument seems to be the old one from design, with regard to which Darwin wrote that he had never been able to make up his mind whether it was a valid one. The order which the lecturer describes in Nature differs somewhat from that produced by human mechanics, for man makes a row of pins exactly alike, whereas God makes every blade of grass different from another.

I hope that this paper may serve to allay the fears of some of those "little faith" Bible loyalists who have been strenuously fighting against the evolutionary theory of the origin of species, as if a belief in the inspiration of the Book of Genesis depended on ability to prove Evolution false. I confess that my faith in God and in the inspiration of the Pentateuch has prevented my ever feeling any ground for anxiety, if Evolution should prove true. What the Caliph is reported to have said about the books in the Alexandrian Library—that if they disagreed with the Qur'an they were false and must be destroyed, and, if they agreed with it, they were unnecessary, and should therefore equally be destroyed—describes my attitude to all scientific theories. If they disagree with Scripture, I believe they will ultimately be found wrong and disappear, as has already happened with Darwin's theory of Evolution by simple natural selection or the survival of the fittest. If, on the other hand, a scientific theory, such as we have been considering to-day, is consistent with a belief in Scripture, it is quite unnecessary as an aid to our faith, and need not therefore be considered in that connection.

But for the sake of the brother who is so weak in the faith as to fear lest his faith be overthrown by Evolution, I am grateful for this paper. It will also be of service to some who may have to contend earnestly, against uninstructed adversaries, for the faith once delivered to the saints, because it shows that, with regard to the present-day theory of Evolution, there is no contradiction between Genesis and true science.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: I think we are greatly indebted to the Professor for his learned paper, which is truly admirable for the purpose for which it was written. He noticed with interest the quotation on p. 22 from Professor H. F. Osborn, of the U.S.A., at the British Association meetings at Oxford lately. It agrees very well with that "Prince of Scientists," Lord Kelvin, when speaking in the same circumstances in 1894, in answer to an appeal from the then Lord Salisbury: "I have always felt that the hypothesis of natural selection does not contain the true theory of Evolution, *if Evolution there has been in biology*" [my italics]. The amateur Evolutionist—especially the amateur religious one—knows no ifs, no doubts, no regrets, no misgivings. He is not afraid. It and the Biblical account are equally true! He knows by intuition it is so, and is quite positive! Such an one is also painfully unaware, when the true scientific world has made forced strategic movements in the rear, that such is the case. At Cardiff, about four years ago, a certain scientific clergyman, preaching before the British Association, is reported to have exclaimed in an ecstasy of opportunism, "O Darwin! Thou hast conquered!" One cannot help wondering what the learned members of the Association had in their minds at that moment. It is not etiquette to interrupt a clergyman, but they must have thought, "He is speaking to the great Gallery."

I should like to be allowed to add a few further words from the same address of Dr. Osborn which I noted at the time: "The outstanding speculations of Darwin's and Herbert Spencer's time, about the causation of the origin of species, have been pared down by laboratory analysis to a mere vestige of their former selves, and the overweening confidence of one School of Causation had been displaced by diffidence, doubt, and even agnosticism." In other words, Darwinism in the technical sense is as dead and buried as its

distinguished inventor, who, if alive to-day, would certainly not be a Darwinist. Evolution is bereft of its explanation, and it is seriously doubted whether it will find another or even better proof than to-day.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. F. C. WOOD wrote: I have been pleased to read the paper by Professor Fleming, partly because of its reasonable character, and partly because it shows that there are some at least who ought to be able to judge of these things who are not carried away by the theory of Evolution, although we are constantly told that no scientific or intelligent man doubts that theory.

Sometime since I listened to an address on "Science and Religion" by one of the leading exponents of the theory of Evolution, and was surprised to find that he gave no solid basis about Evolution being a science, but theorized all along the line, and, when asked a simple question as to proof, was unable to give a satisfactory reply. As a matter of fact, he did not deal with science as such at all. When dealing with religion, the only statement he made was, that if Evolution should be proved to be true, then the question of sin in the world was, and must ever remain, an insoluble problem. His address left me more than ever convinced that the Bible account of the Creation of man was the true one.

The Bible account is couched in very simple language. For myself, I think the account given in Gen. ii is a repetition of that given in Gen. i, but that, for special reasons, it goes more into detail. But the Bible, from God's point of view, is one book, and the Genesis account is corroborated in other parts. I would mention the words of the Preacher: "Lo, this only have I found, God hath made *man* upright: but *they* have sought out many inventions." Also, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Our Lord also stated, "Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female," and then quoted from Gen. ii to show that He referred to Adam and Eve. Again, our Lord referred to Satan as a murderer from the beginning, evidently referring to the scene in the Garden of Eden, because He spoke of him as a liar and the father of lies.

St. Paul, whose doctrine came from Heaven—he being God's chosen Apostle to the Gentiles—wrote his long logical argument at

the end of Rom. v, all based on the first man Adam and his disobedience. I read a few years ago of a celebrated Cambridge Professor who, at an important gathering, practically stated that no intelligent person now believed in the accuracy of that statement by Paul. I would like to say that during a long career I have had to do with a very large number of Christian men who knew their Bible well, but I never knew one of them to doubt the Genesis account of man's creation. In the great resurrection chapter also, we read: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." In another Epistle, Paul wrote: "Adam was first formed, then Eve: and Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." Then again, we have the two great genealogies, one in Chronicles and the other in Luke's Gospel, the latter to trace our Lord as Man, back to Adam.

I refer to these Biblical passages so that we may see that, if Evolution is true, then everything stated above cannot be true, and in that case we must lose faith in the truthfulness of the New Testament as well as the Old. I know well that it is said by some that the Genesis account of the creation of man can be harmonized with the theory of Evolution. This I very much doubt, as my mind is not so constituted as to make two such opposing doctrines agree with one another.

Major LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S., wrote: I have read Dr. Fleming's paper with great interest. The numerous facts to which he draws attention certainly seem to render impossible any purely naturalistic interpretation of Nature. The question, however, remains as to whether we can leave it at that. Personally, I hardly think that students of Scripture can do so; for it seems to me that Scripture demands our belief in occasional divine interventions, both in the past and in the future history of our world, of a kind which cannot be satisfied even by linking the word "Creation" to "Evolution," but imply creation in the most absolute sense of the word.

The subject is too big to discuss in a few lines, but I may refer to what we are told about the creation of Eve in the past and the Return of our Lord in the future. Those who believe, as I do, that untold numbers of dead Christians will be raised in an instant, and the living be changed in an instant so as never to see death, will not

be inclined to explain away the description of the origin of our first mother. The miracle to come, if credible, renders abundantly credible the miracle in the past.

What the Evolutionist, to my mind, has to prove, is not the succession of forms (to which the rocks bear ample witness), but the actual genetic continuity between those forms. Palæontology is the only branch of science to which we can appeal for evidence upon this point, and Palæontology, in my experience, is incapable of demonstrating genetic continuity anywhere. The "lice" of Egypt, of whose creation we read in Exodus, may well have been identical with other "lice," with which they had no genetic connection whatever. If God has, as I believe, literally created forms in the past, no resemblances such as we see in Palæontology can witness against such creation.

These remarks do not mean that I disagree with anything said by Dr. Fleming in his admirably restrained and careful statement of facts, which even the Evolutionist is compelled to allow.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., wrote: It is a matter of astonishment that any thoughtful mind can reject the overwhelming evidence of a Supreme Intelligence afforded by the Design and Order in Nature, to which the lecturer refers (*cf.* Rom. i, 20), and this position is the more unintelligible when such a person catalogues pieces of chipped flint as evidencing the existence of prehistoric man in any locality, and even includes in his collection many pieces in which design and order are not at all obvious, and which may well be the results of chance.

Many Evolutionists, too, appear to consider that the element of Time is a sufficient reason to account for the living world of to-day and the enormous modifications they demand, whereas the real problem is: Why do *any* variations occur which are permanent? Major L. M. Davies has pointed out very clearly, in a recent paper, the difficulties inherent in any attempt to connect succession with descent, while from the subjective point of view, the weakness of the Evolutionary Theory is its entire inability to account for "sin," which is the problem of all human affairs and every human life. The Bible alone gives an explanation and an answer meeting the need of man, as two thousand years of history demonstrate.

## THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

Dr. J. A. FLEMING wrote : In making, by request, a short reply to the interesting debate upon my paper, I should like, in the first place, to offer my thanks to the Chairman, and those who took part in the discussion, for their kindly and appreciative remarks. It is impossible to do more, in the limits of a short hour, than to outline, in the most imperfect manner, the arguments in such a large subject as that considered. It is not, therefore, surprising if some of my contentions may have been apparently slightly misinterpreted. Mr. Percy O. Ruoff has said that I have presented a well-reasoned case for Evolution. If that term is to cover a self-acting impersonal agency, bringing about the development of the Universe, then my object was not to make out a case *for* it, but *against* it, and to show that there are discontinuities in Nature which cannot be bridged by any of the physical or natural agencies with which we are acquainted at present. Even if the term "Evolution" is restricted to denote the slow changes from the simple to the complex, then I hoped I had shown that, nevertheless, all such processes require guidance, and that is evidence of the operation of the Mind and Will of a Supreme Intelligence behind and above events in Nature.

It is here that we have the fundamental distinction between the two systems of thought and philosophy as regards origins. The Scientific Evolutionists, Higher Critics and Rationalists deny that there is any evidence of such discontinuities or events out of line with present-day experience, or of the exceptional operations of a Personal Creator. To them, it seems, any record of such unique actions must be attributed to myth, legend or ignorance. It is curious to notice, nevertheless, how much the advocates of the widely-accepted theory of Evolution take for granted in their arguments for it, and how much they omit to notice things which tell against it, especially in regard to the origin and development of the human race. One well-attested instance of special Divine Interference in human affairs would be sufficient to destroy the basis of the theory of spontaneous Evolution.

Believers in the truth of the historical events which underlie Christianity consider that they have such evidence of a supremely miraculous and veritable event in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ

from the dead. Nothing, however, is gained by overstating a case, and it is an unquestionable fact that this evidence is not of such a character as to appeal to the intellect alone. But, as Pascal, the great French theologian and mathematician, says, "There is light enough for those who want to see." Perhaps it was deliberately intended that, in these matters, so personally important, the appeal should not be exclusively to the intellect in which men differ so much, as to the heart and conscience, and that underlying God-consciousness in which they are so much alike.

It cannot be denied that the Biblical accounts of Creation present some difficulties, but these are not to be abolished by a sweeping and unjustifiable assumption that they are merely legends. The historical, miraculous, and didactic constituents of the Bible are so closely interwoven, that it is impossible to strip away one from the other and yet leave behind a valid residue.

We are finding to-day, even in the region of pure physical science, facts which are apparently irreconcilable by present knowledge, but we hold the conviction that there is a unity in Nature, and that some explanation is possible which will equally include them all. No theory of origins in the Universe will, however, stand the test of searching analysis, and satisfy the human heart as well as intellect, or give hope and confidence to face the future, which excludes the idea of a Personal Creator. Those uniformities we call the Laws of Nature are, as Oersted says, the Thoughts of God, and those exceptions to them which we call miraculous are the modes in which He makes manifest His Power and Purposes to the intelligent part of His Creation, so that they may be drawn into loyal and reverent worship of Him who has "created all things and for whose pleasure they are and were created."



693RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 3RD, 1927,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

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

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections:—As a Member: Captain T. W. E. Higgens (our present lecturer) from Associate; and as Associates: Lieut.-Colonel A. H. C. Kenney-Herbert and Professor J. Mueller, Ph.D.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the lecturer, Captain T. W. E. Higgens, to read his paper on “Man and his God: the Origin of Religion among Primitive Peoples.”

---

MAN AND HIS GOD:

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION AMONG PRIMITIVE  
PEOPLES.

By CAPTAIN T. W. E. HIGGENS.

I.

CURRENT theories of the origin and development of Religion follow, as a rule, on one or other of two broad lines.

According to the *first*, man, created in “the image of God,” received his religion by a Divine revelation, and when he fell from this first state of blessedness, this knowledge of divine things became obscured, so that only in a few instances have his descendants retained any traces of the primeval revelation, except in the case of one nation, the Hebrews. Thus, speaking generally, this theory sets forth the History of Religion as a

continual falling away from the ideal implanted in man's nature by his God, until "in the fulness of time" Christ came to found a Church, which was to proclaim a higher type of religion and spread it throughout the world.

According to the *second* theory, man, originally half-bestial, has raised himself gradually from degraded savagery, and has in his slow upward journey been fashioning his gods after his own image, and as he emerged from barbarism his notion of God has been refined, until at length he arrived at the idea of a Being all good and all powerful, such as we mean when we speak of "God."

Although the first of these theories is popularly supposed to be that of the Bible, there are a very large number of Christians who are persuaded that some modification of the second is not contrary to the faith; and to these I would suggest that arguments in favour of a theory to some extent combining the two may be drawn from the writings of St. Paul as set forth more particularly in Rom. i, 18-23, Acts xvii, 26-31, and xiv, 16-17.

St. Paul's statement of the origin and development of Religion in the Gentile world, as there set forth, is as follows:—God suffered nations in times past to gain a knowledge of Him, not directly, but through the evidence afforded by His works; but having by this means gained a knowledge of His existence, it did not lead to worship and a spirit of true thankfulness towards the Giver of all; for man disregarded Nature's witness to this good and loving God, and, misled by vain and senseless reasoning from what he observed, betook himself to idolatry and lower forms of worship; yet, in spite of all, there was still a seeking after God, the unknown God, whose offspring he felt himself to be.

If we are correct in our supposition that St. Paul believed that the knowledge of God outside Israel came to man very largely from the evidence he saw around him of His handiwork, this is only saying that such knowledge was gained from the argument from Design in Nature. It is true that a certain school maintains that this argument is not a valid one by which to prove the existence of God to a modern scientist, yet without discussing this side issue, it may at any rate be pointed out that the argument would be quite valid enough for our prehistoric ancestors: and the fact that the knowledge of God's existence was in some cases arrived at through an invalid argument—if the argument from Design be invalid—no more proves that belief to be false than it would be justifiable to pronounce many of the well-established conclusions of modern science untrustworthy, because they have

been arrived at by a series of (now) untenable hypotheses. Sir James Frazer says in the introduction to his Gifford Lectures, 1911-12: "It is perfectly possible that a belief may be true, though the reasons alleged in favour of it are false and absurd."

To many savage peoples the argument from Design would appeal with very great force, as the inventive faculty is strong in them. The Australians, for instance, seem to have invented the boomerang, which appears to be unknown in principle to any other race. If, then, a race which has remained so low in the scale of humanity can show such ingenuity, what of other and more progressive nations? Surely to them the wonder of Creation, the handiwork of the great Maker of all, must have appealed with great force as evidence of power and wisdom, and led them on to a belief in a Great Cause behind the phenomena.

It is not denied that God may have revealed Himself more directly to individuals, men of good-will, seekers after truth, in any age and at any time, the same as He did to Abraham and the prophets, but such revelation was the exception and can hardly now be supported by evidence.

## II.

### *God known through His Creation.*

We may, I think, summarize what I have ventured to call St. Paul's statement of the origin of Religion in the Gentile world as follows:—

- (a) The knowledge of God was gained from the evidence of His works.
- (b) The great God was known, but not worshipped, idolatry and other forms of worship being practised.
- (c) There has always been a seeking after God in man's religion.

#### *(a) The knowledge of God gained from His Works.*

It can be said, no doubt, that the first division of our subject is a Philosophical one. There can be no direct evidence, apart from a Divine revelation, of how men gained their first knowledge of God; but, as we know, men have speculated on such matters, and by many it is considered highly probable that man gained his knowledge of God from the evidence of His works, or, as Boedder puts it, "Man can come to a certain knowledge of God

by means of his natural understanding, not however by way of immediate intuition, nor by reasoning *a priori*, but by arguments *a posteriori* based on the essence and properties of the things comprised under the term 'world'” (*Natural Theology*, p. 12).

Dr. Morris Jastrow says: “The origin of Religion, so far as historical study can solve the problem, is to be sought in the bringing into play of man’s power to obtain a perception of the Infinite through the impression which the multitudinous phenomena of the universe as a whole makes upon him. The strength and quality of this impression unite in suggesting to him at first, in a vague and dim way, that there is more in the universe than he can possibly take in with the help of his senses; that beyond what is visible and known to him lies the vast field of the invisible and the unknown; that the power of which he can become conscious in the world outside of him represents only a portion of the power that really exists—in short, that the finite stretches out into the unbounded field of the Infinite” (*The Study of Religion*, p. 196).

Mr. Farrer, in his study of *Primitive Manners and Customs*, says (p. 4): “Few results of Ethnology are more interesting than the widespread belief among savages, arrived at purely by their own reasoning faculties, in a creator of things. The recorded instances of such a belief are indeed so numerous as to make it doubtful whether instances to the contrary may not have been based on too scanty information.”

Capt. R. S. Rattray says: “I can see no reason why the idea of one great God, who is the Firmament, upon whom ultimately all life depends, should not have been the conception of a people living under the conditions of the Ashanti of old, and I can see no just cause for attributing what we have come to regard as one of the noblest conceptions of man’s mind, to dwellers in, and builders of, cities, and to writers and readers of parchments and books” (*Ashanti*, p. 141).

Ratzel considers that religion is connected with men’s craving for causality, which makes him incarnate all the higher phenomena of Nature (*Nat. Hist. Mankind*, vol. i, p. 41); and Sir James Frazer thinks that Primitive Man instinctively, in obedience to an impulse of his nature, attributed a personality akin to his own to the most striking natural objects, and this personification was the principal source of the Worship of Nature (Frazer, *Worship of Nature*, p. 17).

Max Müller: “Man could never have framed a name for God

unless Nature had taken him by her hand and made him see something beyond what he saw in the fire, in the wind, in the sun, and in the sky. He spoke of the fire that warmed him, of the wind that refreshed him, of the sun that gave him light, and of the sky that was above all things; and thus, simply speaking of what they all *did* for him, he spoke of agents behind them all, and, at last, of an Agent behind and above all the agencies of Nature" (*Anthropological Religion*, p. 188).

The views of many other thinkers could be adduced to support the above, but I think enough has been said to justify an opinion that St. Paul's statement that the knowledge of God was gained from His works is accepted by many modern students of Religion.

Perhaps some idea of how the savage philosophers worked out for themselves the problem of Religion may be gained from a conversation a Moravian missionary had with a Greenlander. He told the missionary that he had often reflected that a *kyak* (fishing canoe) with all its tackle and implements does not grow of itself into existence, but must be made with labour and contrivance. But a bird, he added, is constructed with greater skill than the best *kyak*, and no man can make a bird. "I bethought me," said the Greenlander, "that he proceeds from his parents, and they from their parents: but there must have been some first parents—whence did they come? Certainly, I concluded, there must be a Being able to make them, and all other things, a Being infinitely more mighty and knowing than the wisest man!" (Pritchard: *Hist. Man.*, vol. i, p. 189).

### III.

#### *Belief in High Gods.*

In considering beliefs among primitive peoples we not only meet with beings who are creators and powerful rulers, to be approached with awe, but we find supreme beings existing eternally in the heavens, the embodiment of knowledge, wisdom and goodness—the class of beings which Mr. Andrew Lang described as "High Gods." We ask, Whence came the idea of such beings?

Dr. Menzies suggests that such a belief may not be primitive. It may, for instance, be a fading away of the idea of a Nature-

god ; or some god has been advanced to this supreme position "in obedience to that native instinct of man's mind which causes him, even when he believes in many gods, to make one of them supreme" (*Hist. Religion*, p. 35).

But is this so ? Has man such a natural instinct ? Has not the trouble with Monotheism been to avoid Pantheism on the one hand and creature worship on the other ? Look at Mohammedanism or Christianity. Does their history show a natural instinct in favour of one supreme God ? Far from it. Saint worship, relic worship, and image worship in both these religions have constantly overthrown the monotheistic idea among the masses. This, I suppose, is admitted by most people.

As regards the fading Nature-god, Miss Kingsley has given us a very good illustration of what the process is. Among the West African Mpongwe tribes, Ombuiri, a great Nature-spirit, is worshipped without a priesthood attached to him. He is, amongst the parent tribes, a distinct entity ; amongst neighbouring tribes he becomes a class—that is to say, there is an Ombuiri for every remarkable place or thing ; whilst amongst the scattered branches of the tribe, and where much outside influence has been at work, the great Nature-spirit has sunk into a sort of demon who is employed by a priest in trivial affairs concerning thefts of tools, cooking-pots, and such like. The very opposite of fading away into a great spirit too exalted to be troubled with the affairs of men (*Travels in West Africa*, p. 168, and *Folk Lore of the Fiort*, p. XIX).

It is suggested by others that these superior gods among low races were borrowed by them from some neighbouring race of higher culture. That seems unlikely. Where did such a borrowing take place ?

The Kyoungtha of South-East India (20) seem to show the contrary. They have, apparently, no knowledge of the Divine Power which made all things. They are Buddhists, but, contrary to the tenets of that faith, they sacrifice to hills, forests and streams. Can it be doubted that these sacrifices are the remains of their old religion, which they held in common with the surrounding tribes, and which Buddhism has partially supplanted ? Their neighbours, the Toungtha, worship the powers of Nature, and they have not yet adopted the higher culture of Buddhism. Yet they believe in the Divine Power that overshadows all. But they do not worship Him. He is fading out of their minds, and when they get more civilized they

will call themselves Buddhists, and the belief in the Great Power will fade away.

The Lepchas, when in Buddhist surroundings, will pay respect to the lamas and mutter the sacred words of the Buddhists; but they worship some ill-defined spiritual being who may plague them with sickness or famine. The book of Buddhist prayers which could be found in their simply furnished house was a sign of the new religion; the old was represented by the leopards' teeth and brass beads hung as charms round the children's necks (72) (75).

Many instances of tribes living in bitter antagonism and culturally opposed might be given who yet had a vague belief in a supreme Being, but such a belief is about the last thing they would have borrowed from their enemies. In fact, the evidence for borrowing should be of the clearest before being accepted, whereas the theory that a belief in a supreme Being, which had sprung from a contemplation of the wonders of Nature, seems more likely to agree with the facts.

It is often said that the idea of a supreme God is borrowed from Christian missionaries. But very strong evidence to the contrary can be produced. As regards the Gold Coast natives, both Sir A. B. Ellis and Capt. Rattray agree that this was not the case. Mr. Weeks maintains this also of the Congo tribes and Miss Kingsley of the Fiorts. In many cases observers have taken the greatest care to ascertain from natives who have had no intercourse with Christians whether the idea of such a god was known to them. The Rev. Dr. Schön, who visited the Ibo tribes of the Niger country in 1841 with Mr. (afterwards Bishop) Crowther, writes: "The Ibos are in their way a religious people . . . Their notions of some of the attributes of the supreme Being are, in many respects, correct and their manner of expressing them striking. 'God made everything. He made both white and black,' is continually on their lips. . . . That they have an idea of God's omniscience and omnipresence cannot be disputed. On the death of a person who has in their estimation been good, they will say 'He will see God,' while of a wicked person they say 'He will go into fire.' I had frequent opportunity of hearing these expressions at Sierra Leone; but though I was assured that they had not learned them from the Christians, I would not state them before I had satisfied myself, by inquiring of such as had never had any intercourse with Christians, that they possessed correct ideas of a future state, of reward and

punishment. Truly God has not left Himself without witness !” (76).

Professor Leuba, in *Folk Lore* of June, 1912, suggests that the belief in the existence of “ High Gods ” or “ Great Makers ” might have been conceived by some “ gifted individuals ” who thought upon the problem of Creation ; and Dr. Paul Radin, in his *Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture* (p. 57) maintains that in every randomly selected group of individuals there will be one or more “ idealists ” who postulate some First Cause ; and these persons give utterance to the Monotheistic beliefs found almost everywhere.

But these conceptions of the “ gifted individual ” and the “ idealist ” do not seem to sufficiently account for the embodiment of wisdom and goodness, unless we go a step further with Mgr. Le Roy, who maintains, in *La Religion des Primitifs*, that humanity was placed in possession of a fund of religious and moral truths together with the elements of worship, which having their roots in man’s nature itself have perpetuated themselves in the family and developed themselves along with the society, influenced by the mentality of each race.

Without perhaps going quite so far as Mgr. Le Roy in the amount of man’s original endowment, we may agree that these lofty conceptions were that manifestation of God mentioned in Rom. i, 19, a manifestation in the heart of man, which springing from a root in his very nature, so long as he was true to it, kept him at a higher level than that of the brutal and degraded savage some would have us believe him to have been.

But, it may be asked, does not the book of Genesis say that there was originally a Divine revelation ? How then can it be maintained that man was left to discover God by his reason ?

In reply, it may be said that the Bible does not say there was an original revelation—though probably it implies it. But, granting the literal truth of the first few chapters of Genesis, the primeval revelation was to man in a state of innocence, and that revelation, after the third or fourth generation, when men had sinned and become separated from each other, might as well not have been made as far as most of them were concerned.

It seems, therefore, quite in accordance with the facts to say that for the majority of heathen nations God’s revelation became a revelation through His works. Not, indeed, through His works



alone, for there was in man himself that witness, God-implanted, that true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

## IV.

(b) *The great God known but not worshipped. Idolatry and other forms of worship practised.*

The knowledge of God's existence did not, in too many cases, lead to a true worship of Him. Every student of the history of Religion knows only too well the result of the "vain and senseless reasonings" in the repulsive and cruel rites of the heathen. But behind them all we find such a widespread prevalence of Monotheistic beliefs that evidence of them from various sources makes, as it were, a chain of observations as far as possible encircling the world. Much of the evidence is taken from the records of various missionary societies, as their valuable testimony is too often overlooked.

The evidence can only be touched upon very lightly. To avoid repetition and, at the same time, maintain the geographical continuity of the evidence, the name of the people or locality where such belief exists will merely be mentioned, preceded by the letter "S"; but where, in addition to this belief, worship is offered to inferior gods or "spirits," the letters "SI" will be used.

Where special attention is desired, the beliefs will be more fully set out.

The numerals refer to the authorities consulted, which are given in an Appendix.

SI Yakuts of Siberia (1). Japanese (2). Ainu (3).

SI The writer of the Chinese commentary to the Chow-le says that the supreme Ruler of the glorious heavens controls Nature and its elements, and to him honours are to be paid; but he is not to be confounded with heaven, nor with the deities presiding over the fire elements. But the ordinary Chinaman worships spirits and deified ancestry (4).

SI In Corea the popular religion is similar to that of China, but alongside it there is the conception, more or less vague, of a great deity whom most people identify with the sky, but others believe that this is the supreme Being, the Creator and preserver of the world (5).

SI In Annam the sky is personified as "a wise, good, just and omniscient being; in short, as a high god" (6). The everyday religion of the Annamese is of a much lower type.

- S Melanesia, New Hebrides, Banks Islands, Vate, Hawaii and Samoa (7).
- SI The Maori speak of Io. Io the supreme Being, Io the permanent, Io the parent, Io the parentless, Io the hidden face, Io the soul of all things and in whom all things are one. Io, of whom no images could be made, and to whom no offerings were made. Whose very name was not revealed to the vulgar. But the daily life of the people was governed by a religion of a much lower type (8).
- SI Tribes of New South Wales (9). Australians (10).
- S Muruts of North Borneo (11). Natives of Barito River (12).
- SI Kenyahs of Sarawak (13).  
The Dyaks speak of Petara—the Deity—but they have many Petaras or lesser gods. When a Dyak is dying, it is Petara alone (Petara being regarded as a saving power) who can save him. The Dyak may have groped about in a life-long Polytheism, but something like a feeling after the One True Unknown seems to return at the close of the mortal pilgrimage (14).
- S Karens and Chins of Burmah (15). Binouas of the Malay Peninsula (16). Mincopies of the Andamans (17). Kacharees of Assam (18).
- INDIA.—As regards India generally, “Men worship Civa, the destroyer, because they fear him; Vishnu, the preserver, because they hope from him; but who worships Brahman the Creator? His work is done.” In these words one of the poets of the Mahabharata accounts for the discontinuance of worship of the great god of India (19).
- SI The Tougtha of South-East India (20). The Lushais (21). The Angamis (22). The Santals (23).
- SI The Mundas look upon the sun, Sing Bonga, as God. He is a beneficent but inactive deity, who leaves the government of the world to gods in charge of various departments; but in times of sickness or calamity sacrifice may be made to Sing Bonga (24). The Oraons of Bengal have a very similar belief (25), as have also the Peharis (26), the Chamars of the Punjab, and the Singphos of the East Himalayas (27).
- S AFRICA.—The evidence is very convincing concerning Africa generally. Mungo Park, who visited Africa in 1805, says: “I can pronounce, without the smallest shadow of doubt, that the belief in one God and in a future state of reward and punishment is entire and universal among them” (28).
- S Negroes.—Waitz wrote in 1860: “Several of the Negro races . . . in the embodying of their religious conceptions, are further advanced than almost all other savages, so far that, even if we do not call them Monotheists, we may still think of them as standing on the boundary of Monotheism” (29). The missionary Olendorp says very much the same thing about the Negro tribes (30), and Mgr. Le Roy has recently added his testimony (31).
- S The Pagan tribes of the East African Protectorate (32).
- S Kaffirs.—M. le Vaillant, who travelled in Africa in 1785, says that the Kaffirs have elevated ideas of a supreme power, but they never pray, nor have they any religious ceremonies, though they have

- faith in sorcery (34). Bishop Gray (34) and Mr. Theal also bear witness to this Kaffir belief (33).
- S The Zulus have a belief in a Being very remote from men. "When we were children," said an old Zulu, "they used to point to the Lord on high; we did not hear his name" (35). A woman of the Ba-ronga said to a missionary: "Before you came to teach that there was a Good Being, a Father in Heaven, we already knew that heaven existed; but we knew not that anyone was in the sky" (36).
- SI The Makalanga of Mashonaland (37). Dinkas of Upper Nile (38). Thonga (39).
- S The Kondé who live in Tanganyika Territory and Nyasaland (40), and the Wa Kikuyu (41).
- SI The Lugwari have a general name for ancestral spirits, *Ori*, who kill people and bring evils, and they have a god *Andronga* or *Adro*, the creator. They fear the former more than the latter, whom a missionary stated differed little from the Christian idea of Jehovah (42).
- S The Bantu (43), (44), (45), (46).
- S The Bakongo of Equatorial Africa (47). Southern Nigeria (48), (76).
- S Suras, and other tribes of Northern Nigeria (49). Kagoro (50). Yoruba (51). Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast (52).
- SI Tribes in the northern territory of the Gold Coast (52). The Felups of the Portuguese Gambia Territory have a dim notion of a supreme Being, but he is confused by them with heaven, the rain, wind and thunder-storm (53).
- S AMERICA.—The Indians of the Issa-Japura district (Brazil and Columbia) of South America believe that above the sky is a Great Good Spirit who once visited the earth but has returned to his abode. He is entirely passive. The Bad spirit is very active, but no prayer is offered to either, and sacrifice is quite unknown (54).
- SI The Lengua Indians of the Paraguan Chaco (55).
- S The Uitoto of Columbia, South America, have a mysterious creator to whom no worship is paid, and the Kagaba tribe have a female creator who also is not worshipped (56).
- SI The Caribs (57). The Natives of British Guiana (58). The Natchez (59). The Wichita of Texas (60).
- S The chief divinity of the Wintu is Olebis, who from above the sky watches all they do (61).
- S The Red Indians of the United States (62). The Comanches (63). The Pueblo (64). The Indians East of the Rocky Mountains (65), and those of Virginia (66). The Aleuts (67). The Eskimo (68). The earliest missionaries to Greenland could not, at first, discover a belief in a divine Being, but when they became better acquainted with the language they found that a supreme Being was believed in, and had formerly been worshipped (69).

Evidence of the existence of beliefs in supreme gods might be very largely extended. Mr. Andrew Lang, in his book on *The Making of Religion*, devotes three or four chapters to the subject, and quotes instances from among the Fuegians, Australians, Natives of North and South Guinea; also the Dinkas, Wayaos, Fiorts and Gold Coast tribes, and various races in America. Sir James Frazer's latest work on *The Worship of Nature* contains very many instances, more particularly from Africa, collected very largely from modern observers; and whereas the existence of such beliefs was greeted with incredulity and derision some thirty years ago, the latest investigators seem to find them in most peoples of whose religion a careful study is made.

We may at any rate be certain that the opinions of Mr. Herbert Spencer, Sir John Lubbock, and others of that school, have been proved to be utterly unfounded, and the savage without a religion of some sort is a figment of the imagination. The facts have conquered the theories.

## V.

### (c) *Seeking after God.*

Having glanced at the various phases of the belief in a supreme God, we must look at what, after all, is the real test of a Religion, its effect upon the lives of the people who profess it; and I think that we will have to admit that in many cases the worship of some primitive and apparently savage tribes has a moral effect, and is really a seeking after God. Let us look at some instances:—

“Among the Pankhos and Lhoosai crime is rare, there are no blood feuds, they reverence parents and honour old age” (*Wild Races, S.E. India*, p. 254).

“The Ainu are a religious race. Mr. Batchelor, who lived among them for years, says that a more kind, gentle and sympathetic people it would be impossible to find. More than a hundred years ago Krusenstern says of them, ‘The women are sufficiently ugly. However, I must do them the justice to say that they are modest in the highest degree.’ The characteristic quality of an Aino is goodness of heart, which is expressed in the strongest manner in his countenance; and so far as we were able to observe, their actions fully answered this expression” (*Monthly Review*, 1816, vol. 80, p. 284).

“Among the Mincopies the children are tenderly loved; husband and wife, as as a rule, live together in mutual affection, and the women are remarkable for their modesty” (*The Pygmies*, p. 101).

The Santals, even as heathen, are a generous, simple, honest people (70).

It has been said of the Todas that every act of their life bears the stamp of devotion (74). In 1834 they were described as a laughter-loving race, living peaceably, in families, a pastoral life of rural simplicity. The women modest and retiring, though self-possessed as Europeans (71).

The Lepchas who, at the entrance to their settlements, placed offerings to some invisible Being, partly votive and partly as thank-offerings for an abundant harvest, are described by Capt. Sherwill, who visited them in 1852, as happy as schoolboys, enduring days of drenching rain without a murmur. No hardships appeared to ruffle this free, happy, laughing, playful, modest, social, joyous, and honest people (72). Capt. Higgens, who was there in 1851, bears the same testimony, except he adds that on one occasion he found some milkmen (like those of London of that date) adding water to their commodity; but they appeared to be very much ashamed at being discovered (73).

There is also found amongst so-called savages the idea of a good God whose commands must be obeyed, though the reason for them is not apparent and their fulfilment causes pain and grief. Ifa is one of the chief gods of the Yoruba-speaking people of West Africa, and human sacrifices are offered to him. The rulers declare that sacrifice is offered for the whole of the human race, the white man not excepted, and that if the sacrifices were discontinued the white man's superior knowledge would depart from him. Even the priests regards human sacrifice as something to be deplored, but sometimes necessary (*Yoruba-speaking People*, p. 106).

Summarizing his impressions of the religion of the Hottentots, Hahn says: “If the word religion corresponds to a faith in a Heavenly Father, who is near His children in their sufferings; if it expresses a belief in an all-powerful Master, who sends the rain and good weather; if it includes the idea of a Father of lights from whom cometh every good thing; if this Father is at the same time a rewarder, who sees all things and who punishes the wrong and rewards the right; if Religion translates the longing of the heart after the invisible, with the hope of seeing it face

to face in a better world ; if it implies at once the feeling of human feebleness and the acceptance of a divine government, we ought not to hesitate about placing the Khoi-Khoi on our own level" (*The Pygmies*, pp. 236, 208).

A traveller at the end of the 18th century says : " In Africa, as everywhere else, the impression of His (God's) greatness, power and goodness, is evident . . . . I have seen modesty, benevolence, probity, and amiable hospitality among the number of native virtues. I have found the idea of a just and bountiful God engraved in the heart and soul of the upright man, and even ignorant and savage hordes believe in one god alone, and implore his favour and protection" (*Monthly Review*, 1805, vol. 47, p. 273 ; *Review of Travels in Africa during 1785-7 and 1787*, by S. M. Golberry).

Mr. Eliot, more than 130 years ago, in speaking of the wild tribes of the Garo Hills, says their mode of swearing is very impressive. " They call on Mahadeva in the most solemn manner, telling him to witness what they declare, and that he knows whether they speak true or false. When the first person swore before me, the awe and reverence with which the men swore forcibly struck me. My *moherrir* could hardly write, so much was he affected by the solemnity. These people appear to stand in the utmost awe of their deity, from their fear of his punishing them for any misconduct in their frequent excursions to the hills" (*Monthly Review*, 1794, vol. 13, p. 565).

These extracts speak for themselves and show that in the religion of uncultured peoples there has been a seeking after God, and the earnest seeker has been vouchsafed a vision, though dimly seen, of a loving Parent quick to reward and bless his faithful children.

## VI.

Before concluding, the author feels that it may not be out of place to suggest a parallel between the revealed Religion of the Jewish Church and the Nature Religions of the Gentile world to show the divers portions and divers manners in which of old time God spake to His children.

*Parallel between the Religion Revealed to the Jewish Church and the Natural Religion of the Gentile World.*

1	Man in a state of innocence, and in possession of Knowledge of the Divine Being and His attributes.	
2	This Knowledge of the Divine lost or obscured through the " Fall " of Man.	
3	<i>The Jewish Church.</i> Promises to the Patriarchs called forth a response in hearts attentive to the Divine voice.	<i>The Gentile World.</i> The Witness of Nature enables " men of good-will " to gain a belief in a good and loving God.
4	The Law given. " If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law."	This simple Natural Religion dispersed among the peoples of the world, but, " knowing God, they glorified Him not as God."
5	Jewish idolatry and backsliding. But there remained a " remnant."	" Vain reasoning and senseless hearts " produced idolatry and neglect of the good God. But in every nation he that feared God, and worked righteousness was accepted.
6	The Gospel offered alike to Jew and Gentile.	

VII.

*Conclusion.*

As a result of our inquiry, I submit that, as regards the Gentile World :—

- (a) Man gained a knowledge of God, the Great Creator, through contemplating His works ; and there was in man's nature that manifestation of God in his heart which enabled him to formulate these lofty conceptions of the Divine nature.
- (b) The belief in this great God, though known among most peoples, did not generally lead to true worship ; but natural objects or imaginary powers received man's adoration or were propitiated by Him.

- (c) In the religion of primitive peoples there is sometimes a real moral influence at work, as it were the Spirit of God striving with man, who is groping in the dark, waiting for the full revelation which God has given in His Son, in whose name and by whose authority the Christian Church proclaims to the world the message of Eternal Salvation.

And that these conclusions are in accord with the teachings of St. Paul.

---

## APPENDIX.

---

### AUTHORITIES QUOTED ON PAGES 49 TO 53.

- (1) Keane. *The World's Peoples*, p. 178.
- (2) *Ibid.*, p. 171.
- (3) *Ainu of Japan*, pp. 62, 247.
- (4) Medhurst's *Dissertation on the Theology of the Chinese* (1847).
- (5) Frazer. *Worship of Nature*, p. 82.
- (6) *Ibid.*, p. 86.
- (7) James. *Primitive Ritual and Belief*, p. 204.
- (8) Eldon Best. "The Maori" (*Times Lit. Suppl.*, 1926, p. 471).
- (9) *J.A.I.* (1884), p. 364.
- (10) *Ibid.*, p. 321; *Primitive Ritual and Belief*, chap. xii; E. Carpenter. *Comparative Religion*, p. 114.
- (11) *200 Years S.P.G.*, p. 694.
- (12) Ling Roth. *Sarawak*, p. 170.
- (13) *Nature*, 1900, p. 635.
- (14) Ling Roth. *Sarawak*, p. 179; Ratzel, I., pp. 473, 476.
- (15) *Mission Field*, 1903, pp. 199, 318.
- (16) Quatrefages. *The Pygmies*, p. 137.
- (17) *Ibid.*, pp. 124, 128.
- (18) *200 Years S.P.G.*, p. 609.
- (19) Hopkins. *India, Old and New*, p. 113.
- (20) Lewin. *Wild Races, S.E. India*, pp. 192, 242.
- (21) *Ibid.*, p. 275; *The 1901 Census of India*, Appendix, p. 225.
- (22) *Ibid.*, p. 210.
- (23) *Ibid.*, p. 146; *Missionary Conference*, 1894, p. 117.
- (24) *Census, India*, p. 156.
- (25) Dalton's *Ethnology of Bengal* (quoted, *Golden Bough*, iii, p. 52).
- (26) C.M.S. *Hill Tribes, India*, p. 13.
- (27) *Vict. Inst. Trans.*, xix, p. 5.
- (28) *Making of Religion*, p. 241.
- (29) *Ibid.*, p. 239.
- (30) Pritchard. *Physical Hist. Man*, i, p. 199.
- (31) *La Religion des Primitifs* (quoted, *East and West*, p. 368).



- (32) *Report on E. Africa*, 1897, p. 40.
- (33) Theal. *Kaffir Folk Lore*, p. 19.
- (34) *200 Years S.P.G.*, p. 329; *Monthly Review*, 1790, i, p. 487.
- (35) *Making of Religion*, p. 228.
- (36) *Folk Lore*, 1899, p. 227.
- (37) *Ruined Cities, Mashonaland*, p. 58.
- (38) Lang. *Making of Religion*, p. 230.
- (39) Junod. *Life of a South African Tribe*.
- (40) *The Spirit-ridden Kondé* (reviewed, *East and West*, 1926, p. 187):
- (41) *C.M.S. Report*, 1900, p. 119.
- (42) *J.R.A.I.*, vol. lv, p. 461.
- (43) Kingsley. *Travels, West Africa*, pp. 298, 361; *Folk Lore*, viii, p. 142.
- (44) Junod. *Life of a South African Tribe* (reviewed, *East and West*, p. 351).
- (45) *East and West*, 1917, p. 192.
- (46) *Primitive Ritual and Belief*, p. 199.
- (47) Weeks. *Primitive Bakongo* (reviewed, *East and West*, 1914, p. 232); *Brit. Medical Journal*, 1925, p. 166 (review of Mackie Ethnological Expedition).
- (48) *C.M.S. Intelligencer*, 1904, p. 10.
- (49) *C.M.S. Story*, 1908, p. 26; *Nature*, Aug., 1926, p. 220 (review of Meek's *Northern Tribes of Nigeria*).
- (50) *Tailed Hunters of Nigeria*, p. 166.
- (51) Bishop Crowther's *Yoruba Vocabulary*, p. 36.
- (52) *Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 17-29; Cardinall. "Natives of Northern Territory of Gold Coast" (*Times Lit. Suppl.*, 1920, p. 768).
- (53) Keane. *Peoples of the World*, p. 80.
- (54) *Folk Lore*, 1913, p. 56.
- (55) Grubb. *Unknown People*, pp. 115, 126.
- (56) Preuss. *Religion und Mythologie des Uitoto*, p. 166; *Physiologische Forschung*, vol. ii, p. 176 (quoted by Radin).
- (57) *Comparative Theology*, p. 30.
- (58) *Making of Religion*, p. 222.
- (59) *Pygmies*, p. 140.
- (60) *Mythology of the Wichita* (quoted Radin, p. 31).
- (61) Curtin. *Creation Myths, America*, pp. xxx, 285.
- (62) Bancroft's *Colonization of the U.S.*, vol. iii, p. 285.
- (63) *Comparative Theology*, p. 28.
- (64) *Ibid.*
- (65) *Primitive Manners and Customs*, p. 52.
- (66) *Comparative Theology*, p. 29.
- (67) *Ibid.*, p. 27 (quoting Bancroft, i, 44).
- (68) Pritchard. *History of Man*, i, p. 190; Keane. *World's People*, p. 30.
- (69) *Making of Religion*, p. 199.
- (70) *Missionary Conference*, 1894, p. 120.
- (71) *The Neilgherries*, 1857, p. lxvi.
- (72) *Tour in Sikkim Mountains*, pp. 10, 20, 30.
- (73) Capt. J. Higgens. *MS. Diary*.
- (74) Reclus. *Primitive Folk*, p. 229.
- (75) *Census of India*, 1901, p. 202.
- (76) Schön and Crowther's *Journal*, 1842, p. 50.

## DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony) said: The thanks of the Victoria Institute are due to Captain Higgens for this learned paper, which must have involved much research. Some may object that the beliefs of savages in the 19th century do not necessarily coincide with the conclusions to which heathen philosophers had come in St. Paul's day, but such an objection is not supported by the facts. Captain Higgens has doubtless done well to confine himself to one line of evidence, namely, the beliefs of savages before our missionaries went amongst them; but the subject may, and should, be also studied from the historical standpoint. A very useful book on this is Dr. S. Angus's *Environment of Early Christianity*. He points out that Zenophanes said, "The best can only be one. . . . There is one God, among gods and men the greatest, unlike mortals in outer shape, unlike in mind and thought." Æschylus said, "Zeus is the ether, Zeus the earth, Zeus the heaven, Zeus is the universe and what is beyond the universe." Maximus of Tyre said that "all worshipped the same God, his name merely being different in different languages." With this agrees the book of Jonah. Jonah's shipmates demanded that every man, whatever his nationality, should call upon his God. The idea being that the different names of God all stood for a being who had power to make the storm to cease.

Some of the Church Fathers—Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian—admitted that some pagans believed in the unity of God. Plato and Seneca held that God can be only the author of good. Socrates argues for the existence of the Deity from the evidences of design in Nature, and especially in man himself; he believed in the Providence of God, holding that God sees, hears and cares for all. Cicero and Aurelius held the same. Men were exhorted to act as if God sees all, and to practise forgiveness, kindness, purity and self-examination. The circumstances under which Abram left Mesopotamia point to a primeval monotheism, which the people of that land had abandoned. And we read of Melchizedek, priest of God most high, possessor of heaven and earth.

We have very clear evidence as regards heathen belief in the conditional immortality of the soul. The Egyptian Book of the Dead

was certainly in existence as far back as 1500 B.C. It has pictures representing the soul as being accurately weighed against a feather, the symbol of perfection, while close by stands the scribe of the gods waiting to write down the all-important verdict. There squats near an animal, half lion and half crocodile, whose business it was to devour the soul if found to be too heavily weighted with sin. But if the verdict was favourable, the soul was led into the presence of Osiris, prior to entering upon a life of happiness. There is, of course, much other evidence that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul. Plato represents Socrates as saying (Com.) “. . . the soul, which is invisible, and which departs into another place of this kind, a place noble, pure and invisible, viz. into Hades, to a beneficent and prudent God. Thou shouldst say, If God wills it, and if it please Him.”

In St. Paul's day, just as in Jerusalem, the Pharisees and the Sadducees held opposite beliefs about a future life; so in Rome and Athens, the Stoics believed in it and the Epicureans rejected it, which is doubtless why those two cults are mentioned in Acts xvii. But even the Stoics wanted further proof, and probably it was they who said to St. Paul, “We will hear thee concerning this yet again.” As regards the Epicureans, to mock was practically the only thing they could do, for it was most damaging to their party to have an outside witness bringing forward precisely the sort of positive evidence of resurrection which was the one thing their opponents needed to claim a complete victory. But the stress usually put upon this mocking has obscured an important fact, namely this, that in St. Paul's day the heathen world had been brought in the providence of God to feel its need of a motive and dynamic powerful enough to forward social reforms. And we Christians maintain that this motive and dynamic was fully provided by Jesus Christ.

Our lecturer's second contention is, that belief in this great God, though known among most peoples, did not generally lead to true worship; but natural objects or imaginary powers received man's adoration, or were propitiated by Him. This also, of course, is fully borne out by history. We have only to think of the animal gods of Egypt and the false gods the Israelites were so often led away to worship. We know that the populace of Rome and Athens

worshipped many gods, though their thinkers knew better. Even their thinkers were sadly deficient in their sense of sin and many other matters with which Hebrew and Christian theology adequately dealt.

And our lecturer's third contention, that "in the religion of primitive peoples there is sometimes a real moral influence at work," is also true of the ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans.

(The lecturer having been cordially thanked for his paper, the discussion proceeded.)

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS was sorry to strike a discordant note, but considered that, in stating three times over (pp. 42, 43 and 55) that St. Paul attributed the origin and development of religion in the Gentile world to men gaining the knowledge of God through contemplating His works, the lecturer had misinterpreted the Apostle, and therefore unintentionally misrepresented his teaching. So far from speaking of man gaining the knowledge of God, Romans i states that, although what might be known of God was manifested unto them (v. 19), they refused to have God in their knowledge (v. 28), which was quite in agreement with the wise man's discovery: "This only have I found, that God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Eccles. vii, 29). The earliest records agree with this, for they reveal to us man already civilized, although not yet possessed of many of the arts of civilization, and it was an accepted conclusion of science that no instance had ever occurred of any barbarian tribe or nation becoming civilized except through contact with men already civilized. Whatever evolution there might be in the lower creation, he believed the record in Genesis ii showed that man was constituted a living soul by the breath of God, and so was responsible to Him. He called attention to the opening words of St. Peter's first sermon to the Gentiles: "In every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him" (Acts x, 35). He believed that this was true where any heathen followed the example of the tax-gatherer in admitting he had no righteousness, and saying, "God be merciful unto me, a sinner" (Luke xviii, 13); for such a one, whether in the Jewish temple or elsewhere, was, according to the declaration of our Lord, "justified." He did not believe the Genesis account of man's creation and fall could be

reconciled with the gradual evolution of man from apehood and barbarism to gain a knowledge of God, as the lecturer appeared to imply.

Mr. W. HOSTE said : The subject of the paper is of course not the ground of redemption, which is prospectively or retrospectively one and the same from Abel downward, the atonement of Christ, nor yet the *knowledge* of salvation, much less the blessings of Christianity, as now revealed. So far as my experience of Central Africa goes, it would support the lecturer's thesis as to the universality of belief in God, and that this is emphatically not due solely to the presence of Christian missionaries, for I have met it where there were none. It is unfortunate that Dr. Burrows did not give names or places in asserting that there are some peoples without any religious idea. This is contrary to every witness I ever came into touch with. I have heard it said on excellent authority that there is not an atheist among the natives between the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, when uncontaminated by godless whites. The natives think of the whole sky as the face of God. "What terrible things that face does!" said a chief to a missionary, referring to some catastrophe of Nature. This is something quite above and distinct from their fetishism. This belief might be a remnant of the primal revelation. Perhaps we do not attach sufficient value to oral tradition among peoples who have no written records. But more likely still a belief in God is innate in man. This is distinct from a *knowledge* of God. But Paul on Mars' Hill seems to teach that a certain knowledge of God was attainable: "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us" (Acts xvii, 27). Even a heathen poet like Aratus shows in his "Prolegomena," as quoted (v. 28), that he had light to perceive that man could only have sprung from God as his origin. Apart from the revelation of Christ in Incarnation, etc., a full knowledge of God is impossible, but God "has not left Himself without a witness" (Acts xiv, 17), even among the heathen. Here the Apostle refers to God's Providential gifts; and in this connection it is important to remember that when God chose Israel to be His peculiar people, it was only *above* all other peoples (Exod. xix, 5; Deut. x, 15), but not to their exclusion. Captain Higgens seems perfectly correct in his use (p. 42) of Romans i, 19-21.

It is through His visible works that God's invisible things are clearly seen, even His eternal power and Godhead, "so that the heathen nations are without excuse." But when they did thus know God they failed, as he has pointed out quite scripturally, to glorify God, and so were given over to their own imaginations, so that now, alas! it is true that "the things the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God" (1 Cor. x, 20). No doubt it was the Spirit of God who originally used the works of Creation to reveal God, and ultimately that revelation came through Christ, for "all things were made by Him." It is striking that in Romans x, even where the apostle is speaking of the preaching of the Gospel, he does not omit to justify God by a reference to the witness of Creation: "But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily" (*see v. 18*), and then quotes Psalm xix, 2, "their sound went into all the world, and their words unto the ends of the world." This could only apply to the subject of the verse quoted, for it could not be said then, at any rate, that Gospel preachers had visited every land, a thing they have scarcely done even to-day in the 20th century of the Christian era.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I confess I do not like the general tone of this lecture. One impression it leaves on the mind is that there is something in the natural man which enables him to grow into the knowledge of God—(*see on p. 42*: "God, whose offspring he (man) *felt himself to be*"; *also on p. 44*: "bringing into play *man's power to obtain a perception of the Infinite*"). But surely the Bible teaches that man is so hopelessly "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii, 1) that the only hope for man was that *God should seek him* in the Person of His Son (Luke xix, 10). Another impression dangerously conveyed in the "conclusion" (on p. 55, sec. (a)) is that man could find God by contemplating His works in Nature, such as the sun, moon and stars. I wish the lecturer had made it quite clear that, while Nature may teach man that there is a God, nothing short of God's Revelation in the Bible can teach man who that God is. This is strikingly shown in Romans x, 14-17, where St. Paul, speaking of mankind in general, all of whom already possessed what our "Nature" could teach them, was deeply concerned that *Preachers should be sent to tell them of God's written revelation in His Word*, whereby alone they might be saved.

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD wrote : The Institute is to be congratulated on beginning the year with such a valuable and scholarly paper. So far from inviting criticism, it calls for the hearty thanks of the Victoria Institute. One remark alone would I make. On p. 49, I suggest that John i, 9, may equally read, "True *Light* (which lighteth every man) *coming* into the world" (*erchomenon*). I suggest that the true Light is Christ, and not the conscience, which is not ever a *true light* (see Acts xxiii, 1, where Paul had persecuted the Church of God "with a good conscience").

The BISHOP OF CHICHESTER, writing to Captain Higgens, said : "I have read your paper with interest. My anthropology is so much out of date that I dare not criticize details ; but you will let me say that I believe tribes have been found without any religion whatever ; just as practically all men wear clothes, but there are tribes that go absolutely naked. I also believe that in many cases there is no connection at all between the tribal religion and morality, except, possibly, in regard to the virtue of hospitality. I think you would find much of Illingworth's teaching to move along your lines, especially see his "PERSONALITY, HUMAN AND DIVINE," Lecture 7, "Religion in Pre-Christian History" : "There can be no greater mistake . . . than to depreciate the ethnic religions in the supposed interests of an exclusive revelation."

## AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The Chairman's store of classical knowledge has illuminated the subject with light from the Old World. The historical aspect and the teaching of heathen philosophers, to which he draws attention, might easily form the subject-matter of a separate paper.

Dr. Schofield's remarks on John i, 9, I read with great respect. It perhaps would have been better to have written "that True Light which," etc., to show that the God-implanted witness was the indwelling Christ.

As regards the criticism of Mr. Theodore Roberts, I fail to see where I have stated that man evolved from "apehood." On p. 55 I state that the knowledge of the Divine which man originally

possessed was lost through the "Fall" of man, but God left him not without witness, namely, the witness of His works. This seems to me to be the natural interpretation of St. Paul's words.

Mr. Hoste deals with the questions raised by Mr. Roberts in a much fuller and more lucid manner than I am capable of. I am much gratified to read the appreciative remarks of one who has first-hand knowledge of the religious beliefs of Central Africa.

As regards Mr. Collett's remarks, it seems to me that God did not leave man without a witness, otherwise how can one account for the good in numberless heathen who have never had the "Good tidings" preached to them? But this can be admitted without in any way denying the necessity of sending forth men to proclaim Salvation through Christ alone, which it is our bounden duty to do.



694TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 17TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

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

Lieut.-Colonel MOLONY, who had kindly consented to preside at the last moment, explained that Mr. A. W. Oke, F.G.S., who was to have taken the Chair, had been unable to attend.

After the reading and signing of the Minutes of the previous Meeting, the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Frank Cockrem, Esq., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN announced that Mr. G. B. Michell, O.B.E., had been detained in Egypt, contrary to his hope, and that he would call on the Hon. Secretary to read the paper.

The HON. SECRETARY then read Mr. Michell's paper on "The Comparative Chronology of Ancient Nations in its Bearing on Holy Scripture."

---

*THE COMPARATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF ANCIENT  
NATIONS IN ITS BEARING ON HOLY SCRIPTURE.*

By G. B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E.

IT would be perfectly possible, in the light of present knowledge—imperfect as it still is—to establish the complete concordance of the chronology of the whole Bible with what is known of that of ancient nations. This I have done in my recent work on *The Historical Truth of the Bible*.

In the small space at my disposal on the present occasion I can do no more than select a representative period. I have

chosen that on which the least has been done hitherto, viz. the second millennium before Christ. This includes the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, the Exodus, and the times of the Judges.

For the history of the ancient nations I have taken the latest and most authoritative work on the subject, namely, *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge University Press, 4 vols., 1923-6).

For the Biblical chronology of the period now discussed I have established in the above-mentioned work the date of the accession of Solomon in 972 B.C. This agrees, within two years, with that given in the *Cambridge History* (vol. i, p. 160), viz. 970 B.C., near enough, for practical purposes, to make the comparison both possible and reasonable.

I take the Hebrew text as it stands, and proceed as follows: Solomon began to reign in 972 B.C.; his fourth year, in which the Temple was founded, was thus 969 B.C. The Exodus was 480 years before that (1 Kings vi, 1), that is, in 1449 B.C., and the descent of Jacob to Egypt was 430 years before the Exodus (Exod. xii, 41), which gives us 1879 B.C., and the sale of Joseph into Egypt in 1901 B.C., his promotion in 1888 B.C., and his death in 1808 B.C. This will be enough for our present purpose.

At this time two dynasties were reigning in Babylonia, the north being under Samsu-ditana (succ. 1901), of the first, or "Canaanite," dynasty, and the south, or "Sealand," being under Damki-ilishu (succ. 1910). The Elamite domination of Larsa had come to an end nearly 100 years before, in 2015 B.C., and Elam itself was now tributary to Babylon. Assyria was still in a small way. We may surmise that it was at about this time that one Shamshi-Adad introduced the worship of Bel into Assyria. He set up a stela in "the Land of Laban," which has been supposed by some to be Lebanon. Apparently the dominant power in Syria and Palestine was Amurru, as the rule of the Elamites there ("Chedorlaomer" and "Kudur-Mabug") had come to an end with the subjugation of Elam itself by Hammurabi and his son Samsu-iluna.

At a conference of archaeologists in Palestine, called together by Professor Garstang in 1922 to draw up a general scheme of classification, it was decided to divide the periods as follows:—

Periods.	Phases.	Approximate dates.			
I.—Stone Age	1. Paleolithic	—			
	2. Neolithic	—			
II.—Bronze Age	1. Ancient Canaanite	2500 to 2000 B.C.			
	2. Middle	2000 „ 1600 „			
	3. Late	1600 „ 1200 „			
III.—Iron Age	1. Ancient Palestinian	1200 to 600 B.C.			
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">{</td> <td>(a) Philistine</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Ancient Israelitish</td> </tr> </table>		{	(a) Philistine	(b) Ancient Israelitish
	{	(a) Philistine			
(b) Ancient Israelitish					
2. Middle	600 „ 300 „				
3. Late	<table border="0"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">{</td> <td>(a) New Israel</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Hellenistic</td> </tr> </table>	{	(a) New Israel	(b) Hellenistic	300 „ 50 „
{	(a) New Israel				
	(b) Hellenistic				

This places the Palestine of Jacob's time in the "Middle Canaanitish" period of culture in the Bronze Age.

In Egypt the XIIIth Dynasty was reigning—we cannot say exactly under which king until the dates of these are fixed. The fact that it was under the native XIIIth Dynasty that Joseph was promoted, and his father and brothers kindly received in Egypt, is of the greatest importance to understand the whole of the subsequent history of Israel.

The invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos cannot be placed by any means earlier than 1800 B.C., as the *Cambridge History* decides. Consequently it could not have been by them that Joseph was raised to the highest position in Egypt under the king, nor Israel settled in the land of Goshen. On the contrary, as Joseph died in 1808 B.C., the king that arose that knew not Joseph could be no other than the Hyksos conqueror. Now it had been foretold to Abram (Gen. xv, 13) that his seed should be a stranger in a land that was not theirs, and should serve them; and *they should afflict them 400 years*; "and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance." Thus the affliction of Israel was not merely during the reign of the last Pharaoh before the Exodus, but for four entire centuries. Joseph died in 1808 B.C., and the entrance to Canaan under Joshua was in 1409 B.C.—*exactly 400 years*. Thus there is no possibility of

doubting that it was the Aramæan Hyksos that were the oppressors of Israel, who were themselves of Aramæan origin.

In this circumstance we have the explanation of the extraordinary fact that, throughout their history, the Israelites were strongly pro-Egyptian and bitterly anti-Semitic.

In all the relations of the Hamites and the Semites, Semitic Israel alone showed through all its history an undying antipathy to their Semitic kindred, which was bitterly reciprocated, while Hamitic Egypt exercised on them a fascination which held them fast till well into Roman times.

According to the "Reconstructionist" theory there was nothing in the religious opinions of early Israel to divide them from their Semitic brethren, nor in their social life and traditions. I use the term "Reconstructionist" in preference to "Higher Critic" or "Modernist," as an inoffensive title, and because I deny to them the right to be properly called "Critics," or exclusively "Modernist."

We must look for another cause, and a sufficient one, for this persistent antipathy, and since we find no traces of such between the other Semitic races, we must find it in something in Israel itself, in spite of the protests of the prophets. The explanation is furnished by the true chronology alone. It was the oppression of the Israelites by the *Hyksos* in Egypt that infused into the character of Israel an ineradicable instinct of repulsion against everything Semitic. It has been very widely taught that the Hyksos kings were friendly to the Israelites. But this is based upon a false chronology. An examination of the facts will show that the contrary was the case.

When Joseph was sold into Egypt in 1901 B.C., the XIIth Dynasty had come to an end, and, while the XIIIth Dynasty was reigning at Memphis and the north, they were not acknowledged at Thebes, which set up a king of its own, no doubt a junior male member of the old Royal family. Several Theban monarchs reigned, Senusert IV and several Mentuheteps. Egypt was once again divided. This division presented a new and very serious danger which threatened the whole of Lower Egypt, produced by the very means taken by Amenemhat III, of the XIIth Dynasty, to avert such a disaster, namely, the great famine which took place in the time of Joseph.

To regulate the water-supply of Lower and Middle Egypt, Amenemhat III constructed immense hydraulic works in the Fayoum, a low-lying district west of the Nile, south of Memphis.

But the very efficiency of these works brought a still greater menace of famine. If the regulating sluices between Siut and Hawara were to fall into the hands of an enemy it meant that this water-supply would be cut off altogether; only by this means could a famine now occur in Egypt of any seriousness. The Fayoum reservoir would keep supplies going in the case of a low Nile. Now, the conditions during the time of the XIIIth Dynasty were precisely those in which this danger might be realised. The rival princes at Thebes could, at any time, open an inlet at Derut into what is now the Bahr Yusuf, and so run off into the Fayoum an enormous bulk of water, thus starving the whole of Middle and Lower Egypt. If the outlet from the Fayoum into the Nile were also to fall into hostile hands the starvation would be complete. Further, in time of war, the cultivators of the soil would be called off to military service, and the irrigation canals would be untended and soon blocked. Joseph was doubtless well alive to this contingency, and the advice to collect supplies before it should occur was the wisest course possible, in the political weakness of his sovereign.

As for the possibility of a simultaneous famine in Palestine, which was not under the same conditions, "It is equally likely that just as Canaan in a 'short year' was normally supplied with corn from Egypt, now that Egypt was hoarding her supplies, the inhabitants of Palestine and neighbouring territories experienced the sore results of the stoppage of the corn-trade." (Knight, *Nile and Jordan*, p. 113.)

It must be remembered that Jacob and his family, though they were not nomads, and only incidentally were shepherds, were *cattle breeders* and dealers. (Gen. xii, 16; xiii, 2, 7; xlv, 32, 34.) Besides, and more than, pasture, the cattle, etc., would need fattening foods, which, in a hilly country like Palestine, would have to be imported.

The theory that the Hyksos kings were reigning at the time is based on the impossible hypothesis that the Exodus took place under Rameses II or Merneptah. There is *nothing* in favour of this hypothesis, and everything against it.

(1) The sites of the store-cities, Pithom and Raamses, have nothing to do with the situation of the land of Goshen nor with the Exodus; they might have been anywhere in the realm of the Pharaoh. Nor is it likely, for their purpose, that they would both be in one district.

(2) If the sites that have been claimed for them were built by Rameses II, they were certainly only *rebuilt* by him, for their earlier foundations have been found.

(3) "Rameses," where Joseph settled his brethren, and whence the Exodus started, cannot be the same as the store-city "Raamses" which was *built* by the Israelites.

(4) The decisive argument is that, from the time of Thothmes IV onwards, names compounded with "Ra" were pronounced "Riya," as is shown in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence. This is an infallible landmark.

Every argument and every conclusion based upon the supposition that Joseph was promoted, and Jacob kindly received, by a Hyksos king must, therefore, be false. On the contrary, the native, the XIIIth Dynasty, was reigning.

It follows, therefore, that the new king that arose up over Egypt, which knew not Joseph (Exod. i, 8), was the *Hyksos*. And this is in entire accord with the facts.

These Hyksos were Aramæans, and consequently of close kin to the Israelites, and it has been generally supposed that they would be friendly to the Israelites for that reason. But the contrary was the case. Israel remained loyal to the Egyptians, and suffered for their loyalty with the Egyptians. There was more than one good reason for this, though it brought them between the hammer and the anvil.

(1) The Israelites had a big stake in the success of the native kings. Joseph was granted a very high position by one of them. This position was then hereditary in Egypt. Even if it were not so in his particular case, he was married to the daughter of the priest of On, and, in accordance with Egyptian law, her sons would inherit from her father. Even under a change of native dynasty this would be the case; only under a foreign domination could they lose their rights. Therefore, the king that knew not Joseph could be no other than a *foreigner*.

(2) It may be asked, Could they not retain their rights by siding with the foreigner, who was of their own race? The answer is, Not in this case; their situation as cattle-breeders in the land of Goshen precluded it.

(3) The theory that this district was in the Wadi Tumilat, in the Eastern Delta, is utterly untenable. There is *no* valid evidence for such a theory, and that district is totally unfitted for cattle- and sheep-breeding on a large scale; it is entirely dependent on *irrigation*, and it would be the first to suffer from a famine, and the greatest sufferer from the lack of water. The family of Jacob went down to Egypt in a time of *famine*, with five years more to come. It would be madness to settle them in such a district.

(4) There was only *one* district in Egypt where there could be no lack of water under any circumstances, and that was the *Fayoum* and the Nile Valley between Cairo and Thebes. It certainly was the best of the whole land of Egypt. (Gen. xlvii, 6.)

(5) The seat of government of the XIIIth Dynasty was at Ithttaui, a fortress-palace near the modern village of Lisht, south of Memphis. Here the government had control of the Fayoum, and it was here that Joseph planted his relatives. (Gen. xlv, 10.) Here they would, in their own interests, keep the closest watch on the sluices and hydraulic works regulating the water-supply. Thus they would hold the key of the whole prosperity of Egypt.

(6) At the first invasion of the Hyksos, the native kings, whether at Memphis or at Thebes, were in possession of this key, and they long retained it. Until these kings were conquered by the Hyksos they were masters of the Fayoum. Even if the Israelites had been traitors to the kings at Memphis and joined the Hyksos, they would have been at the mercy of the kings at Thebes, and until the fortune of war declared itself on the Hyksos side, they would have been in dire peril of destruction by the Egyptians who surrounded them on all sides. What could they do to help the Hyksos? Nothing but to interfere with the water, which would damage the Hyksos as much as the Egyptians.

(7) On the other hand, as Semites akin to the Hyksos they would always be objects of suspicion to the Egyptians. The only course open to them, therefore, was frankly to side with the latter. This would bring upon them a specially bitter revenge on the part of the Hyksos—just what we are told of their attitude to them in Exod. i, 9, 10.

Also, it must be remembered that it was the *kings* that made them serve with rigour, not the people. The Egyptians are depicted in their monuments as being driven by their taskmasters just as cruelly as the slaves. This would foster a fellow-feeling between the Egyptian people and the Israelites.

The kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty had much to do in restoring the country after the expulsion of the Hyksos. Queen Hatshepsut was a specially great builder. Thothmes III (or more probably his son Amenhetep II, who was co-regent with his father at the time) is not represented as being especially hostile to the Israelites, but as resenting any interference with his work going forward.

Nor did the Israelites propose to quit his jurisdiction, which extended over Palestine and all the intervening country.

We have, therefore, the Israelites as *loyal Egyptian subjects*, long resident in Egypt, having absorbed much Egyptian sentiment and culture, considerably intermarried with the Egyptian people, who did all they could to facilitate their departure (Exod. xii, 33-36), and, at the last moment, even enjoying the favour of the king (Exod. xii, 31, 32). This is of prime importance in considering all the succeeding history of Israel. They were *pro-Egyptians* and *anti-Semites*; this did not cease when they were wandering in the Wilderness of Sinai, nor when they entered Palestine. There were always good Egyptian subjects, and they did not attempt to set up a king of their own till the Egyptian authority over Palestine was gone for ever.

While Amenhetep II and Thothmes IV were carrying on their wars in Palestine, Israel was safe in the backwater of Sinai, out of harm's way, incapable of interfering with those kings' operations and with no desire to do so. On the contrary they were useful in keeping the Semites of the peninsula from giving trouble in the king's rear.

The Law was given on Sinai in June, 1449 B.C., and the Tabernacle set up in March, 1448 B.C., and Israel became definitely, at least in theory, a strongly monotheistic nation.

Thothmes IV died in 1414 B.C. (or, according to Professor Breasted, 1410), and was succeeded by Amenhetep III whose wife was Queen Tiy.

The Israelites made no hostile movement until November, 1410 B.C., when they conquered Heshbon, and afterwards Bashan. This was the first act that might call for attention from the



Egyptian king. Then Israel crossed the Jordan into Palestine under Joshua (April, 1409 B.C.), and thus committed themselves definitely to war in that country.

Why did not Amenhetep interfere? Unless we can find an adequate explanation, the conduct of this king and of his successor Akhenaton, in allowing Palestine to be overrun by the Khabiri, is a mystery which no one yet has succeeded in solving. I offer the simple and satisfactory solution that these kings (or, at least in the case of Amenhetep III, his wife) were in *favour of the invaders*.

It must be borne in mind that, although the earliest letters now existing in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence date from about 1410 B.C., the series is far from complete, and the reports from Canaan, complaining of the activities of "Sa-Gaz" and "Khabiri," do not begin until about 1385 B.C., and then only refer to the intrigues of the Amorite princes Abd-ashirta and his son Aziru, and of the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma in the north. This was in the thirtieth year of Amenhetep III, and twenty-five years after the conquest of Canaan under Joshua. Consequently, even if the Khabiri can be identified with the "Hebrews," these letters cannot describe their initial conquest. It is useless, therefore, to look for the names of kings given in the Book of Joshua in the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, though the places mentioned were the same.

On the other hand, the intrigues of the Hittites and the Amorites in 1385 B.C. do explain how it was that Cushan-Rishathaim was able to oppress Israel from 1383 B.C. to 1375 B.C. The Egyptians advanced to Phenicia in 1377 B.C., but they soon retired. The next year the Hittites conquered Naharin. In 1375 B.C. Abd-ashirta died, and his son was called to Egypt; this gave Othniel his opportunity, and he delivered his people from the yoke of Naharin (Mesopotamia, *i.e.* the country between the *Orontes* and the Euphrates). The next forty years was "rest" for Israel, *i.e.* 1375 B.C. to 1335 B.C. (Judges iii, 11). Now this was the very period of the weakening of Egyptian rule in Palestine under Akhenaton, and their abandonment of the country, till Horemheb restored it, in about 1345 B.C., by his treaty with the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma.

The Israelites were good Egyptian subjects, always keeping within Egyptian jurisdiction, and they were the only people in the Egyptian dominions who were out-and-out monotheists, whose leaders, at any rate, were bent on establishing the supremacy

of Jehovah. It is absurd to suppose that this could be unknown to the king and queen. Who could serve better for the establishment in Canaan of the new religious faith? That Akhenaton did seek to plant his religion in Canaan is evident from the fact that he built an "Aton-city" there, as he did in Egypt and in Nubia. So long as the Israelites were faithful to Egypt, why help to defend the idolatrous Canaanites against such good monotheists? This explanation seems to me to fit the case perfectly.

But these favourable conditions came to an end with the fall of the Aton-cult in Egypt. Under Tut-ankh-amen came the revulsion to the old religion, which was firmly restored by Horemheb. The ideal monotheism of Akhenaton was stamped out, never to rise again; it even became a lasting object of hatred to the Egyptians. The repercussion was not long in falling upon Israel.

By the treaty with the Hittites of 1345 B.C., Naharin and Amurru were left in possession of the Hittites, while Canaan and Phenicia were confirmed to Egypt. But the Israelites would get no protection from Horemheb. Accordingly the Moabites under Eglon had a comparatively easy task in invading and conquering Judæa in 1335 B.C., and in holding it for eighteen years—till 1317 B.C. Horemheb, however vigorous at home, was unable to do anything in Asia. In 1317 B.C. Ehud murdered Eglon, and Israel rose against the Moabites. In 1315 B.C. Horemheb died, and the energetic XIXth Dynasty arose with Rameses I. But he died, too, within a year, and Seti I, his son, came to the throne in 1314 B.C.

In his first year he marched into the country. Undoubtedly, the first to welcome him, protesting their constant fidelity to Egypt, and, more important still, eagerly offering their tribute and help, were the Israelites. Their monotheism, or at any rate their national enthusiasm for it, had by now sadly declined. The protection of the Egyptian king would be well worth the price. Under the stern rule of Seti I and Rameses II (1292 B.C. to 1225 B.C.), Canaan enjoyed the "pax ægyptiaca," which secured to Israel the 80 years' rest spoken of in Judges iii, 30 (1317 B.C. to 1237 B.C.), followed by 40 years more of rest under the judgship of Deborah, 1237 B.C. to 1197 B.C. (Judges v, 31), making 120 years in all. It is true that the extreme northern tribes, Asher, Naphtali and Zebulon, about "Galilee of the Gentiles," suffered for twenty years during this time from the

oppression of a Canaanite kinglet, Jabin of Hazor ; but this was quite local, and there was a good reason for it.

The treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites in 1272 B.C., followed by the marriage alliance of the king in 1259 B.C. with the daughter of Khattusil, resulting in the friendliest relations, set free once more the southward pressure of the Canaanites below the Lebanon mountains, during the feeble old age of Rameses, and while the Hittite kingdom, which was already beginning to decay, was occupied with the invasion of Syria by the rising power of Assyria under Tukulti-Enurta and Ashur-nasir-pal.

Accordingly we find in 1257 B.C., Jabin, the Canaanite king of Hazor, which 150 years before had been the leading state in the Lebanon district (Joshua xi, 1-13), raising his head again, and reasserting the ancient position of his state. Ehud was dead, and under Shamgar anarchy prevailed in the north (Judges v, 6), while Sisera, Jabin's general, devastated Naphtali and Zebulun for twenty years. In 1257 B.C. Deborah aroused Barak to revolt, and, by the slaughter of Sisera by Jael, the freedom of the north was restored, and Deborah judged Israel in peace for forty years, to 1197 B.C.

It is true that Merneptah, who succeeded Rameses in 1234 B.C., made a devastating raid through Palestine three years later (1231 B.C.), a boastful account of which he engraved on the back of an old stela of Amenhotep III ; but the damage he did to the Israelites was at least grossly exaggerated. With indiscriminate ferocity he smashed everything in his path, and after his return in triumph to Egypt collected all the names he could find in a long list in his exultant stela ; but it is significant that the name "Israel" is accompanied by the sign that denotes a foreign people. Israel lived still mostly in the mountains, but they doubtless had settlements in the plains which must have suffered. But so little did the raid affect the nation as a whole, and so small and transitory were its effects, that there is no mention of it in the Bible. Possibly, too, the Israelites, as good Egyptian subjects, took it in good part. The description of Palestine as a "widow" is perhaps a scornful allusion to Deborah.

But Merneptah's gallant struggle, though successful for a time, was in vain. Hordes of mixed peoples from the north-west poured down on Palestine and Egypt, a wholesale invasion which introduced a totally new state of affairs in all the Near East. These northerners also descended into Libya, and some even

poured into the Delta of Egypt, where anarchy had ensued on the death of Seti II, 1205 B.C. Setnekht, 1200 B.C., eventually restored the kingdom, but he reigned only about two years, and was succeeded by his son Rameses III (1198 B.C.). At first this vigorous king had his hands more than full with things at home and threatenings of invasion from Libya. Meanwhile, profiting by the practically entire absence of Egyptian rule in Palestine, and after the death of Deborah in 1197 B.C., the Midianites, and Amalekites and other "children of the east" poured into Judæa and filled the land, hunting the Israelites into the dens and caves of the mountains (Judges vi, 1-10), and "brought Israel very low."

By this time, no doubt, the ruthless destruction of trees in Sinai had desiccated the peninsula into almost its present condition, and the nomad tribes there were drawn to the fertile valleys of Palestine just as the Israelites had been 250 years before. For seven years they devastated the land until the Lord raised up Gideon and delivered Israel by him, 1190-1150 B.C. During this time Egypt was invaded by the Libyans (1194 B.C.), and Rameses III, though he was successful in driving them out, had a severe task which taxed all his resources, and forced him to relinquish all his Asiatic possessions. He had scarcely returned in triumph home, when the whole great wave from the north descended upon him (about 1191 B.C.), both by land and by sea. Rising gallantly to the occasion he defeated them both by land and by sea.

In this crisis Gideon, surnamed "Jerubbaal," with his little band, had his small share in helping the Egyptian overlord. The story is graphically told in Judges vi and vii, and it bears all the indications of truth. Ephraim and the other tribes joined in after Gideon's initial victory, and the deliverance was complete. Although the action of Rameses made this possible, the Book of Judges, which is a "Philosophy of History" rather than a bare narrative, true to its purpose, ascribes it solely to the guidance of Jehovah.

Again the "pax ægyptiaca" reigned in the land for a time, though Rameses soon found it necessary to appear again in Syria with his army, and he organized the Asiatic possessions of Egypt as stably as possible. After a reign of thirty-one years of success, Rameses III died in 1167 B.C. Under his successors Egypt rapidly decayed.

In 1150 B.C., Gideon died and family dissensions arose, but the

general prosperity of the country subsisted. Abimelech, son of Gideon, was "prince over Israel three years" (Judges, ix, 22)—(1150–1147 B.C.). He was followed by Tola, who judged Israel twenty-three years (Judges x, 2)—(1147–1124 B.C.). Then arose Jair the Gileadite for twenty-two years (1124–1102 B.C.).

We must revert now, for light on after-history, to the great invasion of the northerners in 1196 B.C. This had brought with it a new settlement in the coastland of Palestine of colonists from Caphtor (*see* Jer. xlvii, 4, and Amos ix, 7). There had been settlements of "Casluhim" in Philistia from the days of Peleg (2420 B.C.) (*see* Gen. x, 14; xxi, 32, 34; Exod. xv, 14: xxxii, 31; and Judges iii, 3). To these Moses, writing in the fifteenth century B.C., had given the name of "Philistines." The "Casluhim" have not been identified, but it would seem that they came from Caria and Lycia. Some of these, or near relatives of theirs, also settled in Crete, if "Caphtor" is identical with the Egyptian form "Keftiu," as seems probable; but they were not originally Cretans, that is to say, Minoans, from whom they differed in certain particulars. A body of Cretans is recorded in Deut. ii, 23, as having invaded Palestine at a very early date, and as having displaced the aboriginal "Avvim," and "dwelt in villages as far as Gaza."

The Philistines, who now settled in Palestine, are described as true Caphtorim, no doubt on account of their long residence in that island. But both the earlier immigrants from Caria, and the later ones from Crete, seem to have borne the one name of "Pulesati," "Peleset" or "Pelishtim," and to have been of the same character, religion, customs, and costumes. How near the Philistines came to annihilating Israel, and the long struggle that brought out Israel as victorious in the end, with its poignant vicissitudes, is dramatically told in the Books of Judges and Samuel.

Meanwhile another result of the great invasion soon made itself felt in the north-east and east of Palestine.

Mesopotamia and Assyria were under the domination of Babylon from about 1210 to 1174 B.C., but Merodach-Baladan I could do little in Naharin. In 1174 B.C. Ashur-Dan I of Assyria succeeded in turning the tables, with the help of Shutruk-Nakhunte of Elam, on Zamama-shumiddin of Babylon, and shortly afterwards the long-lived Kassite Dynasty of Babylon came to an end (1170 B.C.).

About sixty years afterwards Nebuchadrezzar I of the new

Dynasty of "Pashe," tried to recover the lost dominion of Babylon over Assyria, but he was heavily beaten in two successive campaigns. Again, in 1107 B.C., Marduk-nadin-akhi tried conclusions with Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria, with disastrous results. There was nothing for it but submission, a course which was wisely taken by Marduk-Shapikzerim of Babylon in 1090 B.C., who thus secured peace and prosperity for his kingdom.

But the successful revolt of Ashur-Dan I had restored to Assyria the provinces west of the Euphrates, though the wars with Babylon kept him from exerting his power in that direction. The invasion of the northerners had passed southwards, and the moment was opportune for the establishment of a strong confederation of Aramæans in Syria. "Damascus was now become the centre of an Aramæan state, and gradually in course of time the Amorites and Hittites of the Orontes valley and northern Syria were swamped and absorbed or driven out by the steady pressure of the Aramæans. On the south the new-comers came in contact with the Hebrews, the boundary between Hebrews and Aramæans being on the coast of Jordan the Yarmuk, while on the west it ran northwards up the Jordan valley to the mountains where the tribal territory of Asher marched with the sea coast of the Phenicians" (Hall, p. 400). The effect of this was soon manifested in Gilead and all the Israelite country beyond Jordan. While the newly arrived Philistines were trying to push inland on the west (Judges x, 7), the Ammonites, in 1126 B.C., invaded Gilead north of Jabbok, and "vexed and oppressed the children of Israel that year, eighteen years oppressed they all the children of Israel that were beyond Jordan in the land of the Amorites which is in Gilead" (Judges x, 8). They even crossed the river into Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim. Their excuse was an ancient claim to the land which had been taken by Moses from Sihon three hundred years earlier (Judges xi, 13 *ff.*). From this oppression the Gileadites were finally delivered by Jephthah in 1108 B.C., the Aramæan kingdom being meanwhile raided by Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria.

Meanwhile the Israelites in Canaan continued to enjoy comparative quiet under the failing rule of Egypt, giving them a certain degree of autonomy, while judged by Tola and Jair, the latter governing Cis-Jordania until 1102 B.C., while Jephthah governed Gilead beyond Jordan till the same year. Ibsan followed them over all Israel till 1096 B.C. It was during his judgeship that Eli was high-priest and ecclesiastical judge,

and the birth of Samuel may also be placed in this period. All was still quiet. Babylon and Assyria were on good terms, which lasted for many years. The XXth Dynasty of Egypt had decayed rapidly under a succession of feeble Ramessides, until in 1100 B.C. Herihor, a priest of Amen at Thebes, took the reins and founded the XXIst Dynasty. He was, however, unable to control all Egypt, and a dynasty of Tanites under Nsibanebedd established themselves as kings of the Delta.

In 1095 B.C. Ibzan was succeeded by Elon as judge of Israel, and in 1085 B.C. Abdon followed him till 1077 B.C.

But the dark cloud that had been rising in the south-west of Palestine now loomed up black and threatening. We may place the rise of Samson in about 1079 B.C., the man with a character strangely mixed of strength and weakness, who was destined to play a large part in the lurid drama. He acted as military leader for twenty years, under Eli and Abdon, with some success at first, until he went down, captive and blind, not long before the death of Eli in about 1059 B.C.

While Abdon was judging Israel, the Philistines on the Mediterranean coast had by now organized themselves and had become a formidable force. Finally, in 1077 B.C., the storm broke over Israel which came near to annihilating the nation. For forty years the Chosen People, who had woefully degenerated from being what Moses and Joshua had tried to make them, with no help from any outside source—their patron Egypt being all but prostrate also—bore the brunt of the determined efforts of the Philistines to subdue them.

In 1059 B.C. a disastrous battle ended in the capture of the Ark, the death of the two sons of the high-priest and the consequent death of old Eli himself. The superstitious Philistines, however, smitten with fear of plague, soon returned the Ark, which was deposited in the house of one Abinadab (1059 B.C.). Meanwhile his foster-son Samuel had taken on the reins from the falling hands of Eli, and with unflinching faith held fast to the anchor of hope—though almost alone. Despairing Israel, left without a leader after the collapse of their hero Samson, looked to some man to deliver them, and, at last, decided to stand out as an independent monarchy. In spite of Samuel's protests, he was directed by God to humour the people in so far as to give them a lesson in the futility of the remedy of their own choosing. The choice fell on Saul, a big, commanding Benjamite, and in a private interview in 1052 B.C. this man was anointed by Samuel

as "prince" or "captain" (*nagid*, not king, *melek*) of Israel (1 Sam. x, 1). He does not seem, however, to have taken an active part in defending the people till some twenty-five years afterwards, when he came forth and led the people to victory over Nahash the Ammonite at Jabesh-Gilead, 1027 B.C., after which he was publicly acclaimed as king by the whole people (1 Sam. xi, 15).

Before this it was Samuel who judged the people. After the Ark had been for twenty years in the house of Abinadab, the people began to "lament after the Lord" (1 Sam. vii, 2). Samuel gathered them at Mizpeh and organized reforms. Then, in 1037 B.C., an attack by the Philistines was repulsed in a decisive battle at Ebenezer: "so the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more into the coast of Israel," thus ending the forty years of oppression by the Philistines of Judges xiii, 1. The Israelites even recovered "the cities which the Philistines had taken from Israel, from Ekron even unto Gath; and the coasts thereof did Israel deliver out of the hands of the Philistines" (1 Sam. vii, 14). There was also peace between Israel and the Amorites.

This happy state of peace between the belligerents lasted for twelve years, until the second year of Saul's reign as king, *i.e.* 1025 B.C. (1 Sam. xiii, 1), when Saul attacked the Philistines at Michmash. He was now a middle-aged man with grown sons, the youngest of whom, Ishbosheth, was twenty-five years old. Another son, Jonathan, showed fine qualities, and, had he lived, would have made a first-class king. But God had other designs, and was preparing "a man after his own heart." The story of David is a little difficult to piece together chronologically. As he was thirty years old when he began to reign in Hebron (1 Sam. v, 8), in 1012 B.C., we know that he was born in 1042 B.C., ten years after Saul was anointed by Samuel as "leader." If we place David's slaughter of Goliath in the year after the Battle of Michmash in 1025 B.C., he would be about eighteen years old when he performed that exploit. It was before this (1 Sam. xvii, 15) that he used to play the harp for Saul. From the state of Saul's mind on those occasions it is not surprising that he did not connect the young musician with the hero of the great exploit on Goliath.

Though the temporary successes of Saul and Jonathan showed what could be done with the united people, the Philistines, when thoroughly roused, could generally master them with comparative



ease, and the gallant efforts of Saul and Jonathan ended in disaster on Mount Gilboa (1012 B.C.).

The Philistines seem to have been content with this victory, and Ishbosheth carried on his father's work quite undisturbed by them for seven years, till he was murdered in 1005 B.C. Meanwhile his brethren of Judah had crowned David as their king at Hebron, on the death of Saul. After the death of Ishbosheth, all Israel combined to make David king. His first act was to capture the still unsubdued citadel of the Jebusites in Jerusalem. This he fortified, and then made Jerusalem the capital of the country. Here he reigned for thirty-three years, to 972 B.C. With uniform success he conquered all the enemies of Israel, and left to his son Solomon a consolidated and independent realm which secured to Israel the position, for the time being, of one of the acknowledged powers of the Near East.

As the history of Israel now enters on a new phase, we will draw our rapid sketch to a close at this point.

There are very many other points of contact of which much might be said. They all show that the history given in the Bible is in minute concordance with such facts as have been definitely ascertained of the history and chronology of the surrounding nations. All that is required is to stick closely to the actual text of the Bible, in all its figures as well as its words, to see that it is literally true.

[*N.B.*—For the purpose of this paper the subject has been treated from the purely political point of view. That the hand and mind of the All-Mighty was behind all the movements discussed, as revealed in the first ten Books of the Holy Scriptures, is the author's firm belief. The rich spiritual lessons of types and doctrines are made none the less valuable by being thrown out against the dark background of Israel's failure and the strivings of the nations.]

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony) said : This is one of the most learned and relevant papers for the purposes of the Institute that I remember to have heard read. There are many original theories advanced in it, and they seem to be of a constructional character which will strengthen our faith in the accuracy of Scripture.

We are asked to alter our long-held ideas as to the position of the land of Goshen and other matters, but these ideas, to begin with, were not based on plain readings of the Bible.

Many have been puzzled as to what could possibly have caused seven years of famine in Egypt. Mr. Michell advances an interesting and tenable hypothesis as to how this might have come about, but he does not say that there is any historical evidence, apart from Scripture, whether it *did* come about in this way or not. I hope that he will add some remarks on this point in his general reply. Sir William Willcocks, K.C.M.G., M.I.C.E., in his book on *The Assuân Dam and Lake Moeris*, gives plans and levels of the Fayoum, and many facts from which we may gather that the famine in Egypt in Joseph's time may well have been caused by a power hostile to lower Egypt diverting the Nile flood into the Fayoum. He quotes Diodorus Siculus as follows: "King Moeris dug a lake which is amazingly useful and incredibly large. For as the rising of the Nile is irregular, and the fertility of the country depends on its uniformity, he dug the lake for the reception of the superfluous water, and he constructed a canal from the river to the lake 80 furlongs in length and 300 feet in breadth. Through this he admitted or *let out* the water as required." Then King Amenemhat of the XIIIth Dynasty "widened and deepened the canal."

Sir William Willcocks describes how this "mighty inland sea" (2,500 square kilometres) "was quite capable of reducing a very high flood to moderate dimensions; and if injudiciously or maliciously opened in a low flood, it was capable of depriving Lower Egypt of any flood irrigation at all, and mind, in those days, they had practically no irrigation except flood irrigation. . . . The history of Joseph's famine becomes quite intelligible. . . . It may be that during some of these years the Nile was experiencing a series of low years such as we have had since 1899. In this case the famine in Egypt, aggravated by the opening of the Lake Moeris dyke, must have been severe indeed."

Sir William appears to hold that the drawing back of the water of the Lake during low Nile, plus infiltration into the sand, plus loss by evaporation, would so reduce the level of Lake Moeris during low Nile that it could take the flood discharge for several years in succession, provided that no extra heavy flood came down. From

figures he gives, in another work, it appears that the summer discharge of the Nile is only one-twelfth the average flood discharge. It is therefore clear that, if the canal was wide and deep enough, a quantity of water could be drained back at low Nile, which would be useless for irrigation purposes in the Delta.

Our author confirms all this from the chronological and historical side.

(A vote of thanks having been accorded for the paper, the discussion proceeded.)

MR. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: The paper to which we have listened is, of course, very difficult to follow because it cuts vertically and horizontally all the chronology which we have learnt from youth upward. We still regard Usher, with all his faults, as the father of Biblical chronology, and when one considers the limited material he had to work upon we must regard his work as really wonderful. There is, however, one branch of Biblical chronology which seems to have been neglected, but which I feel sure would be a fruitful field for investigation, and that is the Jubilees and the Sabbatical years.

It is generally conceded that we have four dates about which we are tolerably certain—these are Sabbatical or Jubilee dates—*viz.* 590, 163, 135 and 37 B.C. Upon the face of it, it is quite clear that 163 and 135 cannot both be Jubilee years, but may be Sabbatical years, because the difference between 163 and 135 is not  $7 \times 7$  (equals 49) but only 28 years ( $4 \times 7$ ). From these figures it is easy to make, with absolute certainty, a list of all the Sabbatical years, going backward or forward seven years at a time for any of these dates. For example, if you start at 37, and count back the Sabbatical years seven at a time, the dates are 44, 51, 58, 65, and you come back to 135. If you start at 135, and take seven years backward, you get 142, 149, 156, 163 B.C. If then you work backward from that, you will come to 590 B.C. Further, if you work backward from that, you come to 1003 B.C., the generally accepted date for the consecration of the Temple of Solomon.

The difficult years to discover are the Jubilee years, and for that we have practically little data. If we can only be sure of but *one* Jubilee year, then all other Jubilee years are easily calculated. I

am going to suggest that A.D. 26 was a Jubilee year, and I do it on several grounds: I have before me Lindo's Jewish Calendar, giving the sections of the Law and Prophets to be read on every Sabbath, which list is supposed to have been derived from the work of Ezra. The section for the Sabbath numbered 51, which comprises the reading of Deut. xxix, 10, to the end of chapter xxx, was on the Sabbath called Nitzabin (taken from the first word of the Lesson), read together with Isa. lxi, 10-lxiii, 10. The Lesson called Nitzabin is always in *every* Jewish year read on the last Sabbath of the year—which is generally about the middle of September. That is followed, about ten days later, by the Day of Atonement, which generally begins early in October, and is ten days later, being the 10th day of the month Tishri. Now on that memorable Sabbath when our Lord went into the synagogue, and after the reading of the Law had handed to Him the roll of the Prophet Isaiah, instead of beginning to read from verse 10 of chapter lxi, he read verse 1, a passage which, apparently, had never before been read in public, because I suppose no one ever felt he could say that the "Spirit of the Lord was upon him." In this verse you have the words "the acceptable year of the Lord," which is a Jewish term for the Jubilee. There is a passage, Luke vi, 1, which seems to suggest that there were two Sabbaths between Luke iv, 32, and Luke vi, that the second Sabbath was a Great Sabbath and the Sabbath nearest to the Day of Atonement. At any rate that is the view of some who have studied the Greek text.

Now at the time of the Jubilee it was the custom for all debts to be forgiven by the pious Jews, and for all persons to be restored to their ancestral lands: this explains several passages in the Gospels, and notably that in the *Paternoster*, which says "forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors." Supposing that I am right, and that the list which I have drawn up is correct,\* then from the time of the first keeping of the Jubilee in Palestine, say, 1444 B.C. to A.D. 26, there would have been 210 Sabbatical years and 30 Jubilees—1444 plus 26 equals 1470, divided by 7 equals 210, and divided by 7 equals 30; and if we assume that the call of Moses was the first day from which to reckon the Jubilee year (two years before the Exodus, forty years in the wilderness, and seven fighting for

---

\* See List on p. 95 *infra*.

the land, you get another forty-nine). You then make up that list to approximately our own day, that is, A.D. 1937, and you will have seventy Jubilees, or 3,430 years.

It must be confessed there are very few traces of the Jubilees in the Bible, but there are certain events which are better understood if we connect them with these Sabbatical or Jubilee years. If you take the case of Ruth, which is generally dated 1312 B.C., you will see that the next Jubilee is 1297 B.C.; therefore the land of the family had to be redeemed at a value to be based on the next Jubilee. If the date when David was in the Cave of Adullam was 1062 B.C., the next Jubilee would be 1052, or 10 years later, and we may assume that the Shylocks of that day were very insistent upon getting in their money before the Jubilee could "wipe the slate" and cancel debtors' obligations; so in the language of the Hebrew, there were a number of desperate men who gathered to David who had a creditor or were bitter of soul. If you take the widow whose son was going to be seized by a creditor and put the date at 895 B.C., the next Sabbatical year would be 891 B.C.; so her son would be for four years under the dominion of some person who had purchased him. The Shunamite also, dated at 885 B.C.; the next Jubilee is not till 856, or 29 years later, yet the king commanded that the land should be returned to her.

There is a famous case of 590 B.C., which is referred to in Jer. xxxiv, but this is obviously not a case of a Jubilee but of a Sabbatical year, and 590 was a Sabbatical year. Coming down to later times, the Jubilee year was due in A.D. 75, or five years after the fall of Jerusalem, and two years after the Sabbatical year, and it may have been the Sabbatical festivities which caused Jerusalem to be so full of fanatics at the time of the outbreak which led to the downfall of Jerusalem. One thing, however, is on record, that the beginning of the rebellion was when a number of wild and desperate men attacked and destroyed the archives of Jerusalem and all records of debts.

Finally, I would like to say that there is a very strange coincidence. From this last date A.D. 26, we find that 1839 would be a Jubilee year, and that on August 1st, 1838, possibly, if we could really get the very day, we should find it exactly fell on a Jubilee day that slavery was finally and for ever abolished in the British Empire. There

seems nothing, however, under the subsequent dates which in any way connects Jubilees or Sabbatical years with the taking of Jerusalem on December 9th, 1917, the date when England became at once the liberator and the protector of what is yet to be the renewed Jewish Kingdom or State.

**Mr. G. WILSON HEATH:** Mr. Michell has evidently given the subject much thought and careful study. I rather think that he has endeavoured to solve an impossible problem, and I say this after some considerable study of the subject. The paper easily makes openings for kindly criticism; but as the whole theory seems to rest on chronology, I will direct my remarks to this.

I am convinced that true Bible chronology and that of "ancient nations" will never be found to agree. The records on stone, baked bricks or papyrus, are conflicting, whereas the chronology of the Bible, if gathered up with care and without prejudice, is never contradictory. It is well known that the kings or rulers of "ancient nations," in order to attain their own personal ends, had a bad habit of altering or obliterating records of dates, and at times they destroyed the records entirely. They kept, of course, all such records in their own libraries, and under their own charge, and were thus able to do exactly as their particular policy might indicate. Not so with Bible chronology; it remains absolutely dependable, as God breathed it.

Usher's dates, as given in our Bibles, up to the end of the Book of Joshua, are, I believe, as nearly correct as may be; I have taken some trouble to verify this. Throughout the Book of Judges, Usher seriously fails; by allowing a curious error to creep in, and apparently Mr. Michell does the same. Both seem to make their "bench-mark" the 480 years mentioned in 1 Kings vi, and both of them, possibly, forgetting that the Apostle Paul in Acts xiii gives the number of years covered by exactly the same period as 573 years, this being the correct number in *anno mundi* years.

It appears to me that the lecturer, like Usher, by taking 480 instead of 573 years, starts with false premises and of necessity arrives at false deductions; and this, in exactly the way Usher's dates, after the Book of Joshua (*i.e.* in Judges), confuses many issues; so does Mr. Michell. For instance, we are told that Joseph died

1808 B.C., and that 400 years afterward Joshua led the children of Israel into the promised land of Canaan; this is stated to fulfil a promise given to Abraham. I will not labour the point that this was not the promise given to Abraham or to anyone else, but I suggest that the date, 1808 B.C., is arrived at by a method of calculating *backward* from 1 Kings vi, and is therefore seriously incorrect. If the chronology had been calculated from the known "bench-mark"—Adam's age as given in Gen. v and thence forward—than which nothing can be simpler, for the Genesis ages are all clearly stated—it would have been found that Joseph died in 1635 B.C. (at the age of 110) and not in 1808 B.C.. In Exod. xii, 40, 41 (and this is where the 400 and 430 years come in), we are reminded of God's promise to Abraham in Gen. xii, in 1921 B.C., from which time the 430 years can easily be calculated as being reached exactly as stated in Exod. xii, in 1491 B.C., the "sojourning" in Egypt being 215 years and the "dwelling" 215 years, or 430 years in all: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years. And it came to pass at the end of 430 years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This, I submit, contradicts the suggestion that the 400 years must be calculated from the death of Joseph to the entrance into Canaan under Joshua, which is said in the paper to have taken place in 1409 B.C., but which I believe to have been in 1451 B.C. The quotation in Exod. xii, 40, 41, settles the question for me.

On p. 68 we are told that Joseph was sold into Egypt in 1901 B.C., but by very simple Bible chronology it can be proved that this event occurred in 1727 B.C., when he was 18 years of age, and he died at the age of 110 in 1635 B.C. As far as I have tested the chronology in the paper I have failed to find a date upon which I could rely, and this is what I should expect from the method adopted by Mr. Michell. A starting-point or "bench-mark," as all compilers of figures and calculators well know, must be at one or the other end of a datum line. Mr. Michell, I judge, starts at 1 Kings vi, which is somewhere along his datum line, and works backward it seems, with disaster to his results and his Hyksos theory, with which I therefore cannot agree chronologically, though in large measure agree on other grounds. We must remember that Egyptology is at the moment in the melting-pot of revision.

As to the later part of the paper, may I say that to me confusion appears to deepen. I am sure that God's chronology is orderly, and I submit that, from the creation of Adam to the birth of our Lord, as most chronologers admit, there was an interval of, say, 4,000 or 4,100 years. I have no doubt it was  $100 \times 40 = 4,000$  years, be these years of 360 or 365 days is immaterial. Further, the Kingdom was set up when Saul was anointed, and this, I suggest, was in 1000 B.C. Samuel had previously judged Israel for 40 years; then Saul, David and Solomon each reigned 40 years; and this number 40 (and its multiples) dominates the entire book (*see* the flood periods of 40, the Tabernacle details of 40, the wilderness journeyings of 40 years, the 40 stripes and many 40 days, etc.).

I am glad to agree whole-heartedly with the last sentence in the paper (p. 81): "All that is required is to stick closely to the actual text of the Bible, in all its figures as well as its words, to see that it is literally true."

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT: I consider the last two paragraphs are really the best part of this paper, and if only Mr. Michell had adhered more closely to the Scripture record throughout, his Lecture would have been much more valuable. For example, he speaks on p. 67 of the "400 years" affliction of the Hebrews as terminating when Joshua entered Canaan, while the Scriptures speak of "430" years, and tell us distinctly that the period ended, not when Joshua entered Canaan, but the day that Israel *went out from the land of Egypt*, or 40 years before Joshua entered Canaan! (Exod. xii, 41.)

Then, on p. 72, he speaks of the Egyptians doing "all they could to facilitate the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt," and that the Hebrews even "enjoyed the favour" of Pharaoh, as if they were all friendly together. This is not at all the impression one gets from reading the sacred Record. Indeed, it is just the opposite. For it was only after Egypt had been devastated by ten plagues that Pharaoh, at length, reluctantly let the people go (Exod. x, 7). Even then Pharaoh regretted that he had done so (Exod. xiv, 5), and actually later pursued after them (Exod. xiv, 8). As to the attitude of the Egyptian *people* toward the Israelites, it was only by divine intervention that they showed them any favour at all, as we read in Exod. xii, 36: "*The Lord gave the people favour in the*



*sight of the Egyptians.*" Why the lecturer should have given us such a confusing account of these occurrences I cannot understand.

MISS HAMILTON LAW: May it not be that over and above any action of the rival princes in Middle and Upper Egypt, there really was a scarcity of water? If the sudd (a weed) up above Khartoum had grown to any very great extent, it would have trapped a good deal of the alluvial deposit which is in the Nile water, a natural dam would have been formed, and a vast quantity of water would have been held up. The force-weight of this volume of water might in time have rushed the sudd, broken through it, and caused great plenty. One has heard this suggestion put forward in Egypt.

Lieut.-Colonel A. H. C. KENNEY-HERBERT said: Any remarks that I can offer must be made without that consideration which this paper deserves. I was on the Headquarter Staff of the Army of Occupation from 1901 to 1906, and now speak from memory of any general information, picked up more than twenty years ago.

(1) *Re* the suggestion that the Israelites were settled south of Cairo, speaking as a soldier, I would ask how they could leave their homes after dawn on 15th Abib and reach Succoth that evening, Etham by next evening, and Pihahiroth the day after? It was physically impossible for any general to conduct an untrained rabble of slaves so long a distance in the time. True that they could have marched by moonlight.

(2) Once we carried out manœuvres at the very point generally supposed to be Rameses. We rode back to Cairo in one day from, if I remember right, Belbeis. Without meaning to do so, we competed with an old sheik on his donkey. His donkey never varied a running titup. Often we passed him at the canter, but he caught us up when we walked, and in the long run he arrived in Cairo before us, cool and undisturbed. My memory is that the day's ride did really take some nine hours or so. Add a further ten miles to the point suggested by the writer—ten miles through soft sand—and I submit that a rabble with women and children could not have done the march on foot in under two or three days. From where I speak of, Belbeis, there would be quite three days' further journey, *via* Succoth, Etham and Pihahiroth to any point of the Bitter Lake.

(3) I always understood that the Yusuf Canal was constructed by Joseph after he had been made a viceroy ; that is to say after or during the seven years' plenty and the seven years' famine. If this be true, the canal could not have been used to divert the waters of the Nile to the Fayoum oasis. A better point for this suggestion would have been a marked valley, east of the Nile at Aswan.

(4) The holding back of the waters, if due to sudd, might have caused a shortage for the seven years' famine, but the bursting of the accidental dam of vegetation could not account for the years of plenty which preceded the year of famine. The plenty was, the famine was ; I do not see anything very unusual or improbable in this.

I regret that I know nothing of Egyptology, and dare not criticize the writer's suggestions from that point of view, but I have spent some seven years in working out the chronology of the Bible, on the assumption that God Himself is the Author of it, and is responsible for every word and letter of the original. I find that the statements of time contained in the Bible can be pieced together without amending any text from that which has been generally "received." The scheme of chronology that results stands the test of the closest examination of moon dates and weekdays, and I can find no flaw in the harmony.

From the point of view of the student who is seeking exact dates compiled from the Bible only, I regard those of this paper as valueless. If the writer is content with a broad margin of twenty-five years either way, and if this margin justifies the harmony he proposes, personally I have no more to say. I think that he places the Exodus some twenty-seven years too late, and Solomon some eighteen years too soon. But I could not substantiate this opinion without data which would be wearisome to listen to.

I hope that the author will succeed in establishing his points for the benefit of those who would be happier to know that such a harmony is possible. Personally, I believe that the ox and ass may not be yoked together to plough this field of research.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., writes : The lecturer states, on p. 66 : " the descent of Jacob to Egypt was 430 years

before the Exodus" (Exod. xii, 41), but this statement is open to some argument. The Biblical statements are (a) Gen. xv, 13, 16: "Thy seed shall be a stranger . . . and they shall afflict them 400 years" (quoted in Acts vi, 6) . . . "but in the fourth generation they shall come hither again"; (b) Exod. xii, 40: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years"; (c) Gal. iii, 17: "The covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul."

These statements, viewed superficially, appear to be discordant; but the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX throw a different light on Exod. xii, 40. "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers, who dwelt *in the land of Canaan* and in the land of Egypt, was 430 years" (Sam. Pent.). The LXX reads practically the same, and the Palestine Targum explains the 430 years in the same way as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX. If this is correct, and there is at least a *prima facie* case in its favour, the 430 years would seem to date from the call of Abraham (*at.* 75) (Gen. xii, 1), and the 400 years from the mocking of Isaac by Ishmael (a typical historical fact), which was some 30 years later (Isaac *at.* 5, and Abraham 105). The descent of Jacob into Egypt would then be 215 years before the Exodus. This chronology does not seem to be in disaccord with the Bible statements, viewed typically, and removes the apparent difficulties. If correct, the lecturer's dates and chronology of this period would require serious modification.

#### AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am grateful for Lieut.-Colonel Molony's kind appreciation of my paper, but I regret that so little attention was paid to the real subject of my thesis, and that the discussion on it was so largely diverted to side issues.

My purpose was by no means to propose a "harmony," but to examine the Comparative Chronology of *Ancient Nations* in its bearing on Holy Scripture. The Bible does not require harmonizing either with profane history or with profane science. It is the revealed Truth of God, and the standard by which all man's works and thoughts are to be judged.

I must decline to discuss here rival schemes of Bible chronology, which are in no way relevant to my subject.

I have taken the chronology of the Bible as it stands in the Massoretic text, and stuck closely to all its figures as well as its words. This is why I reject the chronology of Usher, which requires the alteration of some of the figures, and which later information has shown to be imperfect.

I find it stated in 1 Kings vi, 1, that the period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple was exactly 480 years. I also find it stated in Exod. xii, 40, 41, that the sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in Egypt, was 430 years. I take these statements to be the inspired words of God, and that is quite enough for me. I cannot pit St. Paul's incidental and indefinite remark against the positive statement in Kings, which I believe to be equally inspired with the Apostle. And I interpret St. Paul so as to accord with Judges, Samuel and Kings. St. Paul says nothing whatever about 573 years, which are an unwarranted intrusion into his text.

Neither can I admit the authority of the late and very faulty translation of the LXX, nor of the Samaritan, against that of the Hebrew text. Mr. Iverach Munro has shown that the Samaritan was extensively revised (*Transactions of Victoria Institute*, vol. xlv, p. 187). And I take the "confirmation" of Gal. iii, 15, 17, to refer to the assurance given by God to Jacob at Beer-Sheba on his way to Egypt, as recorded in Gen. xlvi, 1-4.

I stick to the Bible statement that the *sojourn* of the Israelites in Egypt lasted exactly 430 years, from the descent of Jacob to the Exodus. The 400 years of *affliction* in Egypt is quite a different matter. It manifestly began *after the death of Joseph*, before which time the Israelites were in the very contrary condition to affliction. It ended when the Israelites *ought* to have entered into rest in the Promised Land (Heb. iv, 8). It is misleading to confuse the two different periods, as Mr. Sidney Collett does. I am sorry he finds my account confusing. If he will take the trouble to set out my figures on a sheet of paper in tabular form, I think he will see the account to be clear enough.

The answer to Lieut.-Colonel Molony's question whether the Fayoum depression would hold the crest of five or six Nile floods is given in the affirmative by the extract from Sir William Willcocks' *The Assuân Dam and Lake Moeris*. The whole question is thoroughly discussed in Sir William's *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing*

of the *Jordan*\*. With regard to the *outlet* from the Fayoum to the Nile, none exists now. It was silted up centuries ago. It is now represented by the Magnuna Canal, north of the Gebel Abu Sir, and originally fell into the Nile a little south of Wasta, along the immense bank, built by Menes, now known as the *Salibat Qusheisheh*. The causes of this silting up it would be too long to give here, but I shall be happy to furnish Sir William Willcocks' explanation of them to anyone who will be good enough to write to me (c/o The Nile Mission Press, Sharia Manakh, Cairo).

The Nile brings down so much silt that its bed rises about four inches in a century. It is now, therefore, about 13 feet above its level in the days of Amenemhat III (1970 B.C.). The lowest point of the Fayoum, now the Birket Qarun, is about 170 feet below sea-level. The level to which the water rose in Lake Moeris is marked by uniform lines of Nile shells at 22.5 metres (about 74 feet) above sea-level.

As for historical evidence that the famine of Joseph's time did come about in the way I have described, some people have thought that the famine "lasting many years" recorded in the inscription on the tomb, at El Kab, of one Baba, an official under Seqenen-Ra III of Thebes, was that of Joseph. But the "short chronology" now accepted (with the addition of 120 years on account of the change in the Egyptian calendar before the XVIIIth Dynasty), makes this impossible, as it is 270 years too late. Another long famine occurred in the time of the last Pharaohs, and again another in A.D. 1065. The latter lasted for seven years, till A.D. 1071. The conditions on all these occasions make it practically certain that they arose from the cause I have advanced.

In reply to Colonel Kenney-Herbert's point (3), what is now the Bahr Yusuf canal was originally the western one of the two main channels of the Nile which enclosed the "Island Nome" of antiquity, now the Gebel Abu Sir. After the neglect of Lake Moeris as an overflow basin, this branch silted up. It was deepened by Saladin (Salah ed Din Yusuf ibn Ayub, Sultan of Egypt, A.D. 1171-93), and received its present name "Yusuf" from that monarch.

May I ask Colonel Kenney-Herbert whence he gets the impression that the Israelites left their homes at dawn, and reached Succoth that evening, Etham by the next evening, and Pihahiroth the day

\* London: E. and F. N. Spon.

after? I find these stages mentioned, but nothing as to the time they took to do the distances. The people took a whole month (Exod. xvi, 1) to reach the "Wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai," and there is no reason to imagine that they spent nearly the whole of that time at Elim. The docility of the people in turning back at Pi-ha Hirot shows that they were in no fear of recapture, and also that they were in no hurry to reach any particular place. I believe they drifted along at their leisure, the encampments mentioned being those of Moses' headquarters. This applies to the whole forty years. The Israelites did not pass Belbeis at all, nor the Bitter Lakes. They crossed the Nile by the Meadi ferries, passed Basatin, and along the Wadi et Tih, by Bir el Jeudali, directly eastwards to Suez past the Gebel Ataka, probably to the *south* of this hill. Père Sicard did this journey in 1716, in two days, on a donkey.

Of course, the attitude of Pharaoh and his people towards the Israelites was by Divine intervention, and Pharaoh was reluctant enough to let the people go. But after the hammer-blows of the plagues they were terrified, and only too anxious to get rid of Moses and his whole crowd. Israel marched out with, no doubt, an arrogant air. It was only when Pharaoh learned, by their doubling back at Pi-ha Hirot, that they were not intending only to perform their religious ceremonies in the Arabian Desert, as he had expected, but were leaving Egypt proper altogether, that he pursued after them. Till then he left them quite free. He had probably sent orders to his local authorities to give them every facility.

With regard to the sudd in the Nile, I know of no reason why it should have had any other effect in ancient times than it has now. But as the bed of the river was 13 feet deeper in Joseph's time, it does not seem probable that sudd collected then at all.

I quite agree with Mr. Wilson Heath that the number forty and its multiples dominate the history of Israel, and I add to his examples the following interesting facts:—

- (1) The affliction of Israel in Egypt lasted 400 years ( $40 \times 10$ ).
- (2) The period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple was 480 years ( $40 \times 12$ ). I have no doubt that Solomon waited until the second month of his *fourth year* with the definite intention of beginning the Temple on the 480th anniversary of the Exodus.
- (3) From the failure of the men of Judah to drive out the Jebusites

from Jerusalem, in 1404 B.C., to the success of David in doing so, in 1004 B.C., was also 400 years ( $40 \times 10$ ).

- (4) From David's capture of Zion, in 1004 B.C., to Nebuchadnezzar's capture of it, in 604 B.C. (Jer. xxv, 1; Dan. i, 1), was also 400 years ( $40 \times 10$ ).

But I can find no Scriptural warrant for the surmise that the creation of Adam was 4,000 years before the Birth of our Lord.

With regard to the period from the Exodus to the Foundation of the Temple, we have an independent confirmation that it was exactly 480 years, as stated in 1 Kings vi, 1, in the argument of Jephthah in Judges xi, 26. He pointed out that it was then just 300 years since the Israelites conquered Heshbon. If the 40 years from the Exodus to that conquest, and the periods between Jephthah and the Foundation of the Temple, as shown in my paper, are added to these 300 years, they will be found to make exactly 480 years. Thus:—Wandering, 40; to Jephthah, 300; Jephthah, 6; Ibzan, 7; Elon, 10; Abdon, 8; Philistines, 40; Ebenezer to Saul, 10; Saul as *king*, 15; David, 40; Solomon's fourth year, 4; total, 480.

I have only to add that I shall be happy to send, gratis and post free, to anyone that cares to ask for it, a copy of my complete tables of the comparative chronology of the whole of the Old Testament.

SUGGESTED LIST OF JUBILEE AND SABBATICAL YEARS.

By W. C. EDWARDS.

(See p. 84 and note.)

B.C. 1444 (1437, 1430, 1423, 1416, 1409, 1402)	B.C. 660 (653, 646, 639, 632, 625, 618)
1395 (1388, 1381, 1374, 1367, 1360, 1353)	611 (604, 597, 590, 583, 576, 569)
1346 (1339, 1332, 1325, 1318, 1311, 1304)	562 (555, 548, 541, 534, 527, 520)
1297 (1290, 1283, 1276, 1269, 1262, 1255)	513 (506, 499, 492, 485, 478, 471)
1248 (1241, 1234, 1227, 1220, 1213, 1206)	464 (457, 450, 443, 436, 429, 422)
1199 (1192, 1185, 1178, 1171, 1164, 1157)	415 (408, 401, 394, 387, 380, 373)
1150 (1143, 1136, 1129, 1122, 1115, 1108)	366 (359, 352, 345, 338, 331, 324)
1101 (1094, 1087, 1080, 1073, 1066, 1059)	317 (310, 303, 296, 289, 282, 275)
1052 (1045, 1038, 1031, 1024, 1017, 1010)	268 (261, 254, 247, 240, 233, 226)
1003 (996, 989, 982, 975, 968, 961)	219 (212, 205, 198, 191, 184, 177)
954 (947, 940, 933, 926, 919, 912)	170 (163, 156, 149, 142, 135, 128)
905 (898, 891, 884, 877, 870, 863)	121 (114, 107, 100, 93, 86, 79)
856 (849, 842, 835, 828, 821, 814)	72 (65, 58, 51, 44, 37, 30)
807 (800, 793, 786, 779, 772, 765)	23 (16, 9, 2. A.D. 5, 12, 19)
758 (751, 744, 737, 730, 723, 716)	A.D. 26 (33, 40, 47, 54, 61, 68)
709 (702, 695, 688, 681, 674, 667)	75

695TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

AVARY H. FORBES, ESQ., M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

As the Hon. Secretary was unable to be present, through illness, the Minutes of the previous Meeting were read by Dr. THIRTLE, and signed, and the following elections were announced:—As a Member: Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S.; as an Associate: Patrick K. Irwin, Esq.; and as Library Associate: the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago.

The Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, D.D., was unable to be present to read his paper on "The Identification of the Pharaohs of the Pentateuch," and the CHAIRMAN kindly read it for him.

---

*THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PHARAOHS OF THE  
PENTATEUCH.*

By THE REV. G. A. FRANK KNIGHT, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.E.

CURIOSITY has always been strong in regard to the identification of those monarchs of Egypt who figure so prominently in connection with the early annals of the Hebrew race. The fact that merely their dynastic name—"Pharaoh" (= "The Great House")—is given in Scripture, opens the door to wide diversity of opinion, and conjectures as to the persons concealed under this vague title have been many. Yet the consensus of modern discovery has gradually been converging towards certain definite conclusions.

(i) *The Pharaoh of Abraham's time.*

The earliest Pharaoh mentioned in the Bible is the sovereign with whom Abraham came in contact (Gen. xii, 10 ff.). It is



now generally agreed that Abraham's descent into Egypt took place during the Hyksos regime. The Hyksos, who belonged to the great Semitic race, overflowed from Arabia in successive swarms, invaded Egypt while the Nile Valley was in the hands of the feeble monarchs of the XIVth Dynasty, and in countless hordes poured in and subjugated the whole land. Yet no sooner had they conquered the country than they were themselves overcome by the civilization which they temporarily displaced. For these nomads settled down in the land they had subdued, availed themselves of the resources of the arts and culture they had despised, adopted the language, learning, and religion of the subjugated population, and to a large extent became thorough Egyptians. They constitute what are known to history as the XVth and XVIth Dynasties.\*

It was sometime during the XVth Dynasty that Abraham entered the Delta. The view once held, that he came down to Egypt during the XIIth Dynasty, when the powerful Amenemhats were on the throne, has now been entirely discarded. Equally impossible from a chronological point of view is the argument that Abraham came into Egypt during the XIXth, or towards the close of the XXth Dynasty. But various clues led us to relegate his entrance to about 2080 B.C., when the Hyksos had settled themselves in the land. The chief clue is his association with Amraphel, king of Shinar (Gen. xiv, 1), whom modern scholars, with practical unanimity, now identify with the famous Hammurabi of Babylon, the sixth king of the Ist Dynasty.† Hammurabi's era has been assigned by Kugler to 2123–2080 B.C., by Langdon to 2067–2024 B.C., and by others to dates slightly different. As the Biblical chronology gives 2090 B.C.‡ as the

---

\* One of the latest discussions on the voluminous Hyksos question—whether the Hyksos were of Semitic or of non-Semitic affinities—will be found in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, i, pp. 310 ff. Various scholars have claimed them as Scythians, Mitanni, Hittites, Pelasgians, etc. It is now, however, generally agreed that they were of Semitic stock. (See Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, p. 5; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 41; Piltner, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xxxv (1913), p. 171.)

† This is now virtually conceded by most experts, though some still hold out. Peet says (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 49): "There is a fairly general agreement that in Amraphel of Shinar we may recognize Khammurabi of the Ist Dynasty of Babylon." Similarly, Hall, in *Journ. of Egypt. Arch.*, ix (1923), p. 253.

‡ 965 B.C. (the date of the founding of Solomon's Temple) + 480 (1 Kings, vi, 1) + 430 (Exod. xii, 40) + 215 (Gen. xii, 4; xxv, 26; xlvii, 9) = 2090 B.C.

period when Abraham left Chaldæa, the date corresponds with the reign of Hammurabi.

It is impossible, however, with our present data, to identify the particular Hyksos king who welcomed Abraham on his arrival in Egypt. The annals of the Hyksos period are exceedingly dim, obscure, and fragmentary. We do not know where to draw the line between the XVth and XVIth Dynasties, nor can we with definiteness assign the various Pharaohs whose names we know to their proper chronological niche. Many names of Hyksos sovereigns have come down to us merely on solitary scarabs, their personalities otherwise being quite unknown. Manetho mentions the names of six of the XVth Dynasty, yet some of these almost certainly must be credited to the XVIth Dynasty. There are even two kings of Babylonian origin—Khenzer and Khandy—who seem to have sat on the throne of Egypt.\* But whoever was the particular Pharaoh with whom Abraham had dealings, he was a Hyksos monarch who had, with his Court, become thoroughly Egyptianized. Abraham, as a great Semitic chief of kindred race, would be warmly welcomed by the Royal House of Egypt.

(ii) *The Pharaoh of Joseph's time.*

The XVIth Dynasty produced some great men. The mighty Khian looms up in the obscure annals of the time, and tokens of his widespread fame and influence are found as far apart as Knossos in Crete, Gezer in Palestine, Zenjirli and Bagdad in the Mesopotamian valley.† One of his successors, Aa-user-Ra Apepi II, must have exercised authority as far south as Gebelen in Upper Egypt, showing that by this time the Hyksos monarchs had so thoroughly consolidated their power that their rule extended far to the south of Thebes.‡

In all likelihood it was while one of these later Hyksos was on the throne that Joseph was sold into Egypt. A tradition, widely held in the Middle Ages,§ gave his name as Apapus, or

---

\* Pieper, *Könige zwischen dem mittleren u. neuen Reich*, p. 32; Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, p. 12.

† See R. Weill in *Journ. Asiatique*, X, Ser. ii, xvi, pp. 247, 507; xvii, p. 5.

‡ Daressy in *Rec. de Trav.*, xiv, p. 26.

§ George the Syncellos *Chronography* (ed. Dindorf, p. 201). Dionysius of Tell Marche (ed. Tullberg, 1850, p. 2).

Aphobis. His name on the monuments is Aa-kenen-Ra Apepi III, of the XVIth Dynasty. Such serious assaults have been made on the historicity of Joseph from many angles that it is noteworthy to observe that Driver has given it, on the other hand, as his conviction that "there was an actual person, Joseph, whose biography, during the time that it lived only in oral tradition, may have been embellished and made more dramatic in details but who underwent *substantially* the experiences recounted of him in Genesis."\*

Many points in connection with the story of Joseph are full of interest. It is also remarkable that although again and again attempts have been made to question the accuracy of the Egyptian life as portrayed in the narrative, later investigation and modern discovery have invariably proved the minute fidelity of the account to the details of Nilotic custom.† For example, it has been alleged that the name "Potiphar" does not become common until the XXIIInd Dynasty, and that therefore the late date of the narrative is attested. But Lieblein has shown that names like "Potiphar," "Poti-pherah," "Asenath," "Zaphenath-Paneah," etc., indicate the Hyksos period, and not that of the much later dynasties.‡ He points out that "Potiphar" is a composite hybrid word, compounded from the Egyptian *Pt* and the Semitic *bar*, a name for Baal, and thus probably Potiphar was an Egyptianized Semite.§ Similarly, it has often been asserted that the celebrated Egyptian *Tale of the Two Brothers* is the original of the Biblical story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. But recently Gardiner has shown that Bata, the hero of the story, is a mythological personage, as the elder brother is clearly Anubis, and the incidents in the *Tale* are merely derived from an old mythological tradition.||

Certain clues link the time of Joseph with that of Apepi III. The seven years' famine seems to be referred to in a monument of the period. Beby, an official under Sequenen-Ra of Thebes, one of the kings of the XVIIth Dynasty, which was contemporaneous

---

\* Driver in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iii, p. 771, whose detailed account of the many Egyptianisms in the Biblical narrative is very copious.

† These may be studied in my book *Nile and Jordan*, pp. 107-19.

‡ Lieblein in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xx (1898), p. 202.

§ Peet (*Egypt and the Old Testament*, p. 100) says that this is an "illusion which still lingers on in the minds of the uncritical." But was Lieblein "uncritical"?

|| Gardiner in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xxvii (1905), p. 185.

with the later portion of the Hyksos XVIth Dynasty, records on his tomb at El Kab in Upper Egypt: "I collected corn, as a friend of the harvest-god, and when a famine arose, *lasting many years*, I distributed corn to the city each year of famine."\* Peet has tried to minimize the strength of this evidence on the score that famines were frequent in Egypt, and that we cannot therefore identify Beby's famine with that of Joseph. Yet it must be noted that, as a rule, famines in Egypt did not last longer than one season of low Nile. Here is the striking coincidence of Joseph's "seven-year famine," and Beby's "many years' famine." It is more logical to accept Kittel's verdict:† "We do not hesitate to admit that the coincidence of the time of the famine with the conjectural date of Joseph, together with the extraordinary infrequency of great famines in Egypt, seems to us to be of real weight in favour of the identifications of the two famines, and consequently in support of the history of Joseph generally."

Other indications as to the date of Joseph's Pharaoh are to be discerned in the commission given to Joseph by the king: *See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt*, which could be strictly true only after the later Hyksos had established their rule as far as the borders of Nubia; in the account given of the transference of the land tenure from the aristocracy to the king (Gen. xlvii, 11), with the exception of the lands owned by the priesthood (Gen. xlvii, 22), a fact testified to by the monuments; and in the geographical references in the narrative. According to the Biblical chronology, the date of the descent into Egypt of Jacob and his family must be 1875 B.C., which is within the Hyksos era. But if this arrival had taken place during the XIIth Dynasty under the Amenemhats, or if it had occurred during the powerful XVIIIth Dynasty which succeeded the Hyksos, Jacob would have had to journey 600 miles up the Nile valley to Thebes before he could have met his son. The Scripture narrative, however, bears the evidence on its face that all the scenes described of the meeting of Joseph with his father, and the settlement of his kinsmen in the land, took place in the Delta, and that there the Pharaoh had his palace. This is in entire harmony with what we know of the Hyksos sovereigns as contrasted with those of the XIIth or the XVIIIth Dynasties.

\* Brugsch, *Hist. of Egypt*, i, p. 304.

† Kittel, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, i, p. 190.

The Hyksos Pharaohs resided as a rule, not in Upper Egypt, but in Memphis, Bubastis, Avaris, and Tanis.

While, therefore, it would be rash to assert with absolute certainty that the Pharaoh of Joseph's time was Apepi III, there are very strong grounds for the identification, and practically nothing against the theory. Certainly Joseph's Pharaoh was one of the later kings of the XVIth (Hyksos) Dynasty.

(iii) and (iv) *The Pharaohs of the Oppression.*

During the Hyksos regime there were frequent attempts on the part of the native Egyptians to free their land from the hated foreigners. The Theban princes were continually heading revolts, and were as systematically crushed. Nevertheless, they managed to maintain a semblance of power which, according to Manetho, lasted 151 years, during which time 43 Theban "kings" ruled, and constituted the so-called XVIIth Dynasty (1731-1580 B.C.). But the majority of them were subject to the contemporary Hyksos sovereign, and their authority must have been nominal. War at last, however, broke out, and lasted for many years. It was continued by king after king of the Theban line until, after an heroic struggle, Aahmes I finally succeeded in driving out the Hyksos from the soil of Egypt and established the famous XVIIIth Dynasty.

Throughout the whole of Egypt there was now a call for architects, builders, and sculptors. Centuries of neglect of all temples, except those devoted to Semitic deities, had brought the public edifices of the land into a pitiable condition. But now the dilapidated temples of Amen at Thebes, and of Ptah at Memphis, rose again from the ground, while the royal quarries at Tura supplied the whitest limestone for the cutting of delicate inscriptions and exquisite bas-reliefs. A people whom the monuments style the "Fenkhu" were set to quarry the stones for all this building activity, and to act as serfs in the brickfields. These were not so much "Phœnicians" as Asiatic or Canaanite prisoners in general.\* They constituted the remaining portion of the non-combatant Hyksos who had not been expelled from Egypt, and among them we must reckon the children of Israel who had been settled by Joseph in Goshen. Of kindred race with the Hyksos, the Israelites had enjoyed prosperity under the

---

\* Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 208.

Dynasty that had now expired. Some of them had even married into the Royal family (1 Chron. iv, 18). But, with the re-establishment of the native Egyptian rule, the lot of the Hebrews had changed indeed. It has become increasingly clear that it was under the XVIIIth and not under the XIXth Dynasty that the Oppression began. Had the Israelites entered Egypt while the powerful anti-Semitic XVIIIth Dynasty was in power, how could their reception have been as cordial and pleasant as we read it was? The remembrance of the indignities they had endured under the Hyksos was too recent and sore for any gracious welcome to be accorded by the Egyptians to a new influx of Semites from Canaan. Equally impossible is it to believe that throughout the whole of the XVIIIth Dynasty—lasting 258 years—no attempt was made by the triumphant Egyptians to tyrannize over the remnant of the “shepherds,” and that only when the XIXth Dynasty arose did the Oppression break out. There is every reason to believe, and contributory evidence from the monuments to prove, that the change for the worse in the lot of the Semitic dwellers in Goshen began as soon as the vast majority of their Hyksos tribesmen had been driven out of Egypt by Aahmes I. On their heads descended the wrath and vengeance of the victorious Egyptians when the new Dynasty was inaugurated. This is the true meaning of the phrase, *There arose a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph* (Exod. i, 8). It refers to the advent of an entirely new Dynasty, whose whole policy was in direct opposition to what had previously obtained under the Hyksos regime which had favoured the Hebrews.

Aahmes I was succeeded by his son Amenhotep I (1559–1539 B.C.), and he by his son Thothmes I (1539–1514 B.C.). He was the first of the great Egyptian military conquerors. He blazed a track through Syria as far as the Euphrates, and swept off to Egypt an enormous loot of gold. His son and successor Thothmes II (1514–1500 B.C.) was completely overshadowed by the personality of his strong-minded half-sister, Hatshepset, who was the real ruler of Egypt. She was one of the most remarkable sovereigns the world has ever seen, for her splendid organizing power, her commercial enterprise, her building exploits, her famous expeditions, have made her name illustrious. But the main fact which renders the personality of this queen of engrossing interest is that there are urgent reasons for identifying her with *the daughter of Pharaoh* who preserved the life of the infant Moses. According to the Biblical chronology Moses was

born 1525 B.C.,\* precisely the time when Hatshepset was a princess, the favourite *daughter of the Pharaoh*, Thothmes I. The policy of repression initiated by Aahmes I, the founder of the new Dynasty, had been continued by Amenhotep I, but it would seem that it was Thothmes I who was the author of the inhuman command, *every son that is born ye shall cast into the river* (Exod. i, 22). And possibly Hatshepset would have followed the same cruel policy had not her womanly instincts been roused at the sight of the infant's pathetic situation. It should be noted that the Bible does not describe her as "Queen." She did not begin to reign till 1514 B.C., and, as we have seen, Moses was born in 1525 B.C. Had she been spoken of as "Queen," the discrepancy would have been manifest. But she is referred to merely as the *daughter of Pharaoh*. Nevertheless, as the favourite daughter, and latterly the co-regent of her father Thothmes I, this remarkable princess, even at an early age, wielded very considerable authority, and it was therefore appropriate that she should be able to defy the Royal order, and in the face of the law carry out her own scheme of saving Moses alive.†

While these facts fit in admirably with the events of the XVIIIth Dynasty, it is hard to reconcile them with the state of matters under the XIXth Dynasty, as is so often attempted. The main argument used in support of the theory that the Oppression took place under Rameses II of the XIXth Dynasty is the statement that the *Hebrews built for Pharaoh store cities, Pithom and Raamses* (Exod. i, 11). The reasoning is fallacious and inconclusive. Apart from the fact that the true reading (as Lagarde has pointed out)‡ is probably "Pithom of Raamses," an explanatory addition made later to identify the site (as in Gen. xlvii, 11), there is this to be remembered, that modern excavation has revealed that Pithom was a site which had been occupied since at least the VIth Dynasty. Any "building" must merely have been re-building on a foundation already hoary with age. Peet, indeed, has clearly stated that the verse proves nothing, for the names mentioned are those of a date long subsequent to the actual

---

\* Obtained from these dates: To 965 B.C. (founding of Temple) add 480 (1 Kings vi, 1) = 1445 B.C. as date of the Exodus; but Moses was then eighty (Exod. vii, 7), so that his birth-year was  $1445 + 80 = 1525$ .

† It is significant also that Josephus gives this princess the name of Thermuthis, which may well be a corruption for Tahutimes, or Thothmes, the family name of the XVIIIth Dynasty.

‡ On this see Jack, *The Date of the Exodus* (1925), p. 23.

time of the original building.\* Similarly Hall says: "The name Rameses, as that of a store-city, may have been conferred by a scribe writing long after the Mosaic period."† No stress, then, can be laid on these titles, seeing that there is so much evidence to prove that Rameses II could not have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression.

The death of Hatshepset was followed by the long and strenuous reign of Thothmes III (1515-1461 B.C.). He avenged himself on his predecessor by chiselling out her name from all inscriptions which he could erase. Then he embarked on that vast systematic plundering of Palestine and Syria which has earned for him the fame of being one of the world's greatest military conquerors. Though Thothmes I was the one who gave the order for the extermination of the male Hebrews,‡ it was Thothmes III who was *par excellence* the "Pharaoh of the Oppression." In this connection a very interesting point emerges.

At the close of the thirty-first year of his reign, Thothmes III, on returning from one of his Palestinian campaigns, found an embassy of Nubians coming to him with lavish tribute-gifts. Early in his reign he had subdued Nubia, as many memorials recently explored testify. But in the thirty-first year the Ethiopians had again broken loose and had been re-conquered. The question is—by whom? If Thothmes III began to reign in 1515 B.C., his thirty-first year would coincide with 1485 B.C. But we have already seen that the Bible chronology gives 1525 B.C. as the date of Moses' birth. Consequently Moses would be forty years of age at precisely this same date, 1485 B.C. Now, as we are told that Moses was brought up as the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, and as that princess was in all likelihood Hatshepset, the art of war was certainly one of the accomplishments he would be taught. Stephen declared that *Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds* (Acts vii, 22), clearly referring to events in his career prior to his flight to Midian. What were these exploits? If we turn to Josephus§ we find reference to an invasion of Lower Egypt by the Ethiopians. The country was in terror when Moses came to

\* Peet, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

† H. R. Hall, *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 403.

‡ The Pharaoh of Exod. i, 8-ii, 10, is Thothmes I; the Pharaoh of Exod. ii, 11-ii, 23, is Thothmes III. This distinction is often overlooked.

§ *Antiq.*, ii. 10, 1.



the rescue. As head of the Egyptian troops he marched southwards until he reached Saba or Meroe, the capital of Nubia, and began the siege. Tharbis, the daughter of the Nubian king, offered to deliver up the city if Moses would promise to marry her. The bargain was accepted. Meroe was captured, and Moses wedded the Ethiopian princess.

Now, putting aside the later legendary accretions to this story, may there not remain some substratum of fact? We have (1) the statement of Stephen as to Moses' exploits while still attached to Pharaoh's Court; (2) the fact that later *Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married* (Num. xii, 1); and (3) the remarkable way in which the respective dates tally, the year 1485 B.C., as shown, by two entirely independent lines of calculation, being alike that of the thirty-first year of Thothmes III's reign, wherein a successful expedition against Nubia (but not by the Pharaoh himself) is recorded, and also that wherein Moses attained his fortieth year. Surely it would be a most natural thing when *Moses was then grown up, and forty years old*, and was flushed with the renown of a great victory, that he made the rash and premature attempt to figure as the deliverer of his enslaved compatriots. Thothmes III resented this proposed reversal of his settled policy of repression, and Moses had to flee to Midian, where he remained in seclusion for other forty years till Thothmes III was dead.

A large number of inscriptions in the Nile valley represent the slavery into which Thothmes III reduced his captives. They are an exact reproduction in stone and wall-painting of what we read in Exodus of the cruelty of the taskmasters. The labourers who thus toil have Semitic countenances, and doubtless represent the hapless Hebrews and their fellow-captives from Canaan. But at last *it came to pass in the course of these many days, that the king of Egypt died* (Exod. ii, 23). The expression is remarkable, and draws our attention to the fact that the greatest of Egyptian conquerors was the greatest oppressor of the Israelites, and also the longest lived of Egypt's kings. He had been co-regent with Hatshepset for twenty-one years, and sole monarch for fifty-three years; in all he had sat on the throne for seventy-four years. He was the embodiment of absolute power, tyrannical might, and brute force. He was the most despotic sovereign Egypt ever had, and to him belongs most appropriately the title of the "Pharaoh of the Oppression!"

(v) *The Pharaoh of the Exodus.*

The Pharaoh of the Exodus was Amenhotep II, who succeeded his father on the throne, and reigned from 1461–1436 B.C. His innate cruelty was revealed in the inhuman way in which he treated his Palestinian captives, as he returned from Canaan after an expedition in the beginning of his reign. He continued his father's ruthlessly oppressive measures, and ever more bitter grew the lot of the enslaved Hebrews. It was not, however, till the fifteenth or sixteenth year of his rule that Moses and Aaron appeared at his Court. This was when Moses was eighty years of age (Exod. vii, 7), in 1445 B.C., according to the Biblical chronology, which is wonderfully supported by other facts.

It has often been pointed out that each of the Ten Plagues was directed against some particular form of Egyptian superstition and idolatrous worship. It is not possible within the limits of this paper to elaborate this point. But two striking facts may be mentioned. The Fifth Plague—that of the murrain of beasts—smote Amenhotep II in a very special and tender spot. No monarch showed such a fanatical attachment to sacred oxen and cow deities as he. In 1906 Naville discovered at Deir-el-Bahari the famous statue of a gigantic Hathor cow, with Amenhotep II kneeling naked under the cow's belly, imbibing the divine milk, and thereby becoming adopted as her son.\* Tremendous, therefore, must have been the blow inflicted on the king when these sacred cows, typified in the statue adored by Amenhotep II himself, fell victims to the ravages of the Fifth Plague.

The other fact has reference to the Tenth Plague—the slaying of the firstborn. The mention of the death of *the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on the throne* (Exod. xii, 29) leads us to enquire if Egyptian records afford any confirmation of this extraordinary and tremendous tragedy. The evidence is not altogether wanting. Thothmes IV, the son and successor of Amenhotep II, records on an immense granite slab that one day, hunting gazelle in the desert, he was tired, and lay down to sleep under the shadow of the Sphinx. The god spoke to him in his sleep, promised him the kingdom, and ordered him to clear away the sand from his (the god's) feet. It is evident from Thothmes IV's narrative that he had no expectation of being king. He was the son of

---

\* See Maspero, *New Light on Ancient Egypt*, p. 272 f.

Amenhotep II, but not by a woman of royal rank. His elder brother, the offspring of a union with a royal princess, was the legal and destined heir to the throne. Why did that legitimate crown prince not succeed? Simply because, as *the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat on the throne* he perished in the Tenth Plague. It is a most interesting side-link, identifying Amenhotep II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

As the mummy of Amenhotep II was discovered in 1898 in the Tombs of the Kings at Thebes, it is clear that he was not drowned along with his troops in the Red Sea. But the Bible is careful to avoid stating that Pharaoh himself met that fate. Moses sang of "*Pharaoh's chariots*," "*his host*," "*his chosen captains*," as being sunk in the Red Sea, but never of Pharaoh himself (Exod. xv, 4).

There is still another link in the chain of evidence connecting Amenhotep II with the Exodus, in that Manetho\* associates the expulsion of the "lepers" (by which phrase we must understand the Hebrews) with a King Amenhotep who had at his Court an adviser bearing the same name. This can be none other than the celebrated Amenhotep, son of Hap, one of the most distinguished ornaments of the middle of the XVIIIth Dynasty. He must have been in his prime during the reign of Amenhotep II, for he was an old man in the time of Amenhotep III. It is noteworthy also that Chaeremon† associates a certain King Amenhotep with the Exodus, and Theophilus of Antioch‡ (A.D. 180) echoed the ancient tradition that Thothmes III was the great oppressor of the Hebrews.

The date of the Exodus—1445 B.C.—is checked in Scripture by four different methods of calculation: (1) It is said to have taken place when Moses was eighty years of age (Exod. vii, 7); and as we have seen that Moses was born in 1525 B.C., it follows that eighty years later we are brought to 1445 B.C. (2) It is said to have occurred 430 years after the Descent into Egypt (Exod. xii, 40, 41). As this Descent of Jacob and his family took place in 1875 B.C., we find that by subtracting 430 years from that date, we are again brought to 1445 B.C. (3) St. Paul stated (Gal. iii, 17) that the Law was given to Israel 430 years after the covenanted Promise at the time of the Descent (Gen. xlv, 3), so again we

---

\* Josephus, *c. Apion*, i, 26.

† *Ib.*, i, 32.

‡ Theophilus, *ad Autolyicum*, iii, 20.

are brought to 1445 B.C. (4) It is said to have taken place 480 years before the founding of Solomon's Temple (1 Kings vi, 1).\* It is not a little remarkable that all these lines of calculation meet in the same year, and that the date should fall in the lifetime of Amenhotep II.

Amenhotep II was succeeded by his son Thothmes IV (1436-1427 B.C.). He ravaged Palestine and forced the Syrian chieftains to resume their annual tribute. All this time, however, the Hebrews were safe from molestation, lost to view during their forty years wandering in Sinai. Under the next reign, that of Amenhotep III (1427-1392 B.C.), Egypt attained the summit of worldly glory. The XVIIIth Dynasty reached its climax of culture and civilization while this magnificent monarch occupied the throne. But one thing connected with his reign goes to strengthen the belief that the Exodus had already taken place. A remarkably fine scarab† records a hunting expedition undertaken by Amenhotep III in the land of Goshen, where the king found the country swarming with roaming wild cattle, 141 of which he slew. This hunt took place on the very spot where the Hebrews had been most thickly planted. How could there have been these roving herds of savage wild cattle in the midst of a dense population of men, women and children occupied in the arts of civil life? This episode is but another proof, therefore, that the Exodus took place earlier than Amenhotep III, and that, since the Exodus, Goshen, cleared of its former inhabitants, had been left deserted, a wilderness given over to wild beasts.

Everyone knows how, under his successor, Amenhotep IV, a religious revolution took place. The "heretic" king broke away from the religion of his fathers, and set up a new faith. In the Royal Library at Tel-el-Amarna, the city which he built, the cuneiform tablets which have been dug up describe the anguish and terror of the Palestinian peoples at the invasion of Canaan by a race styled the Khabiri. The controversy which has raged so long over the identity of these people may now be said to be settled. Practically all authorities are agreed that they represent the Hebrews, in the broad sense of the word,

\* These dates and year measurements are scouted at by Burney's *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 90, and those who hold to the Merenptah theory. But see Luckenbill in *American Journal of Theology*, xxii (1918), p. 39. The same date (1445 B.C.) has been arrived at by Jack, *The Date of the Exodus* (1925), by other lines of evidence which are clearly marshalled.

† Willoughby Fraser in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xii (1899), p. 155.

including not only the Israelites, but other members of the same wide Semitic group.\*

The date fits with absolute precision. As the Exodus took place in 1445 B.C., the interval of forty years in the Wilderness brings us to 1405 B.C. as the year in which the Hebrews crossed the Jordan and invaded Canaan. It took seven years to achieve the conquest. This is proved from the data of Caleb's life. Caleb was forty when he went out as a spy from Kadesh-Barnea (Joshua xiv, 7): the spies were despatched two years after the Exodus, *i.e.* in 1443 B.C. But forty-five years later Caleb captured Hebron (Joshua xvi, 10), so that the date of the seizure of Hebron was 1398 B.C. (*i.e.* 1443 B.C. — 45 = 1398 B.C.). This is precisely the period of the Amarna Letters, which tell of the confusion in Canaan in the end of the reign of Amenhotep III and in the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep IV. The two records dovetail into each other.† The Book of Joshua describes the onward rush of the Hebrews, as city after city fell into their hands. The Amarna Letters tell of the terror in all the land as the Khabiri sweep all before them. The correspondence is so close that it is not surprising that the majority of modern scholars recognize the identity of the two peoples.

Still more. Excavation in Palestine has revealed traces of the invasion. Bliss‡ found at Lachish a vast mass of ashes in which were embedded scarabs of the Khabiri period, showing that the city was burned at this era, as the Scriptures state (Joshua x, 32). At Beth Shemesh, Mackenzie§ found numerous XVIIIth-Dynasty Egyptian relics, and on the top of them a deposit of ashes and burned debris from ruined houses. The conflagration was the work of the victorious Hebrews. It is the same at Taanach, Gezer and elsewhere. In every case exploration shows XVIIIth-Dynasty tokens of civilization superimposed by a layer of ashes. At Jericho we find, indeed, an overwhelming proof that the Exodus did not take place under the XIXth Dynasty.|| The deposits of pottery reveal a clear line of demarca-

---

\* The latest and fullest discussion of the identity of the Khabiri is by Jack, *The Date of the Exodus*, pp. 119-98. He urges the identity with such copious logic that it is difficult to rebut such a mass of evidence.

† For full details of this, see my *Nile and Jordan*, pp. 216-22.

‡ Bliss, *A Mound of Many Cities*, pp. 55, 184.

§ Mackenzie, *Excavations at Ain Shems*, and *P.E.F.Q.S.*, 1912, p. 171.

|| Sellin in *Mittheil. d. Deutsch. Orient. Ges.*, Nos. 39, 41, and Sellin u. Watzinger, *Jericho, Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen*, 1913.

tion between the civic life of the town in the days of Canaanite rule, and the restoration under Ahab in the 9th century B.C. There is an immense hiatus between the fall of Jericho under Joshua and the refounding of the city under Hiel (1 Kings xvi, 34). By the time of Merenptah\* (the oft-styled "Pharaoh of the Exodus") Jericho had been in ruins for 147 years, as the archaeological evidence clearly shows. If, then, it be maintained that the Exodus happened under Merenptah, the story of the fall of Jericho's walls will have to be abandoned, as by that time there were no longer any walls to fall! But all is consistent if we equate the Exodus with the reign of Amenhotep II.

Still further evidence reaches us as to the identity of the Pharaoh of the Exodus from the early years of the XIXth Dynasty. Seti I records that among the peoples whom he ravaged in Palestine was the tribe of Asher, north of Mount Carmel.† Such chastisement is referred to in Judges ii, 13, 14. How could Seti have mentioned Asher if the Israelites were still in Egypt, until the reign of Seti's grandson, Merenptah?

It has been asserted by some that the fact that Rameses II, Seti's son, ravaged Palestine, and left monuments of his presence at Beisan and other spots, proves that the Israelites were not yet settled in the land. But the reasoning is fallacious. Not only does the Book of Judges witness to constant invasions of *spoilers that spoiled them*, and of their being *sold into the hands of their enemies*, so that they could not any longer stand before their enemies, but it is expressly stated that Beisan was not in the possession of the Israelites till it was captured by David (1 Sam. xxxi, 10).

The crowning proof of all is the famous stele of Merenptah, Rameses II's son, in which he glories that "the Hittites are pacified: Canaan is seized upon with calamity of every kind: Ascalon is carried away: Gezer is captured: Israel is wasted: he hath no seed: Palestine is become as a widow before Egypt." That this refers to Israel settled in Canaan has been much debated. There are four possible alternatives:—

(1) It is claimed by some that the Hebrews were oppressed by Rameses II, and that at his death, when his son Merenptah succeeded, Moses led them forth. But how could Merenptah say that he had ravaged and desolated Israel in Canaan, when this conquest of Canaan took place in the *third* year of Merenptah's reign? Where is there room for the wandering for forty years

\* Otherwise Menephtah, as on p. 114 *seq.*

† W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 236.

in Sinai? If Merenptah be the "Pharaoh of the Exodus," then we must abandon the whole story of the wilderness journeyings.

(2) The second alternative is that the Hebrews had not yet gone down from Canaan into Egypt, or begun their years of bondage there, and therefore it was possible for Merenptah to describe them as dwelling in Palestine still. This is Eerdman's theory:\* but it is chronologically impossible. Not to speak of the absurdity of putting the descent into Egypt of Jacob and his family as late as the years subsequent to Merenptah's ravaging of them in Canaan, it means that we must find room for all the sojourn in Egypt, the wilderness wandering, the conquest of Canaan, and the period of the Judges, within a space of about sixty years!† The theory breaks down utterly.

(3) The third alternative finds most favour among scholars. It is that only part of Israel descended into Egypt with Jacob; that part remained behind in Canaan; and that it was this remnant "Israel" whom Merenptah attacked, while their compatriots were still in the Sinai desert, having emerged from Egypt on the death of Rameses II. Yet no two critics agree as to details. Burney‡ regards the tribes of Asher, Gad, Dan, and Naphtali as four inferior tribes who entered Canaan as the "Khabiri," centuries before the mass of the "Israelites" under Joshua. They were idolaters, and worshipped Jehovah under the form of a calf. But Moses revealed to the other "Joseph" tribes, the "Goshen" tribes, the true name and nature of Jehovah. Hence, when the "Goshen" tribes conquered Palestine they found their brethren already there living as semi-pagans, and they had to contend with them as well as with the Canaanites! Equally remote from the Bible narrative are the theories of Petrie,§ Spiegelberg,|| Maspero,¶ and Prásek,\*\* who all in varying phases maintain that some tribes never entered Egypt at all. Yet what of the statements that Dan was in the wilderness? (Exod. xxxi, 6; xxxv, 34: xxxviii, 23; Lev. xxiv, 10; Num. i, 12, 38: ii, 25, etc.) What of the many references to the *twelve* tribes in the Sinai desert? (Exod. xxiv, 4, and many others.)

\* Eerdman's *Alttestamentliche Studien*, ii (1908), 67.

† *i.e.* from Rameses XII (1115-1088 B.C.) to Saul in 1050 B.C.

‡ Burney's *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, pp. 36, 84.

§ Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, p. 35.

|| Spiegelberg in *Orient. Litt. Zeit.*, xi, 403.

¶ Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 444.

\*\* *Expos. Times*, xi (1900), p. 507.

How is it that when the Hebrews reached Canaan they met with none but enemies, who were all by Divine command to be exterminated? This could not have been the case had the dwellers there been of the same family, for then these compatriots of theirs ought to have received the incomers as friends and allies, yet the record is that the people of Canaan were so vile that the land vomiteth out her inhabitants (Lev. xviii, 25, 27).

(4) As these three alternatives, therefore, present extraordinary difficulties, and involve violations of the Biblical narrative and a drastic recasting of Scripture chronology, most modern Egyptologists have been compelled to discard the untenable theory that the Exodus took place under the XIXth Dynasty. Scholars such as Fries, Breasted, Max Müller, Böhl, Obbink, Hommel, Lieblein, Hall, Luckenbill, Daressy, Peet, and many others have been forced to acknowledge that the evidence is strong for the XVIIIth Dynasty, and an increasing number give the Pharaoh of the Exodus as Amenhotep II.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to thank Dr. Knight for his very interesting paper, in which he seems to me to have proved his points clearly. The subject is essentially one for Egyptologists and experts, and few of us can aspire to that rôle. What interests me most about Egypt is the wonderful way its history has borne out the predictions of Ezekiel. When Egypt was at the height of her greatness and power, and while the prophet could not (as we can) look back to history for numerous precedents of the fall of great and powerful kingdoms, he foretold that Egypt would not only fall, but be *a base nation*. "The land of Egypt shall be desolate and waste . . . they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms" (Ezek. xxix, 9, 14, 15). When Ezekiel wrote, nothing was to be seen of Egypt but her greatness. Her antiquity, her dynasties, her kings, her monuments, her cities, her conquests, her wealth, her trade, her commerce and her manufactures—all proclaimed her greatness. Yet what followed? In 525 B.C. (about sixty years after Ezekiel's time) Egypt was conquered by Cambyses the Persian. In 331 B.C. she was subdued by Alexander the Great, and for 300 years was ruled by his nominees, the Ptolemies.



In 30 B.C. Egypt was annexed by the Romans, and after the fall of Rome (in A.D. 476) she had to yield obedience to the Eastern Empire. How far she suffered from the scimitars of Genseric and the Vandals, or the sword of Belisarius, it is not easy to say. But in A.D. 641, she had to yield to the Saracens for 600 years. In A.D. 1250 the Mamelukes—Turkish and Circassian *slaves*—usurped the government. In 1517 the Turks conquered Egypt; but the Mamelukes still ruled the country until their destruction by Mehemet Ali in 1805. Mehemet Ali—an upstart, but endowed with considerable genius—rebelled against the Sultan, and defeated the Turks in a great battle. He aspired to be an “Egyptian Mussolini,” and to revive the ancient greatness of his country. France believed in him, but he came to grief and died insane in 1849. Later on, Arabi Pasha tried the same rôle, but he failed likewise.

After the Great War, Egypt was freed from Turkey, and in 1922 was declared an independent kingdom, while her defence is in the hands of a British garrison. Whether there are any materials amongst the Egyptians for self-government is very doubtful; but could anything prove more clearly the truth of Ezekiel’s prophecy than the history of the country?

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I am glad to notice that, unlike the lecturer of January 17th, Dr. Knight shows (on p. 100) that Jacob and his family went into Egypt at the time when the Hyksos, or, as they are sometimes called—and, I think, with a measure of truth—the Shepherd Kings were ruling. This seems to explain why Joseph warned his father to be sure and tell Pharaoh that “their trade had been about cattle” (Gen. xlv, 34). Because, as “every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians,” they would then get all the help and protection they needed from this so-called shepherd king, who also appears to have belonged to a race similar to the Hebrews.

I cannot, however, think that the legend referred to on p. 105 has anything whatever to do with the complaint of Miriam and Aaron against Moses “because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman” (Num. xii, 1), for the following reasons: First, if he had married an Ethiopian woman when in Egypt, what became of her when he fled to Midian? Did he take her with him? Is it likely that Jethro would have given his daughter Zipporah in marriage to a man who had a wife already? or,

secondly, did he leave her behind in Egypt, and withhold from Jethro the fact that he was a married man? No, the natural assumption is that Zipporah was dead at the time of the complaint, and that the marriage of Moses to the Ethiopian woman was a more recent occurrence.

On p. 106, Dr. Knight calls attention to a very interesting confirmation of the fact that each of the ten plagues was directed against some specific object of worship in Egypt, by his reference to the statue of Amenhotep II kneeling naked under the cow's belly imbibing its "divine" milk! I myself, when in Egypt last spring, saw at Sakkara, a tomb cut in the rock containing six enormous sarcophagi placed in position with extraordinary mathematical precision, each cut out of a solid block of granite, all highly polished, in which had been placed the dead bodies of the sacred cows!

Dr. H. C. MORTON regretted very much that Dr. Frank Knight was not present in person. His monumental work, *Nile and Jordan*, had been constantly in his hands since its issue, and he was much looking forward to seeing Dr. Knight himself. With the general drift of the lecture he entirely concurred, but some dates given by Dr. Knight he believed to be erroneous. For example, the Exodus is put at 1445 B.C. But this calculation is based on 1 Kings vi, 1, which says that from the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon was 480 years. The Bible, in reality, gives 594 years, and the prophet historian in 1 Kings omits all years which were not years of God's government. This makes a difference of 114 years. Or again, the sojourning of the Children of Israel (Exod. xii) is calculated from the entry of Joseph into Egypt. Surely, however, the sojourning should be estimated from the departure of Abram from Ur, and that again makes a great difference in the chronology. But the chronology of Egyptian dynasties is utterly uncertain, and 1612 B.C., the Bible Exodus date, may quite well be the date of Amenophis II.

Dr. Knight seems securely to establish Amenophis II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Manetho's words, to the effect that in the fifth year of Menephtah, a tribe of foreigners in Egypt was exterminated, do not seem capable of application to the Exodus of Israel. Moreover, when one asks what is the further ground upon which the Menephtah identification rests, it is the theory that one great drive from the East accounts for the establishment of the Kassite Dynasty

in Babylon, a Babylonian movement into Syria and Arabia, and the Arabian, or Hyksos, movement into Egypt. Thus, it is urged, as Abraham was contemporary with Hammurabi, who was of the 1st Babylonian Dynasty, he could not have been contemporary with the Hyksos, who were contemporary with the 2nd or Kassite Babylonian Dynasty. But of this mighty drive eastward—Central Asia to Babylon, Babylon to Arabia, and Arabia to Egypt, at one and the same period—there is need of very much more proof.

What seems to lend very great probability to the Amenophis II identification is that everything regarding the "heretic king" Khuenaten (Akhnaton) fits in so remarkably with an Exodus dated just about forty years earlier. The religious monotheistic revolution carried out by Khuenaten, and also his extraordinary refusal to take any steps whatever to oppose the occupation of Palestine by the Khabiri (the Hebrews) are explained if the Exodus was an event of the immediate past. He, and Egypt as a whole, would have vivid memories of the Ten Plagues and of the Red Sea—blow after smashing blow against Egypt and her gods—and would be slow to try conclusions once again. Moreover, Khuenaten would recognize in the Israelites his only monotheistic allies in all the world, from whom, in all probability, he himself learned that God is One and God is Love, and refused to fight against them.

When everything fits in so strikingly, there is need of much more than a seemingly irrelevant sentence of Manetho to hamper the argument of Dr. Knight.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS, after saying that, although it needed an engineer to make a good road, a waggoner knew a good road when it was made—as a justification for attempting to decide between men more learned than himself in the subject—expressed his belief that Dr. Morton was wrong and the lecturer right in the date he alleged for the Exodus, which agreed within a year with that given by Professor Peet in his *Egypt and the Old Testament* (1922), working on the so-called Higher Critical premises. He quoted Professor Peet's statement in his book (p. 64) that "tradition" (his name for the Old Testament) was often incorrect in detail, that its chronology was generally poor, that it telescoped and duplicated, and that its geography was rarely consistent; and pointed out that the Professor went on to admit that "in most cases in which

archæology has permitted a test, the central facts of tradition have been found to contain some kernel of truth." Seeing that, on all but these central facts, the Higher Critical theories could not be tested, the admission proved that the Old Testament narratives stood their ground.

He did not agree with Mr. Collett's suggestion that Moses married an Ethiopian woman during the wilderness journey after Zipporah's death, for he thought Aaron and Miriam's criticism of their brother would have been just, if Mr. Collett was right; whereas it was condemned as unjust because the marriage took place when Moses was excommunicated by his brethren, and could not, therefore, marry an Israelite. He expressed his desire that those who read papers like the present would not content themselves with merely stating their agreement with Scripture, but would proceed to criticize the so-called Higher Critics, for he did not consider it sufficient to denounce their theories: they should be proved in detail to be unsound.

Sir CHARLES MARSTON said that the conclusions of the so-called Higher Criticism of the Bible assumed that humanity possessed a fairly complete knowledge of Nature's Laws, of Ancient History, and of Ancient Languages. As this premise was obviously unsound, it followed that modern conclusions were at best tentative in their character. He complained that many were more eager to establish Theories than to ascertain the Truth. He thought that human ignorance was still too great to pronounce definitely against matters connected with Holy Scripture. Tradition was still a far sounder authority than theory. If we compared the "assured" results of Higher Criticism with those of a generation ago, the obvious absurdity of some of the latter should make us very cautious regarding those of more recent date. Unsound foundations had caused many a construction to collapse, and the higher one built on a false foundation the greater the danger.

Sir Charles said that he had always felt that the date of the Exodus favoured by Dr. Knight was most in keeping with tradition. The only evidence that he could find that conflicted with it was a quotation on the back of a papyrus in the British Museum. It referred to certain despatches which were sent by the Egyptian Government to Palestine in the third year of King Menepthah.

One of these was sent to the King of Tyre, and the bearer of it was Baal\*\*, the son of Zippor, who started from Gaza, at that time in Egyptian hands (Papyrus Anastasi III, in *Select Papyri* from the British Museum—see Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 275). The Baal\*\* there referred to might not be Balak, the son of Zippor, who was referred to in Num. xxii, but if it was, it seemed to conflict with Dr. Knight's theories.

The relationship of King Amenhotep IV with the kingdom of Mitanni was curious, for he understood that Mitanni was Aram Naharaim, whence came Rebekah, Leah, Rachel, and indeed, Abraham. This might account for Amenhotep's monotheism, and his indifference to the Khabiri's invasion.

On the motion of Mr. A. W. OKE, LL.M., F.G.S., a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. Knight for his paper and to Mr. Avary Forbes for presiding on the occasion.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. J. A. FLEMING wrote: I very much regret that I cannot be present at the reading of this very interesting paper by Rev. Dr. Frank Knight; but I have perused it carefully and should like to add my thanks with those of others present, to the author for his full and illuminating survey of the subject of the Pharaohs of the Pentateuch. I have long taken a great interest in this topic, and never have been convinced of the correctness of the widely adopted view that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his 13th son and successor Merenptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. For one thing, if the dating of the XIXth Dynasty adopted by Petrie and others is correct, then the Exodus must have taken place as late as about 1220 B.C. This dating leaves far too little time before the foundation of Solomon's Temple, for all the events described in the Books of Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, even if some of these events are arranged in parallel instead of all in series. Moreover, it is contradicted by the statements in the New Testament—of Stephen and of Paul. It would hardly be possible to crowd all this history into 250 years or so, if the Exodus were as late as the dates commonly fixed for the limits of Merenptah's reign.

There is one point on which I should be grateful for the opinion of the learned author of this paper. The Divine Prediction to Abraham was that "thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them and they shall afflict them four hundred years . . . . But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." (Gen. xv, 13, 16.)

Now Moses was 80 years old at the Exodus, and was the son of Amram, who was the son of Kohath, who was the son of Levi (Exod. vi, 16-20). This gives four generations. The ages of these patriarchs at birth of sons is not given, but only their ages at death. Levi 137 years, Kohath 133, Amram 137. Even if we assume the births of Kohath, Amram, and Moses took place when their respective fathers were each 100 years old, this will hardly fill in the 400 years of the prediction. The question I should like to ask the author is : Between what dates does this 400 years extend ?

It is deeply gratifying to those who firmly believe in the Inspiration of the Old Testament to have such convincing proofs given of the minute accuracy of scriptural chronology as is indicated by the author's statements in his most interesting paper. (Even twenty years ago scholars such as Dr. Orr, in his book *The Problem of the Old Testament* discarded the Rameses-Merenptah theory, and argued that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was most probably Thothmes III, and Amenhotep II, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Canon Girdlestone, in his *Outlines of Biblical Chronology*, also rejects the Merenptah Exodus, but places it in the reign of Thothmes III, which hardly agrees with the facts. The author of the paper now under discussion has therefore placed us under obligation by his very careful review of the subject and his reconciliation of Biblical and secular chronology.

Mr. G. B. MICHELL, O.B.E., wrote : With Dr. Knight's Biblical chronology I am in close agreement, with a difference of only four years throughout. I also support his contentions in Sections (iii), (iv) and (v), from p. 101 onwards. But I differ from him with regard to the Hyksos.

It is, I think, unfortunate that he adopts the "long" Egyptian chronology, which is quite impossible, in spite of the powerful support of Sir Flinders Petrie and other great Egyptologists.

It depends upon the Sothic cycle. As the "short" dating seemed

to allow only about 250 years for all the Kings of the XIIIth to the XVIIIth Dynasties, which was manifestly too little, the only alternative was to push back the reign of Senusert III by a whole Sothic cycle of 1460 years, making him to reign in about 3300 B.C. Yet this is far too long an interval to place between the art of the end of the XIIth Dynasty and that of the beginning of the XVIIIth.

Now the discovery by Mr. Gardiner of the change in the Egyptian calendar before the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty solves the whole difficulty. It shows that Mesore, later the twelfth month, was, till the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, the first month of the year. This shifting of a month adds 120 years to the "short" chronology before the War of Liberation, so giving 370 years instead of 250 years for the interval between the XIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties. This is allowed to be ample. It brings the seventh year of Senusert III to 2002 B.C. Consequently, the XIIth Dynasty arose in 2121 B.C. and the XIIIth in 1909 B.C., and the Hyksos conquest occurred in about 1790 B.C. As the XIVth Dynasty was apparently existing contemporaneously with the Hyksos, and the Thebans reigning, if not ruling, in the South, probably continuously until they arose again as the XVIIth Dynasty in about 1630 B.C., this period is not too short for the events—so far as they are known. The result is that it was the XIIth Dynasty that was ruling in Egypt when Abraham came down to that country. As they governed the whole country, it was not necessary for Abraham to go all the way to Thebes, their capital.

But the XIIIth Dynasty was *Memphite*, their court being at Ithtavi, near Lisht, a little south of Memphis. It was under this dynasty that Joseph was sold into Egypt, and the Hyksos conquered the country some eight years after his death. Thus it was the Hyksos that knew not Joseph, and this throws a new light on the whole subject.

#### THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

I have to thank the various members who spoke for their very kindly and generous remarks on the points mentioned in my paper. Very briefly I shall touch on one or two of the questions raised.

(1) I see no reason to change my opinion in regard to the time when Moses married the Ethiopian woman. There was **nothing**

in Oriental life, as it then was, to hinder him marrying Zipporah even though he had a Nubian wife living. I therefore agree with Mr. Roberts as against the view held by Mr. Collett.

(2) For the chronological evidence on which I base the date of the Exodus as 1445 B.C., I would refer Dr. Morton to the Appendix on p. 515 of my *Nile and Jordan*, where all the facts recorded in the Bible in this connection are marshalled.

(3) I cannot see that there is any ground for the identification of the Baal, son of Zippor, of Papyrus Anastasi III, with Balak, son of Zippor of Num. xxii. The so-called "Diary of a Frontier Officer" betrays no link of connection with the King of Moab. It is, therefore, no proof at all against the validity of my plea that Merenptah could not have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, as Sir Charles Marston seeks to argue.

(4) The question raised by Dr. J. A. Fleming is certainly difficult to answer. The period of 400 years mentioned in Gen. xv, 13, as the length of time during which the Israelites would be afflicted in a strange land is certainly a round number for the more exact period of 430 years, which we know was actually the length of the sojourn in Egypt) 1445 + 430 B.C. = 1875 B.C., the date of the Descent into Egypt). But it is strange to read: "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again" (Gen. xv, 16). It is evident that here at least 100 years was reckoned as the length of a generation. Certainly we find it recorded that Caleb was the fourth from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 4, 5, 9, 18): Moses was the fourth from Levi (Exod. vi, 16-20); and doubtless there were many more.

(5) The question of the "long" and the "short" chronology, referred to by Mr. G. B. Michell, I cannot discuss here. I may say, however, that it seems to me impossible to crowd into 370 years—the alleged length of the interval between the XIIth and the XVIIIth Dynasties—all the events which are alluded to in the monuments. Though the period is admittedly most obscure, it is significant that to the XIIIth Dynasty alone there are 60 kings ascribed by Manetho, all ruling from Thebes, their united reigns totalling 453 years. If this be near the truth, how can we compress Dynasties XIII-XVII within 370 years?



696TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21st, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

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

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Herbert Michell, Esq., J.P., as an Associate, and the re-election of the Rev. W. L. Baxter, D.D., as a Life Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Squadron-Leader P. J. Wiseman, R.A.F., to read his paper on "Babylon in the Days of Hammurapi and Nebuchadrezzar," which was illustrated by lantern slides.

---

*BABYLON IN THE DAYS OF HAMMURAPI AND  
NEBUCHADREZZAR.*

By SQUADRON-LEADER P. J. WISEMAN, R.A.F.

**B**ABYLON has cast a greater spell over mankind than any other city. In ancient times it was unquestionably the greatest and most famous. Only two periods of its long history have been selected for comment, and these because of their connection with Old Testament history. Having visited the site on many occasions during recent years, some account is given of the present state of the ruins.

Babylon enjoyed two "golden ages," the first under Hammurapi and the second under Nebuchadrezzar. It was during these two distinctive periods of its history that the Hebrews were in close

contact with the Babylonians. During the first period, the father of the Hebrew nation, Abraham, migrated with his household from Babylonia, in the second Jerusalem was captured and a large proportion of the population transferred to Babylon. It would be difficult to overestimate the effect of these two periods of contact, and it is usually assumed by "higher critics" that it was the dominating religious and cultural influences of Babylon during these periods which stamped and moulded the religious beliefs of Israel. My study of the situation however has led me to a conclusion radically different from this.

The first "golden age" commenced with the succession of Hammurapi to the throne in the year 2067 B.C. It is a coincidence that both he and Nebuchadrezzar reigned for 43 years. He was the outstanding king in a dynasty which began to reign 102 years before. Until recent times this dynasty was regarded as having had its original home in Arabia. It is difficult to follow the theory which endeavours to account for the presence of new peoples in these already civilized lands by assuming that their original home was in the Arabian desert, and that periodically masses of them "erupted" from a nomadic life in this region into cultured and cultivated countries. There seems little real evidence for the theory—yet it has been widely accepted—principally, I am inclined to think, in the endeavour to account for the Hebrew conquest of Palestine without having to give reasons for their presence in the desert before that conquest. Evidence that the climatic conditions in the Arabian desert 4,000 years ago were essentially different from those existing at the present time is wanting. Why then should it be assumed that these primitive peoples, at a time when populations were admittedly scanty even in lands capable of abundant production, made their home in a desert? Does the evidence show that nomadic desert tribes, even if driven to cultivated lands because of the poverty of the desert, accept a ready-made culture and immediately improve upon it?

The ancestors of Hammurapi appear to have migrated from Syria and to have inherited a Summerian culture which was already old, it having then existed for at least 1,000 years. In this matter there is, I think, a decidedly new trend of thought among archaeologists; the later evidence in Mesopotamia goes towards establishing the antiquity of a cultured civilization. As far back as it is possible to push research in this "cradle of mankind" it is found that the civilizations of these early peoples

are of a decidedly developed order. I was much impressed by the work of the expedition at Kish (11 miles east of Babylon) in this respect. The excavations here show the antiquity of the culture which existed in that city 5,000 years ago. The city of Babylon had already a long history when Hammurapi came to the throne. Sargon of Akkad, nearly a millennium before, "took soil from the outer walls of Babylon and consecrated the boundaries of his new capital by tracing its outer walls with the earth of the holy city of Marduk. He made it after the model of Babylon. But according to the chronicle, this was the last act of his reign, and it adds that Marduk was angry because of this sacrilege and destroyed his people with hunger. These two passages contain the first reference to the famous city of Babylon."\* However, Biblical history (Gen. x) takes us further back to the time when Nimrod—probably the Babylonian Merodach or Marduk—founded the city. Under Hammurapi it became the pre-eminent city of the country. Six years after he came to the throne he captured Erech and Isin. He then gave many years to the building of temples for his various gods and in the year 2037 made war on Elam and Larsa. An inscription of the period reads "Hammurapi King of Babylon, summoned his forces and marched against Rim-Sin, King of Ur. He captured the city of Ur and Larsa and he carried off their possessions to Babylon." Chief among the possessions referred to, we learn, were some gods from Ur. As was usual with monarchs of his day he then began to accumulate gods in his city. This is mentioned as Delitzsch asserts that a monotheistic view of God existed in Hammurapi's time. His well-known Code of Laws is sufficient attestation to the developed culture prevalent during his reign. More recent discoveries have confirmed that the laws were not the invention of Hammurapi, but mainly a codification of laws and customs already long existent. Much has been written on the bearing of this code on the Mosaic law, and it has been noted that while many resemblances are obvious, the differences are not less so.

In the recent *Cambridge Ancient History*, Dr. Cook complains† of "the way in which the historical background has been 'washed out' of the narratives in Genesis." Obviously, there is little room for "background" in the first eleven chapters, giving as

\* *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. i, p. 407.

† Vol. i, p. 385.

they do scarcely an outline of the chief events from the beginning of time to the year 2000 B.C. Admittedly these chapters are only a preface to the history of a nation—a history which was to commence with the call of Abraham—but as soon as we pass from this preface we find “historical background.” Gen. xiv furnishes an immediate illustration ; here we have the names of the four kings Abraham met in battle. Their identity with contemporary monarchs, especially that of Amraphel with Hammurapi, is now generally admitted. Much has been written on this subject, so much that I perceive signs of irritation on the part of “higher critics” at the constant reference to it. Dr. Skinner\* maintains rather aggressively “that because these kings have been found to be historical, Abraham is not necessarily so.” This seems like a fight to the last ditch for the now almost vanished theory which regarded Abraham and these kings as mythological heroes. Archæologists would not now write as did H. P. Smith,† “Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are personifications of clans and tribes and nothing more,” nor argue as Winckler that Abraham represented a moon-god. The weight of evidence has necessitated the abandonment of such a view. The critics of the narrative have been compelled to remove Abraham’s name from the page of mythology to that of history, and his name is now used historically with as much assurance as that of any of his contemporaries.

Fresh evidence regarding the exact date during which Hammurapi reigned was found in a library at Kish in 1924. I visited this site and was shown the collection of tablets found. Unfortunately, many were in a fragmentary condition. Among them was a piece of a tablet which Professor Langdon informed me would prove of exceptional interest. It was then not cleaned, nor had he time to read it in detail. In October, 1925, in an article in the *Illustrated London News*, of October 10th, under the title “Fixing Abraham’s date and the entire chronology of Babylonia—a Kish tablet—a discovery of great historical importance,” Professor Langdon announced the nature of this “find.” It is an astronomical tablet, and its value is enhanced because it completed the text of tablet K2321 already in the British Museum and in conjunction therewith gives the day and month of the risings and settings of Venus over a period of the

---

\* *Genesis, International Critical Commentary.* Introduction.

† *Old Testament History*, p. 48.

twenty-one years during which Ammizaduga reigned. This Kish tablet, together with British Museum K2321 and K260, gives "the day of the month and the year of the reign in which Venus set in the east and reappeared in the west; when she set in the west and reappeared in the east, with exact figures for her invisibility. Between the eastern setting and the western rising of Venus there is an average period of about 75 days; and between the time of her disappearance as an evening star and her rising as a morning star there is an average period of about seven days. These are called the periods of her invisibility. The Babylonian astronomers of the twentieth century B.C. have here given the exact lengths of the periods of the invisibility of Venus with the monthly dates of all her risings and settings for the entire 21 years of Ammizaduga. A summary of all these dates in their monthly order is then given on the reverse of the Kish and British Museum tablets. By means of astronomical calculations, Dr. Fotheringham, Reader in Ancient Chronology at Oxford, has been able to calculate the exact year B.C. in which these risings and settings occurred. His calculations are almost universally accepted by English and foreign scholars; other attempts by German astronomers to fix the dates of the reign of Ammizaduga have been largely abandoned owing to the discovery of the Kish tablet. By this means we now know that the famous law-giver of Babylon, Hammurapi, probably Amraphel of Gen. xiv, reigned 2067—2025 B.C. Consequently, the date of Abraham is thus apparently settled."

Babylon's second "golden age" commenced with the fall of the Assyrian empire; a fall swift and complete. Notwithstanding the difficulties which began to appear before the close of Ashur-banipal's reign, a period of less than 20 years was to see the dismemberment of the empire. Civil war broke out in Nineveh and the provinces revolted. Meanwhile, Media, now united under a single monarch, Cyaxares, combined with Nabopolassar with the definite intent to end the power of the Assyrian empire. At first they attacked independently, gradually hemming in the Assyrian troops.

In 615 B.C., the Babylonians and Medes united in an attack on the ancient capital of Assyria, Ashur (Kalah Sherghât). This attack was completely successful and modern excavations reveal the ruthlessness with which they sacked and pillaged the city. Affairs at Nineveh were then thrown into disorder. The

Assyrian monarch endeavoured to obtain the aid of the Scythians to fight the Medes while his troops met the Babylonians, but it appears the Scythians saw the almost inevitable trend of events and joined the attacking troops. A combined attack by these forces in the year 612 brought about the fall of Nineveh.

Nebuchadrezzar was in Palestine when he heard the news of his father's death, and as Nabopolassar was not of royal blood or even the son of a noble, he would know that the succession was not altogether secure. He hastily returned to Babylon accompanied only by a bodyguard. The Babylonian priests undoubtedly had much power, but events "had already shown that Nebuchadrezzar was a vigorous and brilliant commander and physically as well as mentally a strong man, fully worthy of succeeding his father. He was to become the greatest man of his time in the Near East, as a soldier, a statesman, and an architect."\* Moreover, the army was unquestionably loyal to him, and this must have been a decided factor in his favour.

For a time Palestine was left alone, but the Kings of Judah could never forget that their country lay as a "buffer" state between Babylon and Egypt. They retained a nominal independence, but were never sure which of the two great powers to rely upon for protection from the other. Egypt certainly received most consideration, probably because it appeared to Judah as a power within easy call; though events proved their promises of assistance were easily broken, while Babylon across the intervening desert seemed too remote. Josiah had lost his life in siding with Assyria (2 Kings xxiii, 29), and Necho immediately reasserted Egypt's suzerainty over Judah, demanding a heavy tribute and placing Jehoiakim on the throne as his vassal. After the decisive defeat of Necho at Carchemish, four years later, Jehoiakim became subject to Babylon. He soon revolted and during the reign of his successor Jehoiachin, Nebuchadrezzar besieged Jerusalem, "and he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes and all the mighty men of valour even ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths; none remained save the poorest sort of people of the land" (2 Kings xxiv, 14). Hence a large proportion of the people found themselves in Babylon.

We must now turn to the events at Babylon. Nebuchadrezzar we have seen was a great soldier and statesman, but it was as

---

\* *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. iii, p. 212.

a military architect that he was to excel. It is his work in this respect which spread far and wide the fame of Babylon. It is the city as extended and "made glorious" by him which is told in the pages of Herodotus. Apart from the fame which would accrue to him from the rebuilding of the city on a gigantic scale, there is reason to believe that it was also a policy on his part to conciliate the priests. The Procession Way, the Ishtar Gate, the Temple of Marduk-Esagila, the tower of Babylon-E-temen-ana-ki, have a religious purpose. As a little boy his father had instructed him in the piety of religious building by making him carry bricks for the E-temen-ana-ki. But in such works as the Procession Way and the Ishtar Gate, though built for religious purposes, the scheme is carried out with an eye to possible invasion. Nineveh had fallen and the power of Assyria ended, but his father's old ally in the accomplishment of this, Cyaxares, was gradually consolidating his power, and it must have become obvious to him that ultimately he would have to meet this power in a life-and-death struggle. It is this political consideration I think which, as he often informs us in his inscriptions, caused him to complete some of his fortification works in an almost incredibly short space of time. To meet this dread contingency he planned a series of defence works to surround Babylon, the magnitude of which had never before been attempted. But his work, as can be seen to this day, has not merely a religious and military purpose; he combined to some extent an artistic purpose. When it is remembered that Nebuchadrezzar had nothing except the common clay of the surrounding Babylonian plain, it is astounding how by moulding figures which should stand out in relief upon the walls and by glazing the brick in quite artistic colourings he at least rid the crude brick of its unsightliness if he failed to make it a thing of beauty.

The most impressive feature of the ruined city is the vastness and massiveness of its brickwork. The grandeur of this brickwork has quite departed, largely owing to the brick robbers who have stripped the buildings and roads of their coloured glazed bricks which were uppermost. But the grandeur of the scale still remains. Such artistic triumphs as the hanging gardens, then one of the Seven Wonders of the World, now require much patience, even in tracing their foundations, and repeated visits to the ruins recalled to mind the vivid language of the prophet: "Babylon the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees'

excellency shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah " (Isa. xiii, 19).

Although Rich, Layard and Rassam spent some time digging into these huge mounds, obtaining numerous tablets, it was not until March, 1899, that systematic excavation was commenced. The German Oriental Society planned many years' work, hoping to achieve the complete excavation of the site. From 200 to 300 workmen were employed summer and winter until the outbreak of the Great War—and it is evident from the state of Koldewey's rooms that he left in a great hurry. Some idea of the magnitude of the task involved will be understood when it is realized that the mounds above the ruins were nearly 80 ft. high, compared with the 8 ft. to 10 ft. usually found on the sites of other ancient cities of Mesopotamia. The walls of other cities were 10 ft. to 20 ft. thick. One of the walls in Babylon is 87 ft. wide. Moreover, the extent of the mounds surpassed anything before attempted. Excavation has not recommenced since the war and more than one-half of the city remains unexcavated.

Much uncertainty exists as to the exact size of Babylon. From Herodotus's description it had a perimeter of 56 miles. He states: " Assyria possesses a vast number of great cities, whereof the most renowned and strongest at this time was Babylon, whither, after the fall of Nineveh, the seat of government had been removed. The following is a description of the place:—The city stands on a broad plain and is an exact square, 120 furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is 480 furlongs. While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other city that approaches to it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall 50 royal cubits in width and 200 in height."

Ctesias states that its perimeter was 40 miles, Koldewey expresses the opinion that it was only 11 miles. It is admitted, however, that little has been done to excavate the fortification walls; Koldewey traced  $4\frac{1}{2}$  miles of the wall, which can still be seen. He thought this to be the Imgur-bel wall of Nebuchadnezzar, though he states that, as this wall must necessarily have reached to the Euphrates and have enclosed the principal mounds, its length would amount to at least 11 miles.

An inner wall can be seen running immediately east of the mounds of Homera; of this wall only a little over a mile can be traced. It is in the usual form of a double wall, the eastern



part being  $12\frac{1}{4}$  ft. and the western  $21\frac{1}{4}$  ft. wide, and the space of  $23\frac{3}{4}$  ft. between is filled in—making a wall of 57 ft. wide. It is very important to observe, however, that this wall was constructed of crude mud brick.

Herodotus writes as an eye-witness, having visited Babylon, and his description is generally accurate, especially in his statement of the thickness of the wall, which has by excavation been proved true.

Moreover, Ctesias was physician to Artaxerxes, who lived for some time in Babylon, leaving a monument of his residence in the citadel. There is also Nebuchadrezzar's inscription that Nabopolassar built "a great wall which he had made with mortar and burnt brick like a mountain that cannot be moved." Now, the wall suggested by Koldewey as Nebuchadrezzar's inner city wall is built of crude mud brick, not of burnt brick, and no trace has been found of any other inner wall of burnt brick which would answer the description of the inscription. Moreover, the walls found by Koldewey have no strategic point of beginning or ending, yet Nebuchadrezzar states he surrounded Babylon with two walls. Large portions of these enormous inner walls have disappeared. We know that for centuries the site has been a favourite one for brick plunderers. Even in Parthian and Roman days Babylon bricks were used in the construction of their new cities. In the adjacent town of Hilla, and also in Baghdad, I have seen many of Nebuchadrezzar's bricks in the walls of the houses. Many were used in the construction of the Hindeyeh barrage. Everywhere in the mounds deep trenches can be seen where the brick-work has been dug away to a great depth. In these circumstances is it natural to suppose that the Arab, never over-fond of work, would pass by Nebuchadrezzar's outer walls and journey miles into the centre of the city to obtain bricks while the material nearer at hand lasted?

My own view is that the wall which Koldewey thinks to be the *Imgur-Bel* wall is not the outer but the inner wall of Babylon, and that further excavations would yet trace these outer walls and probably find them to be in accord with Nebuchadrezzar's inscriptions. The abandoned canal system surrounding the city is rather confusing when observing from the air, but I think a series of mounds can be traced which answers the description given by Nebuchadrezzar.

The wall referred to, of which  $4\frac{1}{2}$  miles has been traced, is a double wall, with a 39-ft. space between filled in with rubble.

The inner wall is 23 ft., the outer wall 25 ft. wide, thus making 87 ft. in all. These figures have been verified at several sections of the ruin. Such walls were undoubtedly built for the two-fold purpose of withstanding enemy attack and flood. In our military cantonment outside Baghdad, built in recent years, the same two reasons necessitated a "bund" of earth surrounding it, and during my appointment there a flooding of the rivers Tigris and Diyala tested this earthwork severely. Nebuchadrezzar's wall had also a military purpose, to render easy the rapid movement of his forces to any point most open to attack, hence its width, and the ability of the chariots to which Herodotus refers, being able to pass each other on top. The wall was not merely for spectacular purposes. Astride these walls 15 towers were found, each 170 ft. apart. Jeremiah refers to these fortifications: "though Babylon should mount up to heaven and though she should fortify the height of her strength" and "the broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken" (Jer. li, 53, 58).

Nebuchadrezzar raised the level of, and rebuilt the Procession Road for, Marduk, the patron-god of Babylon, to whose temple—Esagila—it leads, and along which Marduk was carried on the greatest Babylonian festival—that of the New Year. The road is broad, slopes towards the citadel, and was paved with limestone slabs 3 ft. 6 in. square. The edge of each bore the inscription "Nebuchadrezzar, King of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon, am I. The Babel Street I paved with blocks of limestone for the procession of the great god Marduk." Only one of these is still in position, and over this Nebuchadrezzar and Daniel must often have passed.

It would appear that the walls of this road reached a great height. The ruins show them to have been 23 ft. thick and to have been faced with blue enamelled bricks. Into these walls were inserted figures in relief of lions, mostly in white enamel, with yellow manes. Each of these lions was 6 ft. 6 ins. long, and from the large quantities of fragments picked up in the immediate vicinity, it is believed that there must have been one hundred and twenty figures.

This procession road, surmounted as it was by towers, which in case of need were manned by soldiers, and having these lions standing out from the walls in relief so arranged in rows that on either right or left-hand side of the road they were in the attitude of advancing, must have been indescribably terrorizing to the enemy and awe inspiring to the visitor.

It was on the great occasion when this road was used that the so-called Epic of Creation (which should more accurately be described as the Epic of Marduk—as it is essentially a series of laudatory poems to the glorification of Marduk) was recited by his priests as the procession moved along towards his temple. In 1923, Professor Langdon published “The Babylonian Epic of Creation restored from the recently recovered tablets of Assur,” in which he pointed out that these were based upon the Babylonian copy of the Epic, but he says “the scribes of Assur have deliberately suppressed the name of the Babylonian god Marduk substituting Ashur,” and further, that “all copies were ultimately derived from the library of Esagila, the Temple of Marduk at Babylon.” By the publication by Dr. Erech Ebling of the contents of the Ashur tablets, the whole of the Epic is now almost entirely known. It is now admitted that the resemblance between the seven tablets of the Epic and the seven days of Gen. i does not in reality exist. We also know\* that “the Epic originally contained six books and the seventh book existed as an independent poem.” Creation in the Biblical sense scarcely finds a place in the poem, and its morality leaves much to be desired. The Biblical account owes nothing to the Babylonian.

The Ishtar gate, another of Nebuchadrezzar’s schemes of defence and embellishment, is still 40 ft. high, and is the most considerable and striking ruin in Babylonia, and excepting Birs Nimrud, is the highest, yet the 40 ft. standing is believed to be only one-third of the original height and the foundations have not been reached. It is a gateway with three entrances, with recesses, the walls of which are covered with alternate rows of bulls and dragons standing out in relief; these are never mixed in the same horizontal row. When the excavators commenced work in 1899, an upper row of this gateway, made of enamelled bricks of brilliant colourings and design, was still standing. It is no longer to be seen on the site.

The principal audience chamber of the Babylonian Kings is the largest chamber discovered in Babylon. It is 170 ft. long and 55 ft. broad. Koldewey says: “To the south lies the largest chamber of the citadel—the throne room of the Babylonian Kings. It is so clearly marked out for this purpose that no reasonable doubt can be felt as to its having been used as their principal audience chamber. If anyone should desire

---

\* *Babylonian Epic of Creation*, p. 6.

to localize the scene of Belshazzar's eventful banquet, he can surely place it with complete accuracy in this immense room."\*

In connection with Nebuchadrezzar's work of rebuilding, I may mention that on the occasion of my visit to Ur of the Chaldees early in 1924, Mr. C. L. Woolley, head of the joint expedition, working for the Trustees of the British Museum and the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, now excavating the site, explained one of the main results of the winter's work just completed—the clearing of the Temple of E-nun-mah, dedicated to the moon god Nannar and his consort. The winter's work had been almost wholly concentrated on the sacred enclosure. Within this enclosure is a Ziggurat, built by Ur-Engur, the first king of the third dynasty. It cannot, therefore, be doubted that Abraham saw this building, and probably witnessed its ritual. The excavations of E-nun-mah revealed that until the time of Nebuchadrezzar the temple had often been rebuilt, but on the original foundations; these foundations go back to the third millennium B.C. The temple consisted of five chambers, and their size indicated that they accommodated the priests only and not the general public. This is characteristic of the old method of worship, where the temple is the house of the god—where he sleeps and eats—the priests being his servants, the god only revealing himself to the public on special occasions when he was taken on procession about the city. Mr. Woolley showed that originally the rooms and fitments were duplicated, indicating a separate ritual for the moon god and his consort, and here it may be said that the worship of this god was, as at Babylon, associated with immorality.

When Nebuchadrezzar came to the throne he rebuilt this temple at Ur, taking care not to destroy the older foundations. He erected a raised platform where the original entrance to the sanctuary stood and demolished surrounding buildings so as to make an extensive open space. It would seem that by these changes Nebuchadrezzar radically altered in many respects the method of worship—substituting open worship by the masses instead of the secret rites of worship conducted within these small chambers by the few. Is there an indication here of a revolutionary religious development inaugurated by

---

\* *Excavations of Babylon*, p. 103.

Nebuchadrezzar of which we have reference in the third chapter of Daniel? There could have been no novelty in Nebuchadrezzar constructing a huge image of gold—there were several of them already in existence; the novelty appears to have been the directions given for the gathering of all officials of the State to its dedication, not in a temple, but on the open plain of Dura, and here it would seem that the three Jewish nobles were, for the first time, ordered to worship with others, and openly, among the mass before the image Nebuchadrezzar had set up.

The type of building in use as far back as Hammurapi's reign shows the climatic conditions in Babylon not to have been materially different to those now existing. Yet many mistakes are made in this matter. I would refer, for instance, to the explanation given to account for the records of the Babylonian Deluge as being merely a nature myth. Jastrow writes\*: "Recognizing unreservedly the common origin of the Babylonian Biblical traditions of the Deluge—as a nature myth picturing the annual change, and based perhaps on a recollection of some particularly disastrous season," and Dr. Driver, quoting Professor Zimmern, "The very essence of the Biblical narrative presupposes a country liable, like Babylonia, to inundations; so that it cannot be doubted that the story was indigenous in Babylonia and transplanted in Palestine." The same "nature-myth" explanation is given in endeavouring to account for the Creation tablets. Dr. Driver, relying upon Professors Jastrow and Zimmern, writes: "During the long winter, the Babylonian plain, flooded by heavy rains, looked like a sea (Babylonian *tiamtu*, *tiâmat*). Then comes the spring, when the clouds and water vanish and dry land and vegetation appear. So, thought the Babylonian, must it have been in the first spring, at the first New Year, when, after a fight between Marduk and *Tiâmat*, the organized world came into being."†

Similar explanations to account both for the Biblical and Babylonian accounts of Creation and flood are made by many scholars. These so-called explanations are based upon the climatic conditions in which the scholars themselves lived, and not on those of Babylonia. Anyone with an intimate knowledge of Mesopotamia would not have made such blunders.

I take Dr. Driver's statement in detail. "During the long

---

\* *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*, p. 364.

† *Genesis*, 12th edition, 1926, p. 28.

winter." Babylonia has not a long, but a very short winter and a very long summer. The official statistics, taken over a long period, show that the mean daily temperature at Babylon did not fall below that of January, 57·2, and the mean daily temperature of the months of March and November exceeded 75. "The Babylonian plain flooded by heavy rains." Official meteorological figures show that the rainfall at Babylon is 4·25 ins. per annum. It rains on only a few days in the year, the highest monthly rainfall (in March) of 1·09 ins. could not cause a flood.

"Then comes the spring, when the clouds and water vanish and dry land and vegetation appears." It is in the Mesopotamian spring that clouds are most evident and the highest monthly rainfall already quoted falls. However, in spite of these blunders, parts of Mesopotamia do sometimes "look like a sea." This is due, not to rainfall in Mesopotamia, but to the melting of snow in the mountains of Armenia, Kurdistan and Persia. To this day, the river floods feed the permanent swamps in the southern part of Iraq, notably those between Amara and Kurna. The Tigris is at its lowest in October and November—it is not until April that its great volume of water flows. So that every part of Driver's climatic description is inaccurate. It fails to support the nature-myth theory of origin.

The "barrack square" scientific method of making soldiers act alike and with precision has advantages in military training, but should not be adopted by investigators. Higher critics seem to have drawn themselves up so as to form an undeviating line. To consult some of their works is to be impressed with the way they refer to another of their own school of thought and immediately "toe the line" already taken. This is seen in the instance just quoted. The reiteration of "complete agreement among scholars," unless this agreement is due to independent thought, is of no value. The aggressiveness with which we are asked to commence with "assured results" and to accept such assurances as "This latter hypothesis" [the general critical theory of late date and Babylonian borrowings] "with the reconstruction which it involves of our view of the development of Israel's religion *after* 750 B.C., may now be regarded as proved right up to the hilt for any thinking and unprejudiced man who is capable of estimating the character and value of evidence"\* is unscientific.

---

\* Dr. C. F. Burney, *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1908, p. 321.

We are indebted to archæologists for providing abundant material, illuminating contemporary conditions of life and belief among the nations surrounding Palestine. The limits of this paper do not permit any detailed examination of Babylon's influence on Israel, but Professor Sayce's statement, made in 1908, that "the more strictly archæological evidence of Babylonian influence upon Canaan is extraordinary scanty"\* still holds good. The evidence of the Old Testament is that during these periods of contact, instead of the Babylonian religious beliefs permeating those of the Hebrews, vastly different events occurred. In the first period, Abram withdrew from Babylonian polytheism, migrating into Palestine. In the second, the effect was such that the constant tendency of the Hebrew people to lapse into idolatry was cured by their residence in Babylon. They had come into direct contact with Babylonian polytheism in all its degrading immorality and wickedness, so that on their return to Jerusalem they thereafter were unaffected as a nation by idolatry. This adherence to their faith is in accord with what their later history would lead us to expect. Greek or Roman domination failed to move them from their monotheistic faith.

It has been suggested that the name "Yahum" or "Yahweh" has been found in Babylonian contract tablets of the age of Abraham, but such similarities in names do not prove that Babylonian beliefs resemble those of the Hebrews any more than a mud hut resembles a palace. How much would we know of God, His nature and attributes, if our knowledge were confined to Babylonian tablets?

#### THE CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS.

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is needless to say that I think we have listened to a very interesting paper, altogether unlike any that we have heard before. Such a communication as this, by one who has been on the spot and visited the ruins, gives an idea of the country and the conditions prevailing there such as other sources of information rarely contain. From the pictures which have been shown we get a very real idea of the confused heaps of ruin-mounds which the explorers have to investigate and the difficulties by which they are faced. Squadron-Leader Wiseman's knowledge of the literature

---

\* *Archæology and Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 151.

is exceedingly extensive. In my opinion he is quite right in identifying Merodach with Nimrod. From the time of Hammurabi to the fall of the Babylonian Empire, Merodach was the god of its great capital, the magnitude of which classical authorities have handed down to us. Professor Fried. Delitzsch, however, has stated that the portion of the city of Babylon within the walls now standing is no larger than the extent of Munich or Dresden. It is to this part that the explorers have given their attention, and what there may be outside the walls of this older portion we can only guess. It is a great pity that the Tower of Babel is now only represented by its core of unbaked brick, but such work of destruction in Babylonia has been going on for many years. I am glad to say that it is unlikely that it will be allowed to continue.

But it is getting late, and I will not detain you longer. I would ask you, however, before you leave, to pass a most hearty vote of thanks to Squadron-Leader Wiseman for his most interesting and valuable paper.



697<sup>TH</sup> ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 7<sup>TH</sup>, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN then introduced Professor Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., to read his paper on "The Completed Legend of Bel-Merodach and the Dragon," which was illustrated by lantern slides.

---

*THE COMPLETED LEGEND OF BEL-MERODACH  
AND THE DRAGON.*

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

OF all the known accounts of the Creation of the world, there is none which, after the majestic narrative contained in the first two chapters of Genesis, exercises such attraction for the student as does that handed down to us by the Babylonians and the Assyrians. With this account I have dealt on several previous occasions, but every addition thereto renews our interest in that noteworthy legend and leads us to turn our attention once more to the religion, the philosophy, the pantheon, and the turn of mind of that age-old nation with which the Tradition of the beginnings of the Universe originated, as well as the sister-nation—Assyria—which accepted it, and helped in such great measure to hand it down through our explorers of modern times.

And here, at the outset, it is well to consider and realize how different were the two accounts of those two Semitic nations, the Babylonians and the Hebrews. The author of the latter plunges at once into the details, telling us that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and explaining that the earth was without form and void, with darkness upon the face of the Deep, and the Spirit of God brooding over the face of the waters. The Assyro-Babylonian account, on the other hand, makes the creators to be Tauthé or Tiawath and Apsu or Apsū—the personified sea as the mother, and the Ab-zu, Semiticized as Apsū, the knowing, and therefore realizing abode of the waters, the father of all things at first existing. As Damascius says, the Babylonians rejected the one-principal of the creator and constituted two, from whom sprang Mouis or Mummu, the great intelligence which gave all primitive creatures their forms. As a result of the action of these two divine but crude creative forces (aided by Mummu, who, according to Professor Langdon, was their *Logos*), the gods of the later world, who created mankind, came into existence.

Elsewhere, and more than once, I have explained this as a kind of theory of evolution—not of the beings inhabiting the earth, but of the divine powers which brought all the order (and, we may also say, the beauty) which we see in the world and in the universe, into existence. To the chief of these superior divinities the Babylonians believed that mankind owed its existence. But before that great work of the gods took place, much had to be done, and great was the struggle, between the gods and their evil progenitors, to produce the perfected world and the wonders of the universe which the Babylonians saw around them, and for which their sages wished to account.

How far Mummu may be regarded as standing for the "Word" of Tiawath will probably be regarded as doubtful, especially as there may have been two personages bearing the same name, the one seemingly combined with the name of Tiawath, and having no divine prefix, and the other regarded as an independent deity, whose name is introduced with the prefix referred to. The gods whose names follow as having been produced "within them"—that is, as Langdon says, within the Apsū and the Tiawath—the freshwater Deep and the saltwater Ocean—were Lahmu and Lahamu, Anšar and Kišar, Anu their son, and Nudimmud son of Anu. What mystic teaching may be regarded as lying behind these names is uncertain, but when the words are in pairs it is

certain that the male and female deity is in each case intended. Lahmu and Lahamu would in this case stand for the state of creation preceding the *Anšar* and *Kišar*—the Host of Heaven and the Host of earth, whatever that may stand for. In Gen. ii, 1, "the heavens and the earth . . . and all the host of them" are referred to after their creation, but in the Babylonian story the deities bearing names understood to have a similar meaning are mentioned long before the completion of these essential portions of the universe is described. There must, then, be something very different in the real meaning of the names Anšar and Kišar.

Next in order comes Anu, the Assyro-Babylonian god of the heavens—implying, perhaps, an interval whilst Anšar and Kišar grew up and became parents, before the heavens appeared as we now see them. Finally Nudimmud, Anu's son, the great creator, identified with Êa or Enki, "the lord of the earth," arose.

It is at this point that the great change comes in, and the reason for the war between the gods and the powers of evil—the crude beginning of things symbolized by the watery wastes. To all appearance the heavenly powers (as we may call them) had access to an abode of the gods in general called Andurana, which, as Langdon points out, is a name of Arallu, the place afterwards allotted to the departed. Here the gods rebelled against Tiawath, and troubled her, and sang songs in praise, apparently, of their protector—probably Anšar. As they could not be silenced, and had become so powerful that their crude progenitors feared them, Apsū called to Mummu, and the two went together to Tiawath to consult what they should do. Apsū complained that he could not rest by day nor sleep by night—he would therefore confound them and destroy their ways. "Let the noise be stilled, and let us sleep, (even) us."

Tiawath, enraged, asks, "How shall we destroy that which we have made?" In his capacity of "word" or adviser of Apsū and Tiawath, Mummu answered and gave advice to Apsū, and this advice of "his Mummu," as the text has it, was wicked and unfavourable. "Go," he says, "thou art able, (though it be) a difficult way." Nothing is said about the action to be taken, and we may imagine that Mummu, the "word" of Apsū and Tiawath, was regarded as knowing their thoughts without hearing spoken words. Reference to their plans "in their assembly" is then made, and these plans, whatever they were, they communicated to the gods their first-born—that is, the gods of holier mind.

And here we see how manlike the Babylonians conceived their gods to be, for on learning the intentions of their progenitors, "the gods their first-born" wept, and sat whispering in silence. It was only the all-wise god Êa, however, who understood what the powers of evil intended to do, and he set to work to circumvent their designs by devising and fixing "the curse (or ban) of all things"—he made it skilfully, and this incantation was passing great:—

“ He repeated it, and he caused it to be in the waters,  
 In sleep he bewitched him, reposing in a cavern.  
 He had then caused Apsū to slumber, bewitching (his) sleep.  
 Mummu, in his lower part frightfully mutilated,  
 He severed his sinews and tore off [his] crown.  
 His magnificence he removed, him he stripped.  
 He then bound him, and Apsū he slew.  
 [M]ummu he confined, his skull he crushed.  
 He then fixed over Apsū his dwelling.  
 Mummu he held fast—he strengthend his bonds.  
 After he had bound (and) slain his enemies,  
 [Êa] made firm his victory over his foes.  
 In his chamber composedly he rested.  
 He named it then Apsū, (and) specified the shrines.  
 Therein he caused his secret chamber to be founded.  
 Laḥma (and) Laḥamu his spouse abode (there) in majesty.  
 In the chamber of the fates, the abode of (holy) concepts,  
 The wisest of the gods, the counsellor of the gods, was  
 engendered.  
 In the midst of the Apsū was formed Aššur—  
 In the midst of the holy Apsū was formed Aššur.  
 Laḥmu his father then formed him,  
 Laḥamu his mother was his bearer.  
 He sucked then the breasts of goddesses (*Ištarūti*).  
 A nurse tended him (and) filled him with fearsomeness.  
 Pleasant was his form, bright the gaze of his eye.  
 Virile was his growth, potent from the beginning.  
 Laḥmu, the begetter, his father, then beheld him;  
 His heart rejoiced (and) was glad, with rejoicing he was filled.  
 He perfected him, and added to him a god's double measure.  
 He was exceedingly tall, and he surpassed notably.  
 Not understood and gracious were his proportions,  
 Not suited for the intelligence, oppressive to the sight.

Four were his eyes, four were his ears,  
 When he moved his lips fire\* [was kindled].  
 (His) understanding increased fourfold ;  
 And the eyes perceived all things like that.  
 Then was he lifted up among the gods, his form made sublime.  
 His limbs made massive, in height surpassing great.  
 'My son the godhead ; my son the godhead.  
 My son the Sun, the Sun of Anu (or of heaven).'  
 Clothed in the splendour of ten gods, he was exceedingly  
 powerful."

At this point the inscription is defective, and the partial gap gives an opportunity for a few remarks upon the translation just given. It will be noticed that the text makes the deity described to be Aššur, the national god of the Assyrians. This, however, is due to Assyrian patriotism—or Chauvinism—because they wished it to be thought that it was to the head of their own pantheon that the creation of the world was due. The fact, however, is, that they had simply substituted the name of Aššur for that of the Babylonian Merodach, as the duplicates of the tablets inscribed with the Legend show.

Noteworthy, too—and still more important—is the description of Aššur (or Merodach) here given. Anything more unlike the way in which the Hebrews depicted to themselves the God whom they worshipped could hardly be imagined ; yet Mordecai (better Maredecai) means "the Merodachite"—the worshipper and servant of Merodach. We can only suppose, therefore, that the idea of Merodach prevailing about the Persian period in Babylonia was that of the portion of the Babylonian people who were monotheistically inclined, as I showed in my paper upon "The Religious Ideas of the Babylonians" in the *Transactions* of this Institute thirty-two years ago. In the inscription proving this belief, all the chief gods of the Babylonians are identified with Merodach, whose emanations they were. The identification of Merodach with Jehovah, however, is of an earlier date than this, as the Biblical references to Rahab, the Hebrew name of Merodach's opponent Tiawath, show.

That the Babylonians did not altogether accept the description

---

\* 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵, transcribed by Langdon *u<sup>2</sup> gibil*. The divine prefix before the word is not uncommon, and shows the esteem in which fire was held. The usual word is *išatu*.

of Merodach in this Creation-legend is clear from the well-known outline-carving depicting that god found by the German explorers at Babylon. As far as I know, he is never represented with four eyes, four ears, and fire coming from his mouth. The perfection of his form and his intelligence, however, we may well accept as being in accord with Babylonian ideas of the chief of their pantheon. It cannot be said that the translation of this (which is based on that of Professor Langdon, of Oxford) is beyond all doubt, but it is probably better than any rendering given by me previously, and in departing here and there from that of Professor Langdon I may have given a worse, rather than a better, rendering.

In the last line but one of the above rendering I have regarded *îlûtu* or *yaûtu* as being, in accordance with the generally received renderings, words indicating the god's high status as a divinity. *Yaûtu* is an archaic word expressing this, but *îlûtu* is probably of later date, and therefore more usual. The interesting point for the modern commentator is, that *yaûtu* is derived from *ya'u*, the Hebrew Jah, the well-known word for the God of the Israelites when Yahwah (Jehovah) was not used. This naturally has no theological bearing on the Biblical account of the Creation—*yaûtu* is simply an abstract noun from *ya'u*, which is familiar as a common Semitic word for "god," especially when they wished to indicate the one, or the chief, ruler of the universe.

According to Damascius (and the Babylonian story of the Creation confirmed this when it was in an incomplete state) there was but one conflict between the gods and the original creative powers, as represented by Apsû and Tiawath, but the present completed legend indicates that the Babylonians regarded the contest as having been renewed when the Dragon of Chaos took to herself a second spouse, whom they named Kingu. This is owing to the heavenly powers having overcome Apsû, the former male creative principle, whose watery domain they had annexed, and upon whose body Êa, the god of the waters and of deep wisdom, had founded his seat. In this same domain, as the legend relates, Lahmu and Lahamu were installed, and there Aššur-Merodach was born. The completion of the Assyro-Babylonian story of the Creation renders it stranger still than it was in its seemingly less detailed and seemingly incomplete form.

The death of Apsû enraged Tiawath, and she and her followers then determined to wreak vengeance. The details of the plot

against their heavenly offspring are unfortunately wanting, but where the text again becomes fully understandable we find ourselves upon fairly familiar ground. "Mother Hubur," as Tiawath is at this point called, apparently now creates all the monsters of her watery abode which she had conceived in her mind to help her, and in order to ensure success they seem to have exercised themselves in feats of arms:—

"They cursed the day, and went forth by the side of Tiawath,  
They raged, they plotted, not resting day or night.  
They raised a conflict, they chafed, they fumed,  
They set themselves in (battle-)array, and made contests."

The monsters whom "Mother Hubur" created were "sharp of tooth, unsparing of fang, filled with poison like (instead of) blood, uncouth monsters clothed with fearfulness." She loaded them with magnificence, and made them like the gods. Their beholder was verily transfixed with terror—their bodies, indeed, reared high, and (none) restrained their breasts. At this point (and also farther on) their names are given—names which Assyriologists try to reproduce in the languages of to-day. The monsters were the *bašmu* or "viper," the *muš-ruššu* or "raging serpent," the *Lahamu* or "sea-monster," the *úgallu*<sup>m</sup>, which Langdon contends means the "great lion." This is not the word used for the constellation Leo, as that is represented by the compound *ur-gula*. Next comes the *ur-idimmu* or "raging hound," *akrab-awēlu*, "the scorpion-man," such as we see on the Babylonian boundary-stones and cylinder-seals. To these were added "the destructive spirits of wrath," "the fish-man," and "the fish-ram." All these bore unsparing weapons, and feared not the conflict. Altogether there were eleven newly created beings of monstrous form, and one of these, the demon named Kingu, she proclaimed as her spouse instead of Apsū, to whose existence the gods of heaven had already made an end.

From this point onwards Kingu, as well as Tiawath, are the leaders of the host against the gods of heaven, though the counterpart of the Hebrew Rahab is always the greater of the two. She exalts him to undertake the bearing of arms, to advance to the attack, and to become the victorious chief in the expected battle. As a sign of mourning for the slain Apsū, his predecessor, she causes him to sit in sackcloth, and then, addressing him in a grandiloquent speech, she tells him of the "spell" which she had made for him, and how she had exalted him to the rule of all

the gods, expressing the hope that his names might be greater than (those of) all the Anunnaki—the gods of the heavens.

It is a strange story—that of the conflict of the primitive powers of evil and heavenly offspring. Yet the Babylonians apparently saw nothing incongruous in it. Here they are shown as believers in, and supporters of, the gods of heaven, but nevertheless they regarded Tiawath as possessing the highest powers and the might of those holy ones, as though equal with them in holiness and capable of conferring all the legitimate power and dignity of which she (and her followers) were unworthy. This was probably due to the fact that she still possessed, in the belief of the Babylonians, “the Tablets of Fate”—documents belonging to the ruler of heaven alone. As she was about to make Kingu ruler of heaven (though he seems not to have inhabited that exalted realm), she now hands to him the Fate-Tablets, giving him a sure command, which could not be annulled, and also “the Anuship”—the supreme authority in the heavens, Anu’s domain.

With this episode the first tablet of the series comes to an end, and the colophon tells us that the document in question belongs to Nabû-balat-su-iqbî son of Na’id-Marduk, by whose hand it was apparently written. The colophon at the end of another copy states that it was from Babylon, and was written on the 9th of Iyyar in the twenty-seventh year of Darius.

In the second tablet of the legend, Tiawath prepares for the battle against “the gods her offspring,” doing evil “in order to avenge Apsû”—*alû tûr gimilli Apsû*, as Professor Langdon reads. The god Êa hears of the preparations, and becomes faint and pained. When his anger had subsided he set out to seek Anšar his father, to whom he repeats the whole story in the words describing the preparations for the conflict in the first tablet. On hearing the news, Anšar in despair smote his loins and bit his lip. It is thought that he is described in the mutilated passage which occurs here as requesting the god Êa to curse Tiawath as he had done Apsû and Mummu, but that Êa held back. Anšar therefore turns to the heaven-god Anu, telling him to go and stand before Tiawath. Apparently Anšar expected much from this interview, for he says to Anu, “May her mind be appeased—may she be glad in her heart.” When Anu approached Tiawath, however, and, by his divine power, saw her plan, as Professor Langdon translates, he turned and fled, confessing his want of power in the presence of her great might. Anšar ponders the situation in his heart, and then announces



to the Anunnaki that the only deity mighty enough to cope with the power of evil is the valiant Merodach. Êa summons his son, and many words are spoken, and he kissed away Anšar's fear, asking what man had dared to bring battle against him? On learning that the foe was Tiawath, Merodach gives Anšar full assurance of his ultimate success. He asks only that an assembly of the gods should be called wherein his fate—his position as a member of the pantheon—should again be declared, and, as is implied, his power increased:—

“ In Ub-šu-ukkinnaki sit ye then joyfully together ;  
 My mouth being opened, like you, then, fates may I fix.  
 Whatever I create, even I, shall not be changed.  
 Let not return and let not be changed the pronouncement of  
 my lips.”

The second tablet closes with this line, and we learn from the colophons of the two copies extant that the Assyrian text came from the city of Aššur. The other belonged to Nabû-âhê-iddina son of Êtir-bêl, son of the priest of Maš. “ Wilfully he withholds not (anything).”

The third tablet deals with the convening of the assembly, and not only are the gods to meet—they are also to make high festival. Again the history of Tiawath's preparations to destroy the gods of heaven is repeated in identical words by Gaga, Anšar's messenger, to Laḥmu and Laḥamu. They were to be brought unto him, and were, in their turn, to bring the other gods. Nothing is omitted in the tale Gaga was to tell, but the account of the orders of Anšar afterwards seems to be somewhat shortened:—

“ I sent then Anu—he was powerless before her,  
 Nudimmud (Êa) feared and turned back.  
 Merodach, sage of the gods, your son, came forward.”

And the terms of Merodach when he offered to meet Tiawath are repeated. The ceremonial acts of Gaga when he came into the presence of Laḥmu and Laḥamu (in their chamber, seemingly, under the sea) are not without interest:—

“ Gaga went, he pursued his way, and  
 In the place of Laḥmu and Laḥamu, the gods, his fathers,  
 He bowed and kissed the ground beneath them.  
 He lay prostrate, he stood up and addressed them :

‘ Anšar, your son, hath now sent me—  
 The decision of his heart he hath caused me, (even) me, to  
 understand,  
 Thus : Tiawath our procreatress hath cursed us—  
 She conveneth an assembly and angrily she rageth.  
 The gods, all of them, have now turned to her,  
 Except those whom ye have created, they go by her side.  
 They have cursed the day, and are going up to the side of  
 Tiawath.’ ”

The whole story is repeated as on pp. 143 and 144. When Laḥḥa (Laḥmu) and Laḥamu heard the words of Gaga they cried aloud and all the Igigi wailed bitterly. “ Why have they become hostile until the conception of this decision ? We knew not of the deed of Tiawath.”

“ They met together and went—  
 The great gods, all of them, deciders of Fates.  
 They entered then before Anšar, they filled [Ub-šu-  
 ukkinaku].  
 They kissed one another—they were united in the assembly.  
 They conversed together seated at the banquet.  
 They ate bread, they prepared wine.  
 The sweet drink drowned their cares ;  
 The liquor, as they drank, satiated their bodies.  
 Much they discoursed and their mood became exalted.  
 For Merodach, their avenger, they decreed his fate.”

Here the third tablet comes to an end, and we are admitted again to what may be regarded as a phase of Babylonian life. The short but realistic description of the feast recalls the relief found by the French explorers in Sargon’s palace at Khorsabad, where Assyrian soldiers are shown seated at tables and raising their drinking-cups—perhaps in response to a toast. In the feast of the gods here described, however, there are other details which are worth noticing. The gods are not only described as sitting, but their “ love-feast ” (as we may call it) consists only of *ašnan* and *kurunnu*, translated respectively as “ bread ” and “ wine.” It is to be noted that *ašnan* occurs generally in religious texts, and possibly designates some kind of divine food. A section in one of the great lists of gods is devoted to the deity of this divine bread (*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*,

Part xxiv, pl. 23, completed to a certain extent from plates 7-9), and from this we learn that  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$  (so to be completed, in all probability) was identified with  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$  (so read, apparently, instead of  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$ ), the pronunciation of which is *Ašnan*, and that another name of the god was  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$ , *Ezinū*, a form apparently preferred by the Sumerians. He is associated in this section with "the great doorkeeper of Ēkurra"—"the temple of the land," or "of the mountain"—and the god Hani, with whom the names of  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$ , *Mesi*, and  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$ , *Še*, "the god of grain" (barley), also appear. One of the deities mentioned in connection with this name for grain is *En-zi-kalamma*, "the lord of the life of the land," whilst the last deity of the second section referring to the gods of grain is  $\rightarrow\uparrow \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦} \text{𒌦}$ , *Nisaba*, possibly identified with Ašnan or Ezinū.

With regard to the gods' drink at that famous divine feast, it is to be noted that they prepared it whilst at table. Nevertheless it is called *širisa* and *šikaru*, both of which seem to be words for fermented liquor. Naturally the gods, being of unlimited supernatural power, could be regarded as not needing the stimulus of alcohol or as capable of producing it in their drink at will. The human element in the Babylonian pantheon, however, obliges us to think of their divine intelligence as subject to the same physical needs as that of the generality of men.

We now come to the fourth tablet of the completed Story of the Creation. This begins with a reference to the princely chamber which they had constructed for Merodach—apparently as a council-hall. The gods then address him, telling him that his word was that of Anu, the god of the heavens—his command could not be changed, and to exalt and to abase, that was in his power. Restoration was the need of the sanctuaries of the gods, so wherever their sanctuaries lay, that was his place. Merodach was therefore the god of the restoration of Babylonia's holy places, and consequently must have had a share in the divine honours rendered therein. This naturally tended to end in his identification with all "the gods his fathers"—and "the gods his brothers" as well.

"Sit thou then in the assembly—verily supreme has thy word become.

May thy weapons not fail—may they annihilate thy foes.

Lord, who trusteth in thee, spare thou then his life ;  
 And (as to) the god who hath conceived evil, pour thou his  
 life away."

At this point comes the test of the garment, by which Merodach was to know that he really possessed the power "to destroy and to make" by the word of his mouth. The successful fulfilment of this test rouses the gods to enthusiasm, and they did homage, shouting, "Merodach then is king." As a sign of his sovereignty they added to his possessions sceptre, throne, and warrior's battle-axe as a sign of his power. They gave to him also an irresistible weapon wherewith to overwhelm the hateful.

"Go thou and cut off Tiawath's life-breath ;  
 May the winds bear away her blood to a secret place."

Merodach then made ready his bow and arrows, fixing himself the bowstring. He did not forget the weapon which is described as "the toothed sickle," and he then hung the bow and the quiver at his side. Lightning he set before him, and with a burning flame was his body filled. Then comes something special in his armoury—the net with which, as a sea-monster, he intended to enclose her. The winds of the four cardinal points, too, accompanied him, and near by his side he brought another net, which was the gift of his father Anu.

The Assyro-Babylonians were accustomed to regard Addu, Adad, or Rammānu (Haddo, Hadad, or Rimmon) as the great wind-god, because he was the god of rains, storms, inundations, floods, thunder, and lightning, but Merodach would seem to have been in an even greater measure the god of the winds, for not content with the aid of those of the cardinal points, he created seven others, among them being "the fourfold wind" and "the sevenfold wind," which followed him to trouble Tiawath inwardly ; and rode, himself, the chariot of the irresistible, terrible storm. To this he yoked four "span," as Professor Langdon translates, and attached them beside it (*īdušša ilul*). Each steed bore a name—"the Destroyer," "the Unsparring," "the Stormer," "the Swift-runner"—"sharp were their poison-laden teeth." As to the god himself, he was clad in a heavy garment woven to imitate a fleece, like that worn by the king Ê-anna-tum as depicted on the Vulture-Stele (Langdon, Heuzey, and Thureau-Dangin), whilst his head was crowned with the brilliance of flames—a flaming halo, as we might, perhaps, translate. Every kind of

destructive appliance was attributed by the Babylonians to the chief of their pantheon when he went to attack Tiawath, and a few lines farther on he is described as even holding some destructive thing—probably a violent wind—in his mouth, whilst he grasped in his hand “the plant annihilating poison.” Surrounded by the gods “his fathers” and other divinities, he advanced, but notwithstanding all his preparations he only drew near in fear, and, seeing his trouble, the gods who had hastened to his side were troubled too. Tiawath, without “turning her neck”—without looking back, uttered her (curse or reproach) against him—the gods had raised him to his present position (to which, as is probably implied, he had no right), and now occupied *his* place—that which he ought to have occupied. At this point “the lord raised his great weapon,” the “Cyclone,” and sent his answer to Tiawath, “who was enraged,” saying thus:—

“As for thee, thou hast become great, thou art lifted up,  
Thy heart has then urged thee to summon to a conflict.

. . . . .

Thou hast exalted Kingu to be thy husband,  
Thou hast made greater his decree than the decree of Anuship.  
Evil deeds thou seekest, and  
Thou settest thine evil against the gods my fathers.  
Let thy host be harnessed, and let their weapons be girded on.  
Stand then, I and thou—we (will) make battle.”

The clashing of the forces of evil and the god of heaven is told in vigorous language, and after that “the lord” spread out his net and enmeshed her. Tiawath, on her part, opened wide her mouth to consume him, but the evil wind entered before she could close her lips. Filled with the raging winds, she opened wide her mouth. Pierced by the god’s arrow, which rent asunder her heart, he bound her and annihilated her life. Casting down her corpse, he stood upon it, and the gods her helpers, seeing that her end had come, turned and fled. The capture of those helpers followed, and they were cast into the net and sat down in the snare. The eleven monsters created by Tiawath were overthrown and trampled on, and Kingu, her husband, was bound and counted with Ugga, the god of Death. The Fate-Tablets, which were not rightfully his, Merodach took from him, and pressing his seal upon them, took them to his breast. After this he strengthened his hold upon the gods whom he had captured and then, returning to Tiawath, trampled upon her,

and split her skull with his unsparing sickle. After he had cut asunder the arteries of her blood, the north wind carried it away to secret places. The gods his fathers, seeing this, shouted for joy, and brought him gifts and presents. The splitting of the body of the monster, like a shell-fish, into two parts to form the waters above and below the firmament—above and below “the welkin”—is here described at length. The fourth tablet then ends with a description of the abodes which he made for the gods—for Nudimmud, on the face of the Deep, and as a counterpart of the Apsū below, a great abode called Ê-šarra—described as the heavens—wherein he founded strongholds for Anu, Enlil, and Êa.

The colophon states that the text consists of 146 lines written according to a text which was damaged. If this rendering be correct, the scribe Nabû-bêl-šu son of Na'id-Maruduk, who wrote it, must have been very successful in his restorations. The scribe's grandfather or remoter ancestor was a smith. The scribe himself copied the legend for the saving of his soul and the life of his family (literally “his house”), and placed it in Ê-zida—possibly the temple of Nebo in Aššur.

How great is the difference between the Babylonian anthropomorphic Merodach and his equally manlike fathers or companions and the great and noble uncreated and unbegotten God of the Hebrews! That the chief of the Babylonian pantheon should fear, and flinch at the sight of any monster, however terrible in appearance, strikes our Western minds as being in the highest degree incongruous. Naturally, this legend is a key to the Babylonian character as a nation—they, too, would have flinched at the sight of anything uncanny, and the least terrible of the mythical beings described would have put them to flight.

Noteworthy, however, is the fact that this remarkable Babylonian Legend of the Creation makes Merodach to have been begotten, and not the uncreated first cause. The apparently uncreated first cause was the twofold principle which, as Damascius points out, was characteristic of Babylonian religious belief. Apsū and Tiawath were the great producers of all things, and, by evolution, the result was the gods—the creators of man.

The fifth tablet continues the description of Merodach's creative acts. First came the stations for the great gods in the likeness of stars, and those stars were the *Lumaši* or planets—indeed, the Babylonian belief in that identification of the planets with the gods is recorded in the names by which we

designate them, as well as in our Teutonic names of the days of the week. This, however, is a subject which would need a paper all to itself. In arranging the Signs of the Zodiac the god was regarded by the Babylonians as having set three stars (constellations) for each month, in accordance with what we find inscribed on the Assyrian so-called planispheres—I published a fairly complete list of these, from a tablet not arranged in planisphere form, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1900, Part iii (July), pp. 573-5. This portion of the Legend of the Creation corresponds with the Hebrew account, in which God is said to have placed the two great lights in the heavens “for signs and for seasons and for days and years.” I doubt, however, whether the Babylonians regarded Merodach as the creator of the heavenly bodies—he seems to have been regarded merely as the god who ordered them by setting them in their appointed places. The details of the god’s directions for the phases of the moon are interesting, and it is here that the word *šapattu*<sup>m</sup> occurs—a word which is possibly the original of the Hebrew Sabbath, though many deny this, as the Sumerian *šabat*, from which it is derived, is regarded as meaning “mid-rest” and not “heart-rest,” as it was at first translated. The moon “rested” at the full in the middle of the month. The directions to the moon, given as to a living thing—here probably as the god Nannar, the light-giver—are rather detailed, and in Langdon’s rendering require many words to complete the sense, and the equivalent of about eight pages of footnotes (in smaller type) to explain. It is needless to say that this is a very interesting section of the Legend from an astronomical point of view, and it is greatly to be regretted that after line 22, in which the earth’s satellite is described as being in opposition to the sun a second time, the sense is more than merely obscure owing to mutilation, and shortly afterwards breaks off altogether. Nothing, in fact, has been added to the fragments of the fifth tablet discovered by the late George Smith. The colophon is the usual short one of Aššurbanipal (Assurbanipal), in rendering which Langdon departs somewhat from the usual rendering :—

“Land of Assurbanipal, king of universal dominion, king of Assyria.”

In the lost portion of the fifth tablet many important legendary details were recorded, as the opening lines of the sixth tablet show. Evidently Merodach had completed the more material of

his work of ordering the universe and creating new forms, and the question of the final and crowning work had to be considered. They therefore met in council and decided upon the creation of mankind :—

“ When Merodach heard the words of the gods,  
His heart prompts him—he devises clever things.  
He opened his mouth, to Êa he s[peaks, and]  
What he had conceived in his heart, he gives (as) advice :  
‘ Blood will I compose, and bone will I then cause to be :  
Verily I will make *lilû* stand (forth), and let *awêlu* (man) be  
his name.

Verily I will create then *lilû*, man.

The services of the gods will then be instituted, and they  
shall then be appeased.

I will change then the ways of the gods—I will skilfully  
contrive (them).

Together\* let them be honoured, and as two† (orders) let  
them divide.’

Êa then answered him, speaking to him a word :

For the appeasement of the gods he imparts to him a plan.

‘ Let now one of their companions be given—

Let him perish, and let men be created.

Let then the great gods assemble,

Let my punishment be imposed, and let the gods insist.’

Merodach assembled then the great gods,

Kindly he arranges (them), giving instruction.

Opening his mouth, he charges the gods—

The king speaks the word to the Anunnaki :

‘ Verily then (is) true the first (thing that) we announced to  
you.

The truths I announce (were) oaths with me.

[W]ho now was it who made the conflict ?

Caused Tiawath to rebel and joined battle ?

Let him be given who make the conflict—

I will verily cause him to bear his guilt—rest ye in peace.’

The Igigi, the great gods, then answered him :

Unto Lugal-dimmer-an-*kia*, the counsellor of the gods, their  
lord :

‘ Kingu it was who made the conflict,

Caused Tiawath to rebel and joined battle.’

\* *Išteniš*.

† *Ana šina*.



They bound him, before Êa they brought him—  
They imposed upon him the sin, and severed (the arteries of)  
his blood.

With his blood he made mankind (*awêlûtu*)  
In the service\* of the gods, and he set the gods free.

After that he had created mankind, Êa then  
Imposed the service of the gods upon him.

That work was beyond understanding.

By the skill of Merodach [and the wisdom] of Nudimmud,  
Merodach, king of the gods, divided

The Anunnaki [and the Igigi] above and below.”

Here the text becomes imperfect, and the sense of the narrative is difficult to determine. Anu was told to watch or guard something, † and (Merodach) ordered the ways of the earth and “issued” the laws concerning it. Merodach then seems to have consulted the Anunnaki of the heavens and of the earth, who, addressing him as Nannar, “the light-giver”—the name often given to the Moon-god—proposed the founding of a shrine which was to be called “The Shrine of our repose,” wherein they could all rest. There, too, apparently, they offered to found an abode for Merodach their king. When he heard this proposal his countenance grew as bright as the day, and he said :—

“ ‘Like th[at] shall be Babylon (𒂗𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪𒍪 .

*Bâb-îlâni* ‡), whose construction ye have desired—

Let a city be built, let an enclosed shrine be constructed.’

The Anunnaki seized (?) the spade :

(For) one year [they made] its bricks,

When the second year arrived,

They raised the summit of Ê-sagila (as) the counterpart of  
the Apsû.§

They then built the lofty stage-tower of the Apsû.||

\* Or “for the worship.”

† “The Ordinances” (?).

‡ A small mutilated tablet from Kougunjik, unnumbered when I made a note of it many years ago, has the writing 𒂗𒍪𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪𒍪𒍪, probably *Bâb-îlan*, “the Gate of the Two Gods”—but which two?

§ Rendered by Professor Langdon “the nether sea.” The divine chamber in that sea is probably intended, wherein Lahma and Lahama begat Aššur-Merodach.

|| 𒂗𒍪𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪𒍪 𒂗𒍪𒍪𒍪𒍪, Ê-temen-an-kia, “the Temple of the Foundation of Heaven and Earth.”

For Merodach, Enlil, Éa,\* they founded his temple as his abode.

In magnificence they caused it to rise up before them—

From the base of Ê-sagila do they behold its horns.

After they had done the work of Ê-sagila,

The Anunnaki elaborated for themselves their shirines.

They all assembled at Ê-sagila, the basin of the Apsū.

In the sublime shrine which they had built (as) his abode.”

From this it would seem that the gods in their assembly had (in Tablet V) proposed and discussed the building of Babylon, and there, too, they decided, as stated here, to build the great temple-tower which the gods had decided to erect upon what Langdon calls “the *bowl* of the Nether sea.” Explanation of the details given here must for the present remain conjectural, but it is to be noted that, in later times, the land of Babylonia seems not to have been called Akkad, but Êridu—the name of the Paradise-city on the Persian Gulf, at the head of which the Apsū was supposed to lie, apparently beneath the waters. It is possible that the Gulf extended, in still more ancient times, yet farther inland; and, if so, were the Babylonians (or Akkadians) aware of the fact? Perhaps—time alone will show; but it is to be noted that Professor Warren, who wrote a book locating Paradise at the North Pole, because that was the coolest and therefore the first tract where men could have lived before the globe was sufficiently cool, imagined Ê-sagila as a great temple-tower in stages poised upon its inverted counterpart in the Abyss, as though always accompanied by its own reflection. And why were the gods imagined as looking up at the “horns” of the *zikkurat* from its base (*šuršiš*)?

But to leave the domain of suggestion and conjecture, we may, perhaps, here compare the description of the building of the Tower of Babel as told in Gen. xi. There, clearly, it is not the gods who build Babylon and its tower, but men. Both the men and the gods, however, make bricks for the purpose. In both cases the tower was to be a very high one—*ša Ê-sag-ila mihrît apsî ullâ rêša-šu*, “of Ê-sag-ila, the counterpart of the Apsū (below), they raised its head.” The Babylonian gods, however, did not need to make for themselves a name, lest they should be

---

\* Apparently the three deities united in one, hence the singular possessive pronoun.

scattered abroad on the face of the earth. Moreover, for the Babylonians, Babylon was founded before the creation of man, and a confusion of tongues was naturally impossible. Finally, both city and tower were built in accordance with the wishes of the gods and their king, and not out of pride by mere men, thus incurring the Creator's displeasure.

And now, at last, we see the reason of the composition of the great Babylonian story of the Creation—it was to bring before the people of the land the romance of the foundation of their city, and especially its divine origin. For them, it was not Babila<sup>m</sup>, the possible Akkadian form of Babel, "Confusion"—it was Bâb-îli, "the Gate of the Gods"—the place of their entrance into the land—it was Tindir, "the Life-seat"; Šu-anna, "the hand of Anu," the god of the heavens, unless we accept Fried. Delitzsch's rendering of the word—"the (city of the) high defences," referring to its lofty walls; and it was Êri-du when they thought of it as the prototype of the other smaller Êri-du at the head of the Persian Gulf in those early days of the Babylonian empire, but now far inland. To-day it is known as Abu-shahreïn.

The gods' work upon the building of Babylon and its shrines having been finished, their king addressed them, telling them that that was their dwelling-place, and bidding them to make merry with music therein. This they did, feasting and holding high festival with music. Then they made decrees and designs for the future, and the stations of the great gods of the heavens and the earth were fixed. A display of the weapons used in the fight with Tiawath followed, and Anu, the god of the heavens, taking up the skilfully-constructed bow (used by Merodach), kissed it and recited its names. This bow then, set in the heavens, became one of the constellations. The gods in the end praise Merodach, glorify his heroic deeds, and recite his names:—

"Asari-lu-duga is his name, which his father called him.

Verily he is the light of the gods, the mighty hero,

Who like a consoling and protecting genius giveth life to  
the land."

Asari-lu-duga is one of Merodach's most famous names, and has been compared—probably rightly—with the Osiris Unnofer of the Egyptians. Under this title he is described in the "Great List of Gods" (*Cuneiform Texts*, Part xxiv, pl. 42, line 98) as *Maruduk*

*ša šipti*, which Langdon translates as "Marduk of judgment," which is probably false. Asari-lu-duga, "Asari the good man," or "being," however, is probably not a bad reproduction of the Wasiri un-nofer of the Egyptians, who was a judge of the dead. Asari and Osiris are both written with the corresponding characters in the respective scripts.\* In other respects there is also a likeness between the Babylonian Asari and the Egyptian Osiris. Other names of Merodach given in this part of the legend are Namtilaku, "life," from the Sumerian *Namtīla*, so named because he restored certain dead gods to life—possibly "the gods who were his enemies." As a sun-god, like Osiris, he was called Namru, "the bright one," because he was the gods' "brilliant god who illuminateth our way." At the conclusion of this recitation, gifts or "portions" were assigned to the gods in Ub-šu-ukkinaka, the place of the fates, and there all the gods again recited and commented on his names. The colophon states that this is the sixth tablet of *Énuma Éliš*, but there is no owner's name. Another copy of the text, however, belonged to a certain Nabû-balaṭ-su-iqbi.

The seventh tablet, the text of which, according to the catch-line, immediately followed on, is regarded as not having originally belonged to the series. Whilst admitting the possibility of this, I prefer to keep "an open mind" upon that point. One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that there existed in Assyria, and therefore in Babylonia as well, a dialectic Sumerian glossary of all the words which it contained, thus testifying to the esteem in which it was held. No such glossary seems to have been compiled for the first six tablets, but negative evidence is not always trustworthy.

This interesting final section seems to consist of rough explanations or paraphrases of Merodach's names, in which the reasons for applying them to him are given. The following are the opening lines:—

"Asari, bestower of husbandry, who has fixed the boundaries  
(of the fields).

Creator of grain and vegetation, causing grass to grow.

---

\* I have given the Assyrian form in my paper, "The Religious Ideas of the Babylonians," p. 2 (paper read April 26th, 1894), in the *Journal of this Institute*. The identification of Asari with Osiris was proposed by Professor Hommel (*ibid.*). For "Šilig," read "Asari."

Asari-alim, who is honoured in the house of counsel—excellent  
in counsel.

The gods attended (him when) by sorrow they were seized.  
Asari-alim-nunna, intercessor, light of the father his begetter,  
Director of the ordinances of Anu, Enlil, and Êa.

He then is their guardian, determining their abodes ;  
From whose storehouse abundance goeth forth for all.

Tutu, maker of their renewal [is he].

May he purify their tabernacles and may they be content.

Let him create the incantation, and let the gods be at rest.

Angrily did they then advance, did they turn back their  
breasts.

Verily he was then lifted up in the assembly of the gods—

Not anyone among the gods compares himself with him.”

This is the tenor of the seventh tablet of the Creation-series all  
the way through. Every epithet and explanation is worthy of  
analysis, but the space for this is lacking, and a perusal of it, if  
written, would certainly exhaust the patience of readers. The  
reason of the creation of man by the gods Merodach, Êa (and  
Merodach's spouse Zêr-panith), however, is certainly worth  
noticing, notwithstanding that it has often been referred to  
already :—

“Tutu is Aga-azaga, in the fourth (place)—may all things  
glorify him—

The lord of the holy incantation giving life to the dead.

He who had mercy on the gods who were captive,

The yoke imposed he caused to be removed from the gods his  
enemies,

For their redeeming he created mankind.”

There has been much discussion as to what this last phrase can  
really mean. My old translation was “to redeem them he  
created mankind.” I had no idea, however, as to how this was  
to be brought about. Jensen queries the statement by inserting  
the word “Eschatology ?” Perhaps the Babylonians did not  
know themselves. We may hazard the explanation, however,  
that there was an idea that the gods who aided Tiawath were  
alone in consideration. Mankind was created to worship the  
gods of heaven—to praise and give them thanks for their own  
existence, as well as for the means of sustaining and enjoying life,  
and it may have been felt that by this adoration of the gods of

heaven, the followers of Tiawath would in the end benefit—indeed, the miracle-play on the occasion of the New-Year Festival may have contained ceremonies tending to secure the release of the “rebellious gods” from bondage and their restoration to intercourse with their kith and kin on high.

“The merciful one, with whom is the giving of life,  
 May his words endure and not be forgotten  
 In the mouth of the ‘Dark of Head’ (the Semites) whom  
 his hands have made.

He who, in the four regions, created the ‘Dark of Head,’  
 Ordained upon him the decree of the ‘Day of the Gods.’”

As we know from the bilingual lists, the “day” of a god or of a king was his festival, and the great festival of the Babylonian gods must have been that at Du-azaga, “the holy abode,” where the miracle-play and its accompanying ceremonies were performed.

As I have already said, there is much to discuss in this seventh and last tablet of the Fight between Bel and the Dragon, but the text is here and there very imperfect, and a further examination of it would be unsatisfactory.

“By fifty announcements the great gods  
 His fifty names proclaimed—they made supreme his path.”

The remaining lines, bringing up the total on the seventh tablet to 140 or more, is regarded as the epilogue. They praise Merodach and his work from the human point of view, and wish the great god, his work, words, and counsel, every success.

“The utterance of his mouth no god annuls,  
 Should he look favourably, he turns not his neck ;  
 In his anger no god withstands his wrath.  
 Remote is his heart, reserved is his mind,  
 Before whom sin and wantonness are hateful.”

The secret of the great Babylonian story of the Creation is revealed. We now know what were the thoughts which troubled them. They wanted to explain how all things came into existence, and they found that explanation in imagining the beginnings of things to have originated in two powers of evil. But whilst there is much that is evil in the world, there is also a great deal that is good, and the good in this life far outweighs, in the pleasure which it brings, the evil. They therefore conceived the evolution

of beings, offspring of the two first causes, ever growing more and more perfect, until—so great was the change from the first creators of the formless and the void—a great conflict took place, in which the old powers were either destroyed or their power curtailed, though much that originated with them still remained in existence, and still had to be resisted. By prayer and supplication could perfection, as they understood it, be acquired, until the faithful follower of his god attained to bliss with him on high.






Their waters were mingled together—  
 The reed-banks were not constructed, marsh-lands were not to  
 be seen.

When none of the gods had been produced,  
 A name was unrecorded, the fates were not fixed—  
 Then were created the gods within them  
 Lahmu, Lahamu, were produced, (their) names were announced.  
 For ages they grew up, they flourished.  
 Anšar (and) Kišar were created (even) greater than they.  
 The days grew long, the years increased.  
 Anu, their son, was the rival of his fathers,  
 Anšar made Anu, his firstborn, equal  
 And Anu begat Nudimmud in his likeness.

THE FIRST SECTION OF THE LIST OF GODS.

			𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶	𐎶	𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
			𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶			𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
3.	𐎶 𐎶		𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶		𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
6.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
9.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
12.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
15.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
18.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
21.	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶
	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶	𐎶 𐎶				𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶

In the above introductory lines to one of the most important of the lists of gods in the British Museum we have 21 names—three times the sacred number 7—of the god and goddess of heaven, *Anu* and *Antu*<sup>m</sup>. From it we learn that *An-ki* “heaven-earth,” stood for both deities, as did also all the names which follow—*Uraš*, *En-urta*, *Anšar-gal*, *Kišar-gal*, *Anšar*, *Kišar*, *Enšar* and *Ninšar*, “the lord of the host” and “the lady of the host,” *Duri* and *Dari*, probably “time” and “eternity,” *Lahma* and *Lahama* (about whom more is stated in the paper now published), *Alala* and *Belili*, which are also two possible pronunciations of , and the lord and lady of the primæval city (lines 20 and 21). Line 22 tells us that all these are “the 21 lords, mother-father Anu.” The genderless nature of the Sumerian language is well illustrated in this list, and the importance attached to women is shown in the expression “mother-father” instead of “father (and) mother,” the order to which, in all probability, the rest of the world was (and is) accustomed. Nevertheless, in the list itself, the masculine always precedes the feminine—*Anu*<sup>m</sup> and *Antu*<sup>m</sup>, *Enšar* and *Ninšar*, *Lahma* and *La ama*, *Alala* and *Belili*, *En-uri-ulla* and *Nin-uri-ulla* (lines 20 and 21). The section which follows is also exceedingly interesting, but for this we have not room. Other copies have omissions and additions.

#### DISCUSSION.

THE CHAIRMAN : Though in its substance and structure technical, yet the paper to which we have listened brings before us issues and problems that are not wholly recondite, not wholly “caviare to the general.” Those who may not be able to appreciate the grounds on which Professor Pinches bases many of his suggestions need not, on that account, be indifferent to the more practical aspects of Babylonian life and thought that lie behind the text of Cuneiform tablets and cylinders, as they have been recovered from the dust of ages during the past century, and have been read with more or less precision—in some cases repeatedly re-read—during recent decades.

We who have heard Dr. Pinches this afternoon have reason to congratulate him upon the long period during which he has been associated with the Victoria Institute—he has recalled the fact that he read a paper before the Institute over thirty years ago—but we may likewise, and with sincere pleasure, congratulate him upon the fact that he himself has occupied a place of distinction in the group of Oriental scholars who have given their lives to the work of deciphering Assyriological inscriptions.

Dr. Pinches is a scholar who traces with exemplary devotion the

written thoughts of the ancients, and we cannot but commend the patience which he uniformly displays. How often does it happen that when, after much labour, the thoughts of the scribes of old Babylon are reached, even then the psychological bearing and religious intent of their words have to be relegated to the limbo of doubt! How often, moreover, is the investigator compelled to lay bare things that are morally repellent, thoughts with which he has no manner of personal sympathy! Yet the scholar must do his duty as the translator as well as the decipherer of old-time documents.

That the gods of Babylon provoke our contempt, and that their devotees inspire our distrust: that is something to the good. Should it not stir within our minds feelings of pity for men and women—untold millions of them—whose lot was cast in times of ignorance and in regions of spiritual darkness? And if, as many of us must needs do, we proceed to bring the religion of Babylon, with its “gods many and lords many,” under the searchlight of the Divinely given religion of the Covenant People, the seed of Abraham—“Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord”—well, that also is altogether to the good for us in this day of grace and privilege. As on previous occasions, so this afternoon, with the restraint of sound learning, Dr. Pinches has given us in terms of refinement glimpses of the degrading mythology and soul-destroying idolatry which lie on the very surface of sections of the Creation Story which had so large a place in the life of ancient Babylon, and it gives me pleasure to move a vote of thanks to Dr. Pinches for his very interesting paper.

The vote was carried with acclamation, and acknowledged by Dr. Pinches, who also answered a few questions propounded by members of the Institute.

The Lecture was illustrated by lantern slides.

Mr. GEORGE B. MICHELL writes: It is a great satisfaction to have this completion from the hand of such an authority as Dr. Pinches, and his notes on Professor Langdon's *The Epic of Creation*.

The subject came up incidentally in Professor Clay's paper on “The Early Civilization of the Amurru” (*Journal*, vol. lvii). In my remarks on that paper (p. 109), I brought up a question to which I should like to refer again, namely, What is the value of the copies as proofs of the original legends? I believe that the *copies* date from the time of Assur-bani-pal, at the earliest, *i.e.* the seventh century B.C. Have these copies been subjected to Higher Criticism? If so, what residuum of the legends can be established as going back to the

time of, say, Agum-kakrime (c. 1650 B.C.), and in what form did they exist then ?

For any comparison with the account of the Creation in Genesis, it seems to me that the relative dates are of crucial importance. The particular points of which it is specially necessary to investigate the antiquity are : (1) The "logos" theory of Mammu (pp. 138, 139) ; (2) the dualistic theory of the origin of the gods (pp. 138, 150, 158) ; (3) when did *ya'u* become a common Semitic word for "god" ? (p. 142) ; (4) the actual and comparative dates of "Asari" and "Osiris" (pp. 155, 156) ; (5) the seventh tablet, with its doctrine of redemption (p. 157) (*see* Langdon *in loc.*).

Even if we admit that Osiris may have been ultimately of "Syrian" origin, it seems to me very difficult to connect him with a deity of Eridu.

I would also like to have some evidence to justify the identification of Merodach with Jehovah, and of "Rahab" as the Hebrew name of "Tiawath" (p. 141).

REPLY to Mr. George B. Michell's questions :—

The style of the tablets from Aššur\* suggests an earlier date than the reign of Assur-bani-pal. I do not see how, at the present time, these "copies" could be subjected to "Higher Criticism," except in so far as the lists of Creation-deities (p. 161) bear on them. These may by chance imply that there were other versions of the Creation-story giving the gods alternative names, but seem really to identify Anu and his spouse Antum with Anšar and Kišar, Laḫma and Laḫama, and also with Alala and Belili, their "Images," and with "the lord" and "the lady" of *uri ullu*, "the primæval city" or heavenly domain.

I have not been able to go into the question as to when *ya'u* "became a common Semitic word for 'god,'" but it certainly occurs in proper names during the period of the Dynasty of Babylon (2000 B.C.). I regard *Osiris* as preceding *Asari* in date. The Babylonian doctrine of redemption seems to have been very different from that of the Christian Church.

It seems unlikely that Osiris was of Syrian origin, but the myth of Osiris and that of Tammuz resemble each other. Mr. Michell's last paragraph but one suggests an identification of Tammuz with Merodach, "the firstborn of the Abyss," and in this connection we have to admit that both Tammuz and Merodach were sun-gods.

Further evidence to identify Jehovah with Merodach in pre-Christian Judaism, and Tiawath with Rahab, cannot at present be adduced. We must wait.

\* *See* p. 160, where some of the characters have wedges in fours where we should expect only three, etc.

698TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MARCH 21st, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

WILLIAM C. EDWARDS, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the CHAIRMAN introduced the Rev. A. H. Finn to read his paper on "The Predictive Element in Holy Scripture."

---

*THE PREDICTIVE ELEMENT IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.*

By THE REV. A. H. FINN.

IT is generally agreed that there are predictions in the Bible, and most of us are familiar with the more important, yet perhaps it is not commonly realized how very largely that predictive element enters into the whole of Scripture and how wide is its range. Predictions vary in point of time from the immediate future to the utmost limits of time: in significance, from what seem mere trifles to matters of the most tremendous import. Who would have supposed that it could be worth while recording that one man told another that the same day he would meet two men at one place, three at another, and a company

at a third, and that in connection with so small a matter as the search for some strayed asses? Yet that is what Samuel told Saul (1 Sam. x, 2, 3, 5).

There are then forecasts of events to occur speedily. Moses is told that Aaron would come to meet him (Exod. iv, 14), and each of the Ten Plagues, especially the last, is announced beforehand. Then there are the dividing of the Red Sea and destruction of the Egyptians (Exod. xiv, 16, 17); the sending of manna (Exod. xvi, 4), quails (Exod. xvi, 12; Num. xi, 18), and water out of the rock (Exod. xvii, 6; Num. xx, 8); the theophany at Sinai (Exod. xix, 11); the cutting off of Jordan (Joshua iii, 13); the fall of Jericho (Joshua vi, 5) and of Ai (Joshua viii, 2); the victory of 300 over the hosts of Midian (Judges vii, 7); Saul's coming to Samuel (1 Sam. ix, 15, 16); the thunderstorm in wheat harvest (1 Sam. xii, 16); the death of Saul and his sons (1 Sam. xxviii, 19); the death of Bathsheba's child (2 Sam. xii, 14); the rout of the Syrian army (1 Kings xx, 13); the taking away of Elijah (2 Kings ii, 3); the raising of the siege of Samaria, and death of the incredulous lord (2 Kings vii, 1, 2); the failure of Rabshakeh's threats (2 Kings xix, 32); and a double victory over Philistines (1 Chron. xiv, 10, 15).

All these were to occur very shortly, within a few hours or, at most, days; others after somewhat longer intervals. Thus, the Deluge to come in seven days (Gen. vii, 4); the births of Isaac (Gen. xviii, 10) and of Samson (Judges xiii, 5); the promotion of Pharaoh's butler and execution of the baker (Gen. xl, 13, 19); seven years plenty and seven years famine (Gen. xli, 26, 27); Moses and Aaron not to enter the Promised Land (Num. xx, 12); Sisera delivered into the hands of a woman (Judges iv, 9); deliverance from Midian (Judges vi, 14) and from Philistines (Judges xiii, 5); death of Hophni and Phineas (1 Sam. ii, 34); ravens to feed Elijah (1 Kings xvii, 4); a seven years' famine (2 Kings viii, 1); Jehu's successors to the fourth generation (2 Kings x, 30).

Others again involved still longer delay. The first warning to Noah of the Deluge (Gen. vi, 13) was probably given a good part of a century before the catastrophe (*cf.* Gen. v, 32; vii, 11): the servitude of Israel and the return to Canaan were announced to Abraham (Gen. xv, 13, 16) centuries beforehand: the subjection of Esau to Jacob was declared before their birth (Gen. xxv, 23), and again by Isaac (Gen. xxvii, 40), but not brought about till David's time (2 Sam. viii, 14): Israel's return to Canaan

was foreseen by Joseph (Gen. l, 24) : the secession of the Northern tribes after his death was made known to Solomon (1 Kings xi, 13) : Jeroboam is warned of the destruction of his Bethel sanctuary which took place three centuries later (1 Kings xiii, 2) : the extermination of the houses of Jeroboam (1 Kings xiv, 10) and Baasha (1 Kings xvi, 3), and the fates of Ahab and Jezebel and their posterity (1 Kings xxi, 19-23) are foretold ; as also the deaths of Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi, 15) and Amaziah (2 Chron. xxv, 16). The oft-repeated promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that their descendants should be greatly multiplied and inherit the land, were only fulfilled centuries later. The forecasts of Ishmael's future (Gen. xvi, 10 ; xvii, 20) and that of the Twelve Tribes in the Blessings of Jacob (Gen. xlix) and Moses (Deut. xxxiii) all relate to a far-distant future.

Those who are anxious to get rid of or minimize anything like prediction, contend that, as the histories were not drawn up till long after, these seeming predictions were not really uttered, being only due to the pious (ought it not to be impious ?) imaginings of the writers who set down what they thought ought to have been or might have been foretold. That really amounts to an accusation of wholesale fraud on the part of the Jewish historians. If all the Higher Critical theories were sound, it would mean that all the various authors of the J, E, and P histories, the author of D, and those of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles were so unscrupulous or so besotted as to record as facts what were only dreams, and so profane as to put their own fabrications into the mouth of the Most High.

What is more to our immediate purpose is to note that, even if this sweeping indictment of the truth of the writers could be maintained, there would still remain predictions which **cannot** possibly be so accounted for. The promise of the victorious Seed of the woman (Gen. iii, 15) : the promise that in the Seed of Abraham all nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii, 2) ; and that out of Judah should come a royal Lawgiver to whom should be the gatherings of the peoples (Gen. xlix, 10) : Balaam's confident expectation of the Star, the Sceptre out of Israel ; and the wasting of Moab, Edom, Amalek, and Asshur (Num. xxiv, 17-24) : the promise of a Prophet like unto Moses (Deut. xviii, 15, 18) : the promise to David of a house, kingdom, and throne "for ever" : all these duly came to pass, but not till long after the Old Testament was completed. More than that, there are matters which stretch out to times that are still future. There is

no reason to suppose that the sentences pronounced on Adam and Eve (Gen. iii, 16, 19) will cease to operate as long as mankind exists, or that the promise of seedtime and harvest will fail "while the earth remaineth" (Gen. viii, 22): the filling of the earth "with the glory of the LORD" (Num. xiv, 21; cf. Isa. xi, 9; Hab. ii, 14) has yet to come: the restoration of Israel from "the outmost parts of heaven" (Deut. xxx, 3-5) has not yet been accomplished: "the LORD shall" indeed "judge the ends of the earth" (1 Sam. ii, 10), but the time is not yet. It is not possible to eradicate prediction, even from the historical books of the Old Testament.

Turning now to the books avowedly prophetic, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah are full of denunciations of the wickedness of their people; idolatry, murder, theft, licentiousness, greed are rampant in the land, though the outward observances of religion—festivals, fasts, solemn assemblies, sacrifices, prayers—are punctiliously observed. Therefore there are also fervent exhortations to repentance and amendment, together with stern warnings of wrath and bitter punishments awaiting impenitence. So far the view that the prophets were preachers of morality whose messages were addressed to their own generation is justified. Yet there are also passages which go much further. The warnings of disaster are not merely couched in general terms such as modern preachers might use in denouncing the evils of to-day: often the precise quarter from which retribution will come is specified, and, sometimes, that quarter an altogether unexpected one. Isaiah, for instance, while the Assyrian power was still dominant, points in plainest words (xxxix, 6, 7) to captivity in Babylon, then almost insignificant; and with this his contemporary, Micah, agrees (iv, 10). Hosea, addressing the Northern tribes, points indeed to Assyria, but speaks definitely of deportation (x, 6; xi, 5), which could hardly have been anticipated in his day. Amos is even more precise, specifying "captivity beyond Damascus" (v, 27). In Jeremiah's day, no doubt the power of Babylon was nearly at its height, yet how could he have anticipated Nebuchadnezzar's successful invasion of Egypt (xliii, 8-10; xlvi, 25, 26)? or how could Ezekiel have done so while far off in Babylonia (xxix, 19; xxx, 10)?

In the prophetic books, as in the historical, there are predictions speedily fulfilled. Isaiah announces to Hezekiah his recovery and prolongation of life (xxxviii, 5): Jeremiah tells Hananiah he should die that year (xxviii, 16); is forewarned of the coming of



his cousin, Hanameel (xxxviii, 5); and foretells the indignities inflicted on Jehoiakim's corpse (xxii, 18, 19; xxxvi, 30): Daniel warns Nebuchadnezzar of impending madness (iv, 25), and Belshazzar of the fall of his kingdom (v, 28) which took place that very night.

Then events somewhat more distant:—Isaiah is aware of the future desolation of Judæa (vi, 11), of the spoiling of Samaria (viii, 4; also Mic. i, 6), of the killing of Sennacherib (xxxii, 8; xxxvii, 7), of Israel's escape from Babylon (xlviii, 20): Jeremiah foresees the destruction of the Temple (vii, 14: xxvi, 6; also Ezek. xxiv, 21), Jerusalem made heaps (ix, 11), and Babylonian captivity (xx, 4; also Mic. iv, 10), the carrying away of the Temple vessels (xxvii, 21, 22), and the taking of Babylon by Medes (li, 11, 28): Amos knows of the destruction of the Bethel altars (iii, 14): Habakkuk tells of an invasion by Chaldeans (i, 6-8).

It may, of course, be asserted that these are interpolations written after the event and foisted into the earlier writings. If that were true, one could only wonder at the interpolators' idea of honesty and truth, and at the perverse industry which fabricated pretended predictions in such wholesale profusion. But what is to be said of predictions which came true ages afterwards, long after interpolation had become impossible? Take, for instance, the fate of surrounding nations. Desolations and destructions are foretold for Moab by Isaiah (xv, xvi), Jeremiah (xlviii, 9-29), Amos (ii, 1-3), and Zephaniah (ii, 9): for Damascus by Isaiah (xvii), Jeremiah (xlix, 23-27), and Amos (i, 3-5): for Egypt by Isaiah (xix), Ezekiel (xxix, 9-12), and Joel (iii, 19): for Ammon by Jeremiah (xlix, 1-6), Ezekiel (xxv, 2-7), Amos (i, 13-15), and Zephaniah (ii, 8, 9): for Edom by Jeremiah (xlix, 7-22), Ezekiel (xxv, 12-14), Joel (iii, 19), and Amos (i, 11, 12): for the Philistines by Jeremiah (xlvii, 4-7), Ezekiel (xxv, 15-17), Amos (i, 6-8), and Zephaniah (ii, 4-7): for Tyre by Isaiah (xxiii), Ezekiel (xxvi, xxvii), Joel (iii, 4-8), and Amos (i, 9, 10). The dispersion of Israel throughout all the world is referred to by Isaiah (xi, 11, 12), Jeremiah (ix, 16; xxx, 11), Ezekiel (vi, 8, 9; xxvi, 19), Joel (iii, 2), and Zechariah (vii, 14). How truly all these have come to pass, let the present state of the world attest, yet not till long after the Old Testament was completed. It is also worth noting how often different prophets corroborate one another, yet clearly without collusion, since their statements are by no means identical.

Even more important is the long list of Messianic prophecies. Passing over some whose precise meaning has been disputed (such as

“ a Virgin shall conceive ”), it cannot be denied that Isaiah has a good deal about a descendant of David, “ out of the stem of Jesse,” a Branch “ out of his roots ” (xi, 1), specially endowed with “ the Spirit of Jehovah ” (xi, 2), who should rule in righteousness (xi, 4), to whom “ the Gentiles should seek ” (xi, 10), a King who “ shall reign in righteousness.” (xxxii, 1). In the later part of the book there is the marvellous delineation of the Servant of Jehovah, of whom it is said, “ I have put My Spirit upon Him : He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles ” (xlii, 1) : who was to be unobtrusive (xlii, 2), patient and forbearing with the bruised and dimly burning (xlii, 3) “ till He have set judgment in the earth ” (xlii, 4) : He would be obedient to the Lord Jehovah, even to enduring “ shame and spitting ” (l, 5, 6) : His visage would be “ marred more than man ” (lii, 14) : He was to be “ despised and rejected . . . wounded . . . bruised . . . oppressed . . . afflicted . . . taken from prison and judgment . . . to make His grave with the wicked and with the rich ” (liii, 3-9) : all this was to be for the transgressions and iniquities of others (liii, 5), Himself being innocent of violence or deceit (liii, 9) : in the end He would be “ satisfied ” (liii, 11), and have His portion “ with the great and . . . with the strong ” (liii, 12) : the benefits were to be for all mankind, for He was to be “ for a covenant of the People, for a light of the Gentiles ” (xlii, 6), not only “ to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel,” but “ a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth ” (xlix, 6). As we have already seen, it is said of the Servant, “ I have put My Spirit upon Him ” (xlii, 1), and that is referred to in “ The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon Me ; because Jehovah hath annointed Me to preach good tidings ” (lxi, 1). He is, then, the herald that “ bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace ” (lii, 7), and the good tidings which Zion and Jerusalem were to re-echo was “ Behold your God. Behold, the Lord Jehovah will come with strong hand ” (xl, 9, 10), though also as a gentle Shepherd (xl, 11), and therefore the voice in the wilderness was to cry “ Prepare ye the way of Jehovah ” (xl, 3).

Though the figures of the King in the earlier part and of the Servant afterwards seem to differ so much, yet they have certain characteristics in common : each is to be markedly endowed with the Spirit (xi, 2 ; xlii, 1 ; lxi, 1) ; to establish righteousness and justice (xi, 4 ; xlii, 4) ; and to attract the Gentiles (xi, 10 ; xlii, 6 ; xlix, 6). There is reason to think that both titles belong to one and the same Person.

Jeremiah again has, "the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch [the same word as "the Branch of Jehovah" (Isa. iv, 2)], and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth" (xxiii, 5), whose Name will be "Jehovah our Righteousness" (xxiii, 6). Ten chapters further on (xxxiii, 15, 16) the promise is repeated in slightly different form, followed immediately by an assurance (xxxiii, 17, 18) that "David shall never want a man upon the throne . . . neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before Me . . . to do sacrifice continually," a double promise suggesting a combination of kingly and priestly functions. For the next indication we must look back to Isaiah's saying that the Servant should be "for a covenant of the People" (xlii, 6; xlix, 8), and "this is My covenant with them, saith Jehovah" that His Spirit and His words should not depart "from henceforth and for ever" (lix, 21). When, then, Jeremiah says, "I will make a new Covenant with the house of Israel . . . I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts" (xxxii, 31, 33), and "I will make an everlasting Covenant with them" (xxxii, 40), it is evidently a reference to the work of the Servant. Ezekiel, too, promises a "new heart" and a "new spirit" (xi, 19; xxxvi, 26, 27), and "an everlasting Covenant" (xvi, 60; xxxvii, 26). Also he has Isaiah's thought of Jehovah as the Shepherd: "I will feed My flock, and I will cause them to lie down, saith the Lord Jehovah" (xxxiv, 15). Daniel interprets the Stone "cut out without hands," which "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth" (ii, 34, 35), as meaning that in the days of the fourth kingdom "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (ii, 44), indicating an universal King not of merely human origin. Also he records the definite message of Gabriel, that "Seventy weeks are determined . . . to seal up [*i.e.* close and confirm] the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy"; that "after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," and after that "the city and sanctuary shall be destroyed"; that "He [the Messiah] shall confirm the Covenant with many," and "cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease" (ix, 24-27). Micah tells of One "to be ruler in Israel"—which the Jews of Herod's time understood as meaning "the King of the Jews"—"Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (v, 2). The post-exilic prophets supply some remarkable details. Haggai predicts that the Second Temple should be filled with

glory, so that "the glory of this latter House shall be greater than of the former, saith Jehovah of hosts, and in this place will I give peace" (ii, 9). Since the Temple of Solomon (to whose name the giving of "peace" alludes) was filled with "the glory of Jehovah" (1 Kings viii, 11), the greater glory can only refer to a yet more marvellous Divine Presence of One "greater than Solomon." Zechariah has, "behold, I bring forth My Servant the Branch" (iii, 8), thus identifying the "Branch of Jehovah" of Isa. iv, 2, with the Servant of Jehovah of the later chapters. Then he is commanded to say that "the Man whose name is The Branch" is to "sit and rule upon His throne, and He shall be a priest upon His throne" (vi, 12, 13), combining the offices of priest and king (as suggested by Jer. xxxiii, 17, 18), and the combination will be "the counsel of peace." This priestly office of "My Servant the Branch" accounts for and explains His making "His soul an offering [*asham*, a guilt-offering] for sin" (Isa. liii, 10). Also, Zion and Jerusalem are to rejoice because "thy King cometh unto thee: He is just and having Salvation" (Zech. ix, 9), a righteous King as in Isaiah and Jeremiah. Moreover, "He shall speak peace to the heathen, and His dominion shall be from sea even to sea" (ix, 10), a marked relation to the Gentiles included in world-wide rule. Malachi, like Isaiah, speaks of the Messenger who "shall prepare the way before Me," for "the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His Temple" (iii, 1), explaining Haggai's filling the House with glory.

Now none of all these sayings can possibly be interpolations, for, long before anything corresponding to them had occurred, the Jews are witnesses that they belong to the original writings. Yet, unless the Gospel narratives are shameless fabrications, it cannot be denied that they were completely verified. At the time indicated by Daniel, a Child, a descendant of David, afterwards repeatedly hailed as "Son of David," was born "in the city of David": received homage from Chaldean pilgrims as "born King of the Jews": and accused by His enemies of claiming to be Christ—anointed—a King. The name given Him was "Jehovah is Salvation." His public ministry was ushered in by one who cried in the wilderness "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," whose message was "the Kingdom of Heaven [that foretold by Daniel] is at hand": He Himself diligently preached the Kingdom, and when on trial claimed that He was a King "not of this world." By Jews and Samaritans He was acknowledged to be Messiah—the Christ, the Anointed, and publicly He claimed

for Himself the prophecy of Isa. lxi, 1. He avowed Himself more than human by claiming to be Lord of the Sabbath and able to forgive sins; accepted without protest on more than one occasion (Matt. xvi, 16; John xi, 27) the witness of followers, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God"; and was charged by His enemies with making Himself equal with God. He called Himself the Good Shepherd, seeking out the lost sheep, especially of the house of Israel. At the same time He avowed Himself a Servant who came "not to be ministered unto, but to minister,"—"among you as he that serveth"—taking upon Himself "the form of a servant."

He was undoubtedly despised and rejected, subjected to shame and spitting, cut off out of the land of the living, numbered among the transgressors, and buried in a rich man's tomb. He inaugurated a New Covenant in His Blood (Matt. xxvi, 28). It is mere matter of history that city and sanctuary were destroyed, that sacrifice and oblation have ceased, that the Gentiles have sought to His standard, and that He has been "a Light to lighten the Gentiles." All the varied traits foreshadowed by the prophets are found combined in JESUS of Nazareth and in Him alone. No wonder He could say of the Old Testament Scriptures, "they are they which testify of Me" (John v, 39), and appeal to the united witness of Law, Prophets, and Psalms (Luke xxiv, 44).

Besides fulfilled predictions, there are others looking forward to ages yet to come. The ultimate restoration of Israel to their land is confidently anticipated by Isaiah (xi, 12; xxvii, 12, 13), Jeremiah (xxx, 3; xxxi, 8; xxxiii, 7), Ezekiel (xi, 17; xxviii, 25; xxxvi, 24), and Zephaniah (iii, 20), and that as a united nation, the breach between North and South being healed (Isa. xi, 13; Jer. iii, 18; Ezek. xxxvii, 19; Hos. i, 11). Physical marvels are predicted:—the wilderness is to be made fertile (Isa. xxxv, 1, 2; xlii, 19, 20; lv, 13), and Palestine even more so (Isa. li, 3; Exek. xxxvi, 35): wild beasts are to lose their power to harm (Isa. xi, 6-8; lxxv, 25): sun, moon, and stars are to be darkened (Isa. xliii, 10; xxiv, 23; Joel ii, 31; iii, 15): the heavens and earth are to be shaken (Isa. xliii, 13; Jer. iv, 23, 24; Hag. ii, 6): a new heaven and earth (Isa. lxxv, 17; lxxvi, 22), and a terrible "day of the Lord" are to come (Isa. ii, 12, 21; Joel ii, 1, 2, 11; Amos v, 18; Zeph. i, 7, 14, 15; Mal. iv, 1). Then death will be swallowed up in victory (Isa. xxv, 8; Hos. xliii, 14): all nations will worship God (Isa. lxxvi, 23;

Jer. iii, 17) : and there will be a resurrection to judgment (Dan. xii, 2 ; Joel iii, 2, 12).

Here, then, we have a number of men of differing temperaments—think of the difference between Isaiah and Jeremiah—in different circumstances, living in different ages and, to some extent, in different regions. Yet they express themselves with quiet certainty and to much the same purport about the distant future, far beyond human ken. How could this be possible, unless they were controlled by one over-ruling Mind ? and whose mind could that be but God's ? He alone can declare “the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done” (Isa. xlvi, 10 ; *cf.* Acts xv, 18), who declares new things when “the former things are come to pass” (Isa. xlii, 9), and challenges all others to do the like “that we may know that ye are gods” (Isa. xli, 22, 23). That they were so controlled is exactly what the prophets themselves affirm, constantly and consistently attributing their utterances to a Higher Power with an emphatic “Thus saith the LORD.”

Hebrew poetry as well as history and prophecy has its predictions. The Song of Moses tells of judgment (Deut. xxxii, 35, 41) and of the nations rejoicing with God's People (Deut. xxxii, 43). The “last words of David” speak of a perfectly just ruler and an everlasting covenant (2 Sam. xxiii, 3-5). Psalms ii, xlv, lxii, set before us a King of superhuman power and existence : ii, lxxxix, cxxxii, the Anointed of Jehovah : xxiii, lxxx, the Shepherd : lxxxix, the Seed of David. There are many references to God judging the earth (*e.g.* lxvii, 4 ; xcvi, 13), and to the nations worshipping God (*e.g.* xxii, 27 ; lxxxvi, 9). Psalms xxii, lxix, cix, depict the Innocent Sufferer ; and Ps. cx, an enthroned, victorious Priest-King. Job is confident that his Redeemer “shall stand at the latter day upon the earth,” and that after death “in my flesh shall I see God” (xix, 25-27).

It is none otherwise in the New Testament. Events to occur shortly are foretold :—The birth of a son to Zachariah (Luke i, 13), and to Mary (Matt. i, 21) ; the finding of the ass-colt in the highway (Mark xi, 2), and the meeting a man carrying a pitcher of water (Luke xxii, 10) ; the warning of the Betrayal (Matt. xxvi, 21), and of Peter's denials (Mark xiv, 30) ; and the promise of baptism “with the Holy Ghost not many days hence” (Acts i, 5). St. Peter announces the immediate death of Sapphira (Acts v, 9), and St. Paul, the blinding of Elymas (Acts xiii, 11), and that there would be no loss of life in the shipwreck (Acts xxvii, 22).

Then there are events somewhat more distant :—The Baptist announces the coming of One who “ shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire . . . thoroughly purge His floor . . . and burn up the chaff ” (Matt. iii, 11, 12) : Zachariah forecasts the future of his son (Luke i, 76–9) : Simeon declares that the Child in his arms will be a Light of the Gentiles and the glory of Israel (Luke ii, 32), while a sword shall pierce the Mother’s soul (Luke ii, 35) : Our Lord announces that “ the Son of Man will be lifted up ” (John iii, 14) and so “ will draw all men unto Me ” (John xii, 32) ; foretells His own Passion and Resurrection before the Transfiguration (Matt. xvi, 21), on the road to Jerusalem (Matt. xx, 18, 19), and just before the Passover (Matt. xxvi, 2) ; laments over the desolation of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii, 38 ; Luke xiii, 34, 35) ; foretells the siege (Luke xix, 43, 44), and the utter destruction of the Temple (Mark xiii, 2) : Agabus predicts famine (Acts xi, 28) and the binding of Paul (Acts xxi, 11) : St. Paul is marked out as Apostle of the Gentiles (Acts ix, 15 ; xxii, 21) even at Rome (Acts xxiii, 11) and before Cæsar (Acts xxvii, 24) : St. Paul tells the Ephesians they should see his face no more, and grievous wolves would attack the flock (Acts xx, 25, 29). Then there are events far distant. Our Lord tells how He will reject workers of iniquity though they had called Him “ Lord ” (Matt. vii, 23) : denounces woe on Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum “ in the day of judgment ” (Matt. xi, 21–24) ; speaks of the harvest at the end of the world (Matt. xiii, 39, 40) ; says much in the Olivet discourse (Matt. xxiv ; Mark xiii, Luke xxi) of terrors and sorrows in the latter days, of the coming of false Christs, and of the Gospel being preached in all the world : the angels tell how “ this same Jesus . . . shall so come in like manner ” (Acts i, 11) : St. Paul warns the Athenians of judgment of the world and resurrection of the dead (Acts xvii, 18, 31). Many are the forebodings of the last days in the Epistles : anticipations of perilous times (2 Thess. ii, 3–10 ; 1 Tim. iv, 1 ; 2 Tim. iii, 1 ; 2 Pet. iii, 3) : of the Second Advent (1 Cor. iv, 5 : xv, 23 ; Phil. iii, 20 ; Col. iii, 4 ; 1 Thess. iii, 13 : iv, 15, 16 ; 2 Thess. i, 7, 10 : ii, 1 ; 1 Tim. vi, 14 ; Titus ii, 13 : Jas. v, 7, 8 ; 1 Pet. v, 4 ; 1 John ii, 28 ; Jude, 14) : of the Resurrection (Rom. vi, 8 : viii, 11 ; 1 Cor. vi, 14 : xv, 21, 42 ; 2 Cor. iv, 14 ; Phil. iii, 11, 21 ; 1 Thess. iv, 16 ; Heb. vi, 2) : of Judgment (Rom. ii, 5 : xiv, 10 ; 1 Cor. iii, 13 ; 2 Cor. v, 10 ; Heb. vi, 2 : ix, 27 : x, 27 ; 1 Pet. iv, 17, 18 ; Jude, 6, 15) : of the salvation of Israel (Rom. xi, 26) and of Gentiles (Rom. xi, 25 ; 1 Cor. xii, 13 ; Gal. iii, 14) : of future glory (Rom. viii, 18 : ix, 23 ;

1 Cor. xv, 49 ; 2 Cor. iii, 18 ; Col. iii, 4) and reward (1 Cor. ix, 25 ; 2 Tim. iv, 8 ; Jas. i, 12 ; 1 Pet. v, 4).

Whatever view is taken of the Apocalypse, it is fairly clear that there are matters in it which are still in the future. The rewards promised to those who overcome (Rev. ii, 7, 10, 11, 17, 26 ; iii, 5, 12, 21) have not yet been bestowed : only by a very strained interpretation can it be made out that the thousand years of the reign of Christ and the saints while Satan is bound (xx, 2-4) refers to the present : the first and second resurrection (xx, 4, 12) have not occurred : the new Jerusalem (xxi, 2) has not descended from Heaven, nor are the new Heaven and new earth yet in existence (xxi, 1). Some nowadays deny that the Second Advent, the Resurrection of the Dead, and the general Judgment will ever take place, yet the apostolic writers had their Master's authority for expecting them.

It is also sometimes asserted that there are predictions in the Bible which cannot possibly be fulfilled. It would be interesting to have a list of them, and I personally must confess my ignorance of which they may be. However, we may notice a couple which may be deemed highly improbable. There is the cleaving of the Mount of Olives (Zech. xiv, 4), half removing to the north and half to the south, forming "a very great valley," which also seems to be implied in Ezekiel's river (xlvii, 1, 8) issuing from the Temple and flowing to the Dead Sea. Anyone who has seen how the great bulk of Olivet blocks the way may well wonder what tremendous convulsion could accomplish this. Yet considering what has happened in recent years at Krakatoa and Mt. Pelée, and how little we know of the power of seismic forces, it would be rash to assert that it can never take place. Again, we are assured that "the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat" (2 Pet. iii, 12 : cf. Ps. cii, 2 ; Isa. li, 6). Scientists, on the contrary, have calculated that in the course of ages the earth will cool till it becomes a frozen planet like the moon. That however, assumes the undisturbed continuance of present conditions. What would happen if a great comet, perhaps one not yet known, or the earth itself, were drawn into the sun ? Can that be pronounced impossible ?

Fault is found with the prediction of a distant future in minute detail. Critics consider that the sketch of events in Dan. viii and xi is so accurate about that which happened in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes that it must have been written after the



event, and they roundly assert that such detailed prediction is "out of harmony with the analogy of prophecy" (Driver, *L.O.T.*, p. 509). Yet many of the passages already cited contain precise details, and there are others. The horrors described in Deut. xxviii, 49-57, were literally carried out in the Roman siege of Jerusalem, and not before : the utter desolation of Babylon, a dwelling-place for wild beasts, is foretold by Isaiah (xiii, 21) and Jeremiah (li, 37) : Jeremiah predicts that the Captivity would last 70 years (xxv, 11, 12), and gives a vivid description of Babylon captured by surprise, "taken at one end" (li, 31, 32) : Ezekiel says that Tyre would be a place for "the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea" (xxvi, 5) : Micah specifies the birthplace of Christ (v, 2), and speaks of Zion becoming "as a plowed field" (iii, 12), which actually was its condition till recently ; Psalms xxii, lxix, and Isa. liii, give many details in the sufferings of our Lord ; Zechariah mentions the riding on an ass-colt (ix, 9), the 30 pieces of silver cast to the potter in the house of the Lord (xi, 12, 13), the piercing (xii, 10), and the wounds in the hands (xiii, 6). Our Lord foretells that Mary's anointing should be told in all the world (Matt. xxvi, 13), and that not one stone of the Temple should be left on another (Mark xiii, 2). 1 Thes. iv, 17, declares that at our Lord's return the saints who are alive will be caught up in the air, and 2 Thes. ii, 3-8, has a detailed account of the Man of Sin and his fate. Isaiah predicts that the gates of Jerusalem should be "open continually ; they shall not be shut day nor night" (lx, 11), and Zechariah that it should be "inhabited as towns without walls for the multitude of men and cattle therein" (ii, 4), full of old men and old women, boys and girls (viii, 4, 5). These conditions have been most surprisingly brought about, but only within the last few years. So far from minute detail being "out of harmony with the analogy of prophecy," it would be truer to say that it is strikingly characteristic of a very great deal of Biblical prophecy as contrasted with the vague generalities of heathen oracles.

It only remains to consider briefly two points about unfulfilled prophecy :—

(1) Jeremiah states expressly that God's promises of blessings and threats of punishment are conditional (xviii, 6-10), the promises on man's faithfulness, the threats on obstinate impenitence (*see also* Lev. xxvi, 3, 21 ; Deut. xxviii, 1, 2, 15 ; Ps. lxxxix, 30). Therefore it was that Jonah's prediction, "Yet

forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown" (iii, 4, 10) was averted by the repentance of the Ninevites.

(2) Precise predictions have been so brought about in unexpected fashion that the very witnesses of the event failed, at least for the time, to realize that it was the fulfilment of prophecy. Thus, about so distinctive a matter as the entry into Jerusalem riding on an ass, we are told, "These things understood not His disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him" (John xii, 16). It would seem then that predictions have been given, not so much to enable us to anticipate history, as to recognize, when the fulfilment comes, that "this is the LORD'S doing: it is marvellous in our eyes" (Ps. cxviii, 23). We should be very chary of putting our own interpretation on prophecy, and insisting that only so can it come to pass.

To sum up:—Prediction is no insignificant, negligible element in Scripture; it pervades the whole Bible, both Old and New Testaments. It is as a golden thread running throughout a closely-woven fabric. To tear it out forcibly would be to reduce the seamless garment to rags and tatters.

The Predictive Element in Holy Scripture is a part, a very important part, of the hall-mark which stamps the whole Bible as the "fine gold" of God's Word, not the dross of men's imaginings.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: It is a long time since I have listened to a paper so entirely delightful. We have had brought before us, as in a panorama, Biblical history and holy prophecy. From my youth I have been taught to regard prophecy as one of the evidences of the divine authorship of Holy Scripture, just in the same way as we looked upon the signs and miracles of the Apostles as proving their holy calls and offices. To that view I still sincerely subscribe. I remember very well with what horror and concern I heard, for the first time, a student of divinity call this in question, and advance his blasphemous modernisms.

Spurgeon once gave his students a parable of the way in which

Modernists gave up one position after the other to the enemy : " Imagine a man driving in a sledge with his wife and family, which includes an infant in arms and several children. He is followed by a howling pack of wolves. He *must* pacify them, so he throws the baby to them ; they stop for a moment, but only for a moment, and one by one he throws out the other children. Last of all, the brave (?) man makes a supreme sacrifice, and throws out his wife." Let us hope that at last the wolves got him !

Thus the Modernists seek to conciliate the sceptics, by surrendering precious doctrines or parts of Holy Scripture one after another. It is all in vain, for nothing but total apostasy will satisfy the dragon of unbelief. The first Higher Critic was that evil intelligence who inquired : " Yea, hath God said ? " I affirm my settled conviction that this attack upon Holy Scripture and prophecy, in its genesis, continuance and development, is Satanic. This came to me very strongly years ago when reading Cheyne. He said that *he* thought that the children of Israel came from *Mizrim* (a part of Arabia adjoining Egypt), but *they* thought that they came from Egypt (*Mizraim*), and he added : " The whole story of the Exodus from Egypt appears to be due to a confusion between *Mizraim* and *Mizrim*." I submit that this was an absurd and monstrous proposition, formed only as an attack on Holy Scripture. As I read those words I espied the cloven hoof, and said to myself, " That is Satan's work ; it is not human but *sub-human*."

There is a prophecy that I should like to add to the long list of the paper. It is found in Jer. xxxiv, 3-5, where it is prophesied to the King Zedekiah that he " shall not be slain, but shall see the king of Babylon's eyes, and speak mouth to mouth," and " *thou shalt go to Babylon.*" Compare this with Ezek. xii, 13 : " I will bring him (the king of Judah) to Babylon, yet shall he not see it, though he die there." Now turn to Josephus (*Ant.*, Bk. x, c. viii, sec. 2), and see how Ezekiel sent his prophecy to Jerusalem. It is an interesting speculation to inquire if Jeremiah ever met Ezekiel in the flesh. Anyway, we have the record that at least once Jeremiah was commissioned to go to Babylonia (Jer. xiii, 4-7).

Regarding the " Virgin's " prophecy, I have before me *Origen Against Celsus*, and there the Jew attacks the prophecy of the Virgin Birth of our Blessed Lord. Origen replies by asking : " What sign

could a young woman conceiving be, if it were not meant of a Virgin ? ” (Bk. 1, ch. 30).

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES : The subject is a gigantic one, and has been the *pièce de résistance* of hundreds of volumes, or, rather, of libraries. Prophecies relating to the Jewish race alone would require a large octavo. Mr. Finn has treated the subject with wonderful and pregnant brevity and marshalled his materials with admirable tact.

From a paper read here a month ago we saw how the prophecies of Ezekiel foretold that Egypt should become a “ base ” kingdom (ch. xxix), a prediction surprisingly fulfilled over the last two thousand years and more, during which time Egypt was never an independent country, while for many centuries she was ruled by usurping *slaves*.

That was prophecy on a large scale, but when we descend to details, then the improbability of correctly forestalling the future, or hitting upon it by chance, is enormously increased. Isaiah liii furnishes us with an example ; the whole chapter is a miraculously true prediction of Christ’s career and character, but it contains a detail which is often overlooked : “ He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.” Placing the making of the grave *before* the death sounds strange. But the Romans, though great lawyers, were a cruel people, and often, to increase the agony of the victim, they dug his grave in front of the cross, so that while dying he might contemplate it. Christ’s grave was, no doubt, dug between those of the two malefactors, but He was not buried there. He was “ with the rich ”—Joseph of Arimathea—“ in his death.”

My friend, Rev. Francis Denman, has pointed out that prediction sometimes lies concealed in a *name*. When the first woman was created, Adam called her *Isshah*, “ from, or for man.” But after the Fall, when *death* had entered the world, he called her Eve (Heb., *Chavah*), the “ living one ” or “ life,” pointing to her Posterity, who would bring “ life and immortality to light through the Gospel.” “ Jonah ” means “ a dove,” yet Jonah was the least dove-like of all the prophets : he was, indeed, a surly and disobedient man ! Yet, before he penned the Book of Jonah, he must have become contrite and humble to a degree ; as no Jew would “ wear his heart upon his sleeve,” or draw such a humiliating picture of himself without

any feature in his favour—as Jonah does—unless he had really become a dove-like character. Simon was christened by our Lord “*Petros*,” a “stone” or “rock,” yet Peter was *then* anything but a “rock.” It was not till after Christ’s Death, Resurrection and Ascension that Peter began to justify his new name.

The futility of man, apart from revelation, trying to foretell the future is well illustrated by some of our statesmen. The younger Pitt was brought up from his cradle in the very thick of statesmanship. He was, moreover, an exceedingly talented young man and became Prime Minister at the age of twenty-four. If any man could forecast the political future it was surely William Pitt, who was perfectly familiar with both foreign and domestic politics. The French Revolution broke out in 1789, and in introducing his Budget in 1792, Pitt, after predicting that the troubles in France would terminate “in general harmony and regular order,” said “unquestionably there was never a time when, from the situation of Europe, we might reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than at the present moment.” In the very next year, 1793, Britain was drawn into the great Napoleonic wars, which only ended with Waterloo twenty-two years later! Even after war was declared, Pitt was as blind as ever as regards the future. “It will be a short war,” he said, “and certainly end in one or two short campaigns.”

Are we any better prophets now? In January, 1914, Mr. Lloyd George declared that never had there been a more suitable time for disarmament; and within seven months we were sending the greatest army we had ever raised to fight in the greatest war in history!

Lieut.-Colonel F. MOLONY said: We are indebted to our lecturer for a very striking gathering together of Biblical predictions. In the middle of the South African War I was at Hoopstad, in the Orange River Colony, with a moving column. One evening, after supper, the officers of the staff were chatting together, when one of them made a remark which I took to be derogatory to Holy Scripture. I asked him if he had ever compared the predictions in the Bible about the great nations of antiquity with the subsequent fate of those nations, and he said “No.” Then General Sir Henry Settle broke in: “Well, this is something I do know about, having been so long in the East, and let me tell you that those predictions were fulfilled with marvellous exactness.”

Our lecturer has omitted the striking prediction in Nahum about the burning of Nineveh, and, though the date for the writings of that prophet given in our Bibles may be incorrect and ought to be put after 664 B.C., yet I have been told, on very good authority, that the book was undoubtedly written before Nineveh fell.

With reference to what our lecturer says at the middle of pp. 167 and 169 about wholesale fabrications of predictions—and limiting ourselves to predictions fulfilled before the time of Christ—we shall do well to stress the fact that the Jews were a very clever people and in the best position to know the facts, yet I am told on high authority that very few Jews have ever objected to the arguments brought forward by the lecturer. On the other hand, the facts he quotes certainly resulted in the Jews of our Lord's day having a wonderful confidence that all the predictions of the Old Testament would come true—a confidence surely caused by their experience that such had been the case throughout their history.

MR. THEODORE ROBERTS said: I welcome this paper; although it deals with only one point, and that hardly in the way of argument, the point itself is a very important one.

Education in the Roman world during the three centuries which succeeded the death of our Lord was more widely spread than ever before or since until the last hundred years, and during that period Christianity, by argument and persuasion alone (for no force was used, as in Mohammedanism), advanced from Pilate's sentence of crucifixion to the throne of the Roman world. Among the five causes by which the historian Gibbon seeks to account for this, the argument from the fulfilment of prophecy finds no place; and yet the Book of Acts shows that this was the means by which the first Evangelists persuaded men in the great centres of population of the Empire, such as Cæsaræa, Antioch in Pisidia, Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus and Rome, that Jesus of Nazareth was the world's Saviour.

In his two interesting volumes entitled *Testimonies*, Dr. Rendel Harris has shown how the early Christians collected quotations from the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament as proof-texts for the convincement of Jews and Gentile proselytes. All this shows the importance of the predictive element in the Old Testament, and I regret that Mr. Finn has not elaborated a few salient proofs

instead of indiscriminately enumerating so many, among which a large number are necessarily not of equal value for the defence of the truth.

Principal Wheeler Robinson, in his recently published *Cross of the Servant* (in the Student Christian Movement series), denies that there is any predictive element in the later chapters of Isaiah; but he fails to account for the clear distinction made by the prophet between Jehovah's Servant and the nation of Israel, to whom the Servant is sent, and on whose behalf He suffers. Dr. Robinson is forced to argue that Israel's sufferings were vicarious for the Gentile nations, whereas these prophecies clearly show them to have been occasioned by Israel's own transgressions.

The real point of the predictive element in Scripture is that it compels the recognition of its divine inspiration—that is to say, that prophecy came, not by the will of man, but “men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit” (2 Pet. i, 21).

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: This paper, concise and cogent in form, illustrates how impressive the argument for inspired prophecy is in the Bible. Even a superficial knowledge of Holy Scripture forces the reader to the conclusion that by far the largest portion of the Bible is taken up with the great subject of prophecy. And, moreover, the distance of time between the several prophetic writings and their extraordinary agreement forces the conclusion upon accurate students that the Bible is an organic unity and has one ultimate Author—God. If the predictive element were eliminated very large gaps in the literature would occur, and it is surprising how small the remaining writings would become. It is to be deprecated that the great, solemn and awe-inspiring subject of prophecy is often discussed in the spirit of a mathematical problem; it should ever be handled, on the contrary, in an attitude of deepest reverence, for this reason, that in all prediction, in the Bible sense, the quality of the foreknowledge of events is present. Foreknowledge is the prerogative of God alone.

Prophecy differs in its essence and features from shrewd views which are formed in advance of an event from a widely informed study of history. This difference may be seen clearly by an illustration. It does happen in the affairs of men that a first-class politician sometimes accurately outlines the features and

development of certain social movements, which subsequent history has fully justified. But the Bible predictions are different in kind rather than merely in degree. For instance, Micah prophesied (v. 2): "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah (Ephratah is added to distinguish it from the northern city of the same name), which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall the One come forth unto Me that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are of old, from everlasting." In this instance a prediction is announced of the coming Messiah, historically about 700 years before the event, stating that Bethlehem, this particular inconsiderable place among the thousands of Judah, was to be the birthplace of the Messiah.

Take another instance. In the graphic, artless record of the crucifixion scene of the Son of God at Calvary, in the Gospel by John, it is expressly written: "After this, Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, 'I thirst.'" It is safe to say that every prophetic statement concerning the Christ had been, or was about to be, fulfilled when He uttered the words "It is finished," even to such minute details as His garments, His bones, His piercing, the vinegar, and His sayings on the Cross.

Now, in order to secure the fulfilment of prophetic utterance, there must be a guiding, governing hand in history, conditioning events, places and people. It would be as inconceivable for predictions to be fulfilled without superhuman power as it would be to conceive that if thousands of alphabets were thrown into the air they would fall in an ordered arrangement so as to form the wording of the Bible in their incidence. So, it may well be asked, whose power, whose prediction, whose government? Chance is out of the question. If, as the Scripture insists, all things that are written must be fulfilled, it must also be a fact that all things must have been foreknown, and, if foreknown, by whom? Is there any other answer which fits the question but the word "God"?

In a recent able book entitled *It is Written*, the Rev. G. T. Manley writes: "The principle which He (Christ) intended to enunciate appears to be that the written prophetic word possesses a reality, permanence and binding force which no opinion of man or process of time can undo, but that the unfolding revelation of history



is sure to explain and expand its meaning and confirm and substantiate its truth."

If it can be proved by satisfactory evidence that any of the predictions of the Bible have failed, it would, on account of the peculiar claims of the Book, invalidate it as the Word of God. If, on the other hand, its prophecies have had a substantial, verifiable body of historic fulfilment, it establishes its claims of superhuman origin.

Mr. W. HOSTE remarked that in a paper read before the Institute last year the then lecturer said: "I doubt if we can maintain that any definite proposition was communicated by revelation" (*i.e.* to a prophet). I think Mr. Finn's paper is an adequate reply. It is hard to understand how anyone who had read the Bible with any attention could make such a statement.

The Modernist method to which Mr. Finn refers, of dealing with prophetic fulfilments as "interpolations," is imputing to the writers a "dodge" worthy of some little schoolboy "crib." The alternative plan of advancing the date of the Book merely begs the question. There are confessedly in Scripture many unfulfilled prophecies which, by analogy, we have every right to believe will come to pass in due time. I suppose, on the same showing, this will prove that a great part of existing Scripture has not yet been written.

I do not think, among all his wealth of Scriptural reference, the learned lecturer mentions the first comprehensive basal prophecy in Gen. iii, 15, which includes in its opening words the religious history of mankind, then the final victory of Christ, and, in the last phrase, Christ's death at Calvary. Here are three fairly "definite propositions" revealed beforehand by God and fulfilled in their course.

At the top of p. 174 the lecturer refers to a most important point in citing three passages from Isaiah, in which Jehovah elects to stand or fall on His *unique* ability to foretell the future. Denying the prophetic element in Scripture, in the sense of definite prediction, is really to deny to God the very ground on which He bases His claim to superiority over the idols. Any of us can prophecy what happened last week in the sense of philosophising about it. These Isaiah passages, to which we may add ch. xlv, 21, touch the very core of the matter, and deserve careful study.

Mr. R. DUNCAN said: I desire to express my warm appreciation of this most helpful paper. At the same time, and in the hope of receiving light in the matter from the lecturer's observations, I would mention two instances of, to me, seeming difficulty in relation to specific predictions:—

(1) As to the fate of Damascus, which, as we all know, still survives as a capital city, although Isaiah, looking into the future, said (ch. xvii, 1): "Behold, Damascus is taken away from being a city, and it shall be a ruinous heap." It is only the other day, however, that a sign was, perhaps, given that this prediction slumbers not, part of the city having been destroyed by shell fire in the fighting arising out of the Druse rebellion.

(2) As to the final destiny of Egypt, which Isaiah (ch. xix, 23-25), pictures as one of happy association with Israel and Assyria under the blessing of the Lord of Hosts, whereas Joel, speaking likewise, as one would judge, of the time of the end, says, "Egypt shall be a desolation."

#### REPLY OF LECTURER.

When my subject was assigned to me—I did not choose it myself—I soon recognized that it was far too big for a mere paper like this. It would take a volume, and a fairly large one at that, to do it justice. It was no surprise to me, therefore, to find that some of the speakers have referred to predictions not mentioned in the paper. Indeed, I have not dealt with all the passages noted by myself.

The prediction "a virgin shall conceive" was purposely passed over, because I was anxious to concentrate on passages whose meaning is not seriously disputed. You are probably aware that it is contended the word here used is not the one which strictly means "virgin"—*Bethoolah*—but *Almah*, which, it is held, may mean a married woman. So far as I can make out, this word seems to correspond to our English "maid," which may have more than one meaning, but used absolutely would be readily understood to mean strictly virgin. Fuerst, in his "Lexicon," asserts that *Almah* can be used of a young married woman, yet, while giving several references to passages where it is used of those not married, the only reference he gives as applying to one who is married is—the passage in dispute!

In reply to Mr. Duncan, I take it that Damascus is used for the Syrian power of which it was the centre, and not merely for the city itself. In the same way Egypt stands for the power rather than for the land, and both these powers have been desolated.

The prediction (Isa. xix, 23-25) which couples Egypt and Assyria with Israel is very remarkable, as indicating that the two powers which had oppressed God's people will in the end be found on the Lord's side.

Reference has been made to our Lord's cry, "I thirst," being uttered "that the Scripture might be fulfilled." It would, I think, be a mistake to suppose that our Lord uttered words or did actions merely in order that they might correspond to ancient sayings. Rather is it the other way. The sayings were entrusted to the prophets, because the Divine Wisdom had ordained that so, and only so, should be carried out the plan of Salvation.

As to the "Prot-Evangelium," the promise of Gen. iii, 15, there are two points worth noting: (1) Elsewhere where "seed" is spoken of, it is the seed of a man; here, and here only, it is "her seed," the seed of a woman, a most unusual phrase. (2) The use of the English "it" is a little unfortunate; the Hebrew word may stand for either neuter or masculine, but the context so clearly refers to a Person that it would be better to read "He shall bruise."

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY wrote: I regard the paper as very useful. It follows a good and careful method of examining Holy Scripture. In Ps. cxxii, 6, we are told: "They shall prosper that love Thee," and this is an utterance which is being fulfilled upon us to-day for our kindness to the Jewish people. Daniel, speaking by the Holy Spirit (xii, 4), gave as a sign of the last days that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Again, in the New Testament, we have the prediction that "grievous wolves" shall enter the Church (Acts xx, 29). Has not this been proved true?

Major L. M. DAVIES wrote: I wish to say how heartily I agree with the lecturer's concluding words, to the effect that "The

Predictive Element in Holy Scripture is a part . . . of the hallmark which stamps the whole Bible as the 'fine gold' of God's Word, not the dross of men's imaginings." In the Bible alone, among the religious books of the world, do we find the phenomenon of true prophecy—predictions indubitably fulfilled long after the last possible date for their writing. My own studies are constantly bringing before me the fact that the Bible teems with prophecies which can be shown to have been fulfilled long after their writing. As a geologist, for instance, I have been peculiarly struck by the fact that we have, in 2 Pet. iii, a most perfect summary, written eighteen centuries before its rise, of our modern unproved and unprovable Doctrine of Uniformity, together with a statement of the effect which the acceptance of that doctrine as science would have upon belief in the literal Second Advent. This prediction has only been fulfilled in our own day.

But who could deny that the Book of Daniel was completely written before the time of our Lord? Yet Daniel, in predicting the rebuilding of Jerusalem, foretold that that same rebuilt city and its Temple would be destroyed *after* the "cutting off" of the Messiah (Dan. ix; cf. *vv.* 25 and 26). Now the rebuilt city had not yet been destroyed when our Lord was on earth; but it *was* destroyed *after* His rejection and crucifixion.

Yet not at once. Many an offer of forgiveness and mercy was given to His murderers before the final disaster came upon them; but finally St. Paul wrote to indicate that their predicted obstinacy had sealed their predicted fate. "*The Wrath*," said he, had come upon them to the uttermost. This use of the definite article (1 Thess. ii, 16) pointed the readers of his epistle back to all the then unfulfilled prophecies—in Deuteronomy and Daniel—which were soon afterwards so remarkably fulfilled to the letter. Yet St. Paul did not live to see them fulfilled. He was beheaded by Nero, while Vespasian and Titus made good the words in the Book of Daniel, and the peculiarly significant predictions in the still more ancient Book of Deuteronomy. Critics themselves, I believe, allow that Deuteronomy was written some 700 years before Christ, yet Deut. xxviii found its fulfilment only some 70 years after the birth of Christ. That chapter, from *v.* 49 onwards, which described the culminating disasters which should come upon the Jews, and had never

been fulfilled when Daniel wrote—nor even in our Lord's day—and so must be put in parallel with Daniel's predictions regarding the great national disaster which was to follow the cutting off of the Messiah.

So note its peculiarly apt character. The land was to be covered by the members of a hostile and domineering foreign nation, who should on all hands dispossess and oppress the Jews before finally destroying them by war. How improbable this must have seemed before the event! For normally it is the war which precedes and makes possible the occupation of the land. Yet the prediction was exactly fulfilled nevertheless. The Romans did occupy the land, and they oppressed the Jews on all hands until the latter finally rose in revolt. And how truly the subsequent war answered to Moses' description of it! According to his prediction, that war, unlike any previous Jewish war (*e.g.* of the Maccabees), was to be peculiarly a war of *sieges* all through the land of Judea. And so it proved. The Jews were besieged through all their land, for this war, arising out of a prior occupation, was not a war of movements and battles, but a war of resistance to the last by men shut up within their walled towns throughout the land they once called their own. And the result—they were scattered through all the world, as the same most ancient prophecy declared (*v.* 64). *Yet*—they have remained distinct to this day, as was also foretold.

A Book which teems with true prophecies—of which the above only mentions one or two—is, I firmly believe, not a work of man, but of God.

699TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 4TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

ROBERT CALDWELL, Esq., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following:— As Members: Professor Theodore Graebner, of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A., and Miss Jessie B. Monro; and as an Associate, Harold P. Barker, Esq.

The CHAIRMAN explained that, owing to the Rev. Dr. Zwemer's absence in New York, Lieut.-Colonel Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., had kindly undertaken to read the paper on "The Place of Woman in Islam."

---

*THE PLACE OF WOMAN IN ISLAM.*

By THE REV. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D.

I.

“TO regard polygamy as an essential in Islam would be an unpardonable mistake,” says the Editor of the *Islamic Review*. “Islam is a universal religion. With its world-wide mission comes the necessity of providing for the requirements of all ages, countries, and civilizations. Besides, the substantial laws—the Code of Islam, the Holy Koran—provide certain ordinances which are, in effect, remedial laws, deprecating their abuse, and laying proper restrictions on their use.”

Such statements not only reveal the psychology of the New Islam, but raise the whole question whether Mohammed improved the position of womanhood and advocated her rights, or whether by his legislation and example he did exactly the opposite. A

recent western writer goes so far as to say: "Mohammed, according to his lights, and with due regard to the needs of his time and country, was probably the most earnest champion of women's rights that the world has ever known. He found women, at least in some tribes, the property of their kinsmen, to be used, sold, or let to hire, like other chattels. He left them possessed of full legal personality, and capable of acquiring property and contracting on their own account. In other words, Mohammed brought about a condition whereby the veiled woman of Islam has ever since the seventh century of the Christian era, possessed and effectively exercised property rights not yet enjoyed by many hundreds of thousands of English-speaking women."\*

What are the facts? It is true that the position of women in Arabia among the nomad Arabs was in some respects an inferior one; but in all that makes for life and freedom it was far superior to what became her lot under Islam. There was the cruel and barbaric custom of female infanticide; but this was far from universal. The use of the veil was unknown in Arabia before Islam, nor did the Arabs seclude their women in the days of idolatry. Women had rights, and were respected. In two instances, beside that of Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra, we read of Arabian women ruling over their tribes; and Freytag, in his *Arabian Proverbs*, gives a list of female judges who exercised their office before Islam. The Nabathean and South Arabian coins and inscriptions prove that women held an independent and honourable position; they built expensive family tombs, owned estates, and were independent traders. Khadijah, Mohammed's first wife, is an example. We find, moreover, a genuine spirit of chivalry in the pre-Islamic poetry of Arabia. A woman was never given away by her father in an unequal match, nor against her consent. Professor G. A. Wilken has conclusively shown that, before Mohammed's time, women had the right, in every case, to choose their own husbands, and cites the case of Khadijah, who offered her hand to Mohammed.† Even captive women were not kept in slavery.

---

\* Pierre Crabitès, in *The Nineteenth Century and After* (1924). The contrary opinion was ably voiced by no less an authority than Martin Hartmann, the great Orientalist, in an address at Berlin in 1913 (see *The Moslem World*, vol. iv, pp. 258-65), and by Mohammedans themselves, as in *Al-Mar'at al-Arabiyyat*, by Abdallah Afifi. (Cairo, 1921.)

† G. A. Wilken, *Het Matriarchaat bij de oude Arabieren* (1884), and a supplement to the same, in answer to his critics. (The Hague, 1885.)

Polyandry and polygamy were both practised; the right of divorce belonged to the wife as well as to the husband; temporary marriages were also common. As was natural among a nomad race, the bond was quickly made and easily dissolved. But this was not the case among the Jews and Christians of Yemen and Nejran.\*

Two kinds of marriages were in vogue in ancient Arabia. The *muta'a* was a purely personal contract between a man and a woman; no witnesses were necessary, and the woman did not leave her home or come under the authority of her husband; even the children belonged to the wife. This marriage, so frequently described in Arabic poetry, was not considered illicit, but openly celebrated in verse, and brought no disgrace on the woman. In the other kind of marriage, called *nikah*, the woman became subject to her husband by capture or purchase; in the latter case, the purchase-money was paid to the bride's kin.

Robertson Smith sums up the position of women in Arabia before Islam in these words: "It is very remarkable that, in the family and in society, the position of women has steadily declined under Islamic law. In ancient Arabia we find many proofs that women moved more freely and asserted themselves more strongly than in the modern East. The Arabs themselves recognized that the position of woman had fallen, and it continued still to fall under Islam, because the effect of Mohammed's legislation in favour of women was more than outweighed by the establishment of marriages of dominion as the one legitimate type."†

The real difference between marriage in Arabia before and after Islam was not in the temporary character of the union, but in the fact that in the one case both spouses had the right of divorce, while in the latter only the husband has it. And so, though Islam softened some of the harshest features of the old law, it yet has set a permanent seal of subjection on the female sex, by stereotyping a system of marriage which at bottom is nothing else than the old marriage of dominion.

---

\* The statement is often made that the position of women with Mohammedans is very much the same as under Judaism. This is not the case, as was shown by P. Nyland in an article on the subject (*The Moslem World*, vol. vi, p. 291).

† *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, pp. 67 and 100-4. The veil was unknown. Cf. "Fakhr-ur-Razi," V, 249, and "Tabar," I, XXII, 32, both quoted by Abdallah Afifi in the book already mentioned.



The Koran degraded early Arabian womanhood. The one great classic on the subject by Dr. Perron\* is as convincing as it is exhaustive. From the early poets, the musicians of the desert, from a multitude of references in Islamic writers and from the Koran itself, he brings forward evidence that can leave no reader in doubt. Any woman would choose to have lived in pagan Arabia rather than under the system of Islam. Mansour Fahmy, himself a Mohammedan, says:—

“Altogether, in spite of her theoretically inferior station, the woman then lived her own life, in word, thought, and deed. History furnishes us with numerous facts which prove the superiority and activity of the ancient Arab woman; she took part in war; she busied herself in commerce; she had her own individual religious freedom, entirely apart from passively following her husband in matters of conscience; and if one should compare the two rôles played by the woman in this ancient society and in the actual society of Islam, one would say with Renan that the Arab woman at the time of Mohammed did not resemble in any way the stupid being who dwells in the harems of the Ottomans.

“The ancient Arab woman was happy in her home. She lived. Soon Islam, with its diverse institutions, its theocratic laws, and the consequences that followed, changed the customs, and the activity of woman was paralyzed.”†

## II.

What place then does woman occupy in the Koran—the bible of Islam? It has often been stated, though erroneously, that Mohammed taught that “women have no souls.”‡ So far from this being true, the Koran addresses itself to women as well as men, and contains much on the subject of women as believers in

\* *Femmes Arabes Avant et Depuis l'Islamisme*, 2 vols. : vol. i, 309 pp.; vol. ii, 302 pp. (Paris, 1858.)

† *La Condition de la Femme dans La Tradition et l'Evolution de l'Islamisme*, pp. 6, 7. (Paris, 1913.)

‡ P. de Lacy Johnstone, in his book, *Muhammad* (Appendix B), says:—

“The not uncommon belief that Muslims hold that women either have no souls, or that their souls perish at the death of the body, is no groundless calumny of the Christian. If Hood sang of—

‘the barbarous Turk

Where woman has never a soul to save,’

the Prophet himself said that ‘Hell was for the most part peopled with

God and in Mohammed's message. It mentions with high honour not only Mary, the Mother of Jesus Christ, but other women who are saints in the Moslem calendar. Reward is promised to good women as well as to good men (33 : 35). Modest behaviour is the chief virtue of a woman, and the veil is enjoined (33 : 59); a severe penalty is laid down for those who defame virtuous women (4 : 39). Daughters, as well as sons, are a gift of God, and Mohammed reproves his people for lamenting the birth of female children, and is especially indignant with the old custom among the pagan Arabs of burying some of their infant daughters alive. Daughters, however, are not equal to sons, but have only a half-portion of the inheritance (4 : 12).

The Koran requires the testimony of two women in a law court to rebut the testimony of one man. Yet it teaches reverence for motherhood, although sometimes only indirectly (4 : 1 ; 17 : 24 ; 46 : 14). "We have enjoined on man the doing of good to his parents ; with trouble did his mother bear him, and with trouble did she bring him forth." The most prominent element in Koranic teaching regarding women is in relation to marriage, divorce, and domestic slavery. The word for marriage in the Koran is *nikah*, a crude expression no longer used in polite society, because it has reference solely to the physical aspect of marriage. The Koran teaches that marriage is for the begetting of children . . . and the multiplication of the race (42 : 9). The wife is to be treated with love and tenderness (30 : 20). Marriage with a Jewess or a Christian woman is lawful, but not marriage with idolatresses (5 : 7 ; 2 : 20). A list of prohibited degrees is given (4 : 27), in which the father's wife (4 : 26) is especially forbidden, but the wife of an adopted son allowed (3 : 4).

Polygamy undoubtedly has the sanction of the Koran, for this world and the next (4 : 3). "But if ye cannot do justice between orphans, then marry what seems good to you of women, by two's, or three's, or four's ; and if ye fear that ye cannot be equitable, then only one, or what your right hand possesses" (*i.e.* female

women' ; and there is remarkable recent evidence that the belief that women do *not* live after death is held by educated Muslims." Again, Sir Edward Malet, in his charming book of recollections, *Shifting Scenes*, records a conversation he had with the late Khedive of Egypt (Taufiq), Tewfik Pasha, for whom Sir Edward had high regard. There was fear that the rebels would storm the palace and murder the Khedive and all his family, and Tewfik explained the abject terror of his wives by saying, "For them, you know, existence ends absolutely with death." If the Khedive of Egypt held such a belief, it is probably common among his co-religionists.

slaves). Although Mohammed by this legislation regulated and limited polygamy, yet, in the history of Islam this restraint, which can be read into the text, was of little effect in view of Mohammed's own example, and that of his immediate followers: In addition to four wives, a Moslem is allowed slave girls at his discretion (70 : 30 ; 23 : 4 ; 4 : 29). Wives are to be treated with strict impartiality, and the marriage of orphan girls is to be carefully arranged (4 : 26). Widows must not remarry till they have waited four months and ten days. At the time of marriage the wife receives a dowry from her husband, which becomes her property, unless, on her own account, she releases the claim, when wanting a divorce.

On this subject there are many detailed and unsavoury regulations, which can be summarized as follows:—Four months' interval are required between separation and final divorce (2 : 26). A divorced wife cannot be taken back by the husband after the triple divorce until she has consummated marriage with another husband.\*

“But when ye divorce women, and the time for their sending-away is come, either retain them with generosity, or put them away with generosity; but retain them not by constraint so as to be unjust toward them. He who doth so, doth in fact injure himself.

“And make not the signs of God a jest; but remember God's favour toward you, and the Book and the Wisdom which He hath sent down to you for your warning; and fear God, and know that God's knowledge embraceth everything.

“And when ye divorce your wives, and they have waited the prescribed time, hinder them not from marrying husbands when they have agreed among themselves in an honourable way. This warning is for him among you who believeth in God and in the last day. This is most pure for you and most decent.

“Mothers, when divorced, shall give suck to their children two full years, if the father desires that the suckling be completed; and such maintenance and clothing as is fair for them shall devolve on the father. No person shall be charged beyond his

\* We quote this passage as typical of the general teaching: “But if the husband give sentence of divorce to her a third time, it is not lawful for him to take her again until she shall have married another husband, and if he also divorce her, then shall no blame be attached to them if they return to each other, thinking that they can keep within the bounds fixed by God. He maketh this clear to those who have knowledge” (2 : 229).

means. A mother shall not be pressed unfairly for her child, nor a father for his child; and the same with the father's heir. But if they choose to wean the child by consent and by bargain, it shall be no fault in them. And if ye choose to have a nurse for your children, it shall be no fault in you, in case ye pay what ye promised her, according to that which is fair."

Such is the teaching regarding divorce laid down as eternal law by the Arabian Prophet. The Koran itself is witness to the fact that Mohammed found himself fettered by his legislation in the matter of marriage. His domestic affairs are laid bare to public gaze.

Mohammed's wives are said to be "mothers of the faithful" (3 : 36), and therefore none of them was allowed to marry after his decease. They were all to veil themselves carefully from the public, and to be an example of modesty, for God is ever watchful over all (24 : 31).

"O ye who believe! do not enter the houses of the Prophet unless leave be given you, for a meal—not watching till it is cooked! But when ye are invited, then enter; and when ye have fed, disperse, not engaging in familiar discourse. Verily that would annoy the Prophet, and he would be ashamed for your sake (he would be reluctantly obliged to ask you to leave), but God is not ashamed of the truth (24 : 27).

"And when ye ask them (the Prophet's wives) for an article, ask them from behind a curtain: that is purer for your hearts and for theirs. It is not for you to annoy the Prophet of God, nor to wed his wives after him, ever; verily that is with God a serious thing.

"There is no crime against them (the Prophet's wives) if they speak unveiled to their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their brothers' sons, or their sisters' sons, or their women, or what their right hands possess; but let them fear God—verily God is witness over all."

Two of the Prophet's wives were rebuked, and threatened with dismissal (66 : 3). The wives of Noah and Lot are held up as a warning to such disobedient women (66 : 10). The special privileges granted Mohammed in the choice of his wives, and their number, are recorded (Chap. 33, from 48–58) :

"O thou Prophet! verily, we make lawful for thee thy wives to whom thou hast given their hire (dowry), and what thy right hand possesses out of the booty that God has granted thee, and

the daughters of thy paternal uncle and the daughters of thy paternal aunts, and the daughters of thy maternal aunts, provided they have fled with thee, and thy believing woman if she give herself to the Prophet, if the Prophet desire to marry her ; a special privilege this for thee, above the other believers. We knew that we ordained for them concerning their wives and what their right hands possess, that there should be no hindrance to thee ; and God is forgiving, merciful.

“ Put off whomsoever thou wilt of them and take to thyself whomsoever thou wilt, or whomsoever thou cravest of those whom thou hast deposed (divorced), and it shall be no crime against thee. That is nigher to cheering their eyes and that they should not grieve, and should be satisfied with that thou doest bring them all ; but God knows best what is in their hearts ; and God is knowing, clement.

“ It is not lawful to thee to take women after this, not to change them for other wives, even though their beauty please thee.”

In such a polygamous household peace was not always present, and we are not surprised therefore that Mohammed sought a remedy and put it into the hands of his followers : “ Chide those wives for whose refractoriness ye have cause to fear ; remove them into sleeping-chambers in part, and scourge them, but if they are obedient to you, then seek not occasion against them ; verily God is high, great ! ” (4 : 38).

### III.

What the actual conditions were is revealed in that marvellous collection of authentic sayings and doings called *Hadith*, or Tradition. This is the Talmud of Islam, and is as authoritative to the followers of the Prophet as the Koran itself. In these books of *Hadith*, we have the fireside literature of the Moslem home everywhere.

It is recorded in them that the Prophet said : “ I have not taken any wife, nor given away any daughter to any one, without Gabriel having first brought me an order from my Lord : and I only acted according to that order.” Biographers record that he had twelve married wives with whom he consummated marriage. They all agreed respecting eleven of them ; but in regard to the twelfth, their opinion differs as to whether she was a married wife or a slave concubine.\*

\* Cf. W. W. Koelle, *Mohammed and Mohammedism*, pp. 487-209. He gives a short biographical sketch of each of the wives of the Prophet.

It is recorded that Ayesha stated :

“ When the Apostle of God married me, I was in my sixth year, and was still playing with other little girls. These girls would run away when that prince came near me, being ashamed ; but he would go after them and bring them back to continue the play.

“ One day he visited me, when I had been playing with my dolls, which I had laid on a cushion, and drawn a curtain over them. After a while the wind blew the curtain aside, and the Prophet seeing them, asked : ‘ What is that ? ’ I answered, ‘ These are my dolls.’ Then seeing something like a horse with wings on both sides, he inquired again : ‘ And what is that other thing I see amongst them ? ’ I replied, ‘ A horse.’ ‘ And what is that on both sides ? ’ ‘ Those are its wings.’ ‘ Have horses wings ? ’ ‘ Hast thou not heard that Solomon had winged horses ? ’ Upon this his Excellency laughed so heartily that the whole row of his teeth was seen.”

Here are other authentic traditions regarding women and marriage :—

It is related from Abdullah bin Omar that the Apostle of God said : “ The whole world is valuable ; but the most valuable thing in the world is a good woman.” (Muslim.)

It is related from Umamah bin Zaid that the Apostle of God said : “ I have not left after me any calamity more distressing to man than woman.” (Muslim, Al Bukhari.)

It is related from Abu Umama that the Prophet said : “ A believer has not benefited more, after the fear of God, than by a virtuous wife who, if he commands her, obeys him ; and if he looks at her, pleases him ; and if he swears by her, justifies him ; and if he goes away from her, acts sincerely in respect to herself and his property.” (Ibn Majah.)

It is related from Anas that the Apostle of God said : “ When a servant of God marries, he has perfected half of religion ; then let him fear God for the remaining half.”

It is related from Ayesha that the Prophet married her when she was a girl of seven years. And she was taken to her husband’s house when a girl of nine years ; and her playthings accompanied her. And the Prophet died, and left her when she was a girl of eighteen. (Muslim.)

It is related from Omar binu’l-Khattib and Anas bin Malak that the Apostle of God said : “ It is written in the Old Testament that he whose daughter reaches twelve years of age, and he has

not given her in marriage, and she falls into sin, he is responsible for that sin." (Al Baihaqi.)

It is related from Ayesha that when the Apostle of God wished to go on a journey, he used to cast lots among his wives, and would depart taking her with him whose name came out. (Muslim, Al Bukhari.)

It is related from Abu Hurairah that the Prophet said : " When a man has two wives, and does not treat them impartially, he will come on the day of resurrection with half his body fallen off." (Al Tirmidhi, Abu Daud, An Nasai, Ibn Majah.)

It is related from Abu Hurairah that the Apostle of God said : " If I had ordered anyone to prostrate to another, I would certainly have ordered a woman to prostrate before her husband." (Al Tirmidhi.)

There are traditions not only in favour of, but also against, divorce :—

Thus Abd' Allah b. Mas'ud reports that the Apostle cursed the second husband who made her again lawful for the first and cursed the first husband for whom she was thus made lawful. Other *Hadith* which remind one of Christ's interpretation of the Mosaic law are : "Of the things which are lawful the most hateful thing to God is divorce."

The following *Hadith* claims to give Mohammed's view on the question of the custody of the child : " A woman came to the Apostle and said : ' With my body I carried, nourished and cradled this son of mine, and now his father has divorced me and wants to snatch him from me.' The Apostle answered : ' You are the most worthy of him so long as you remain unmarried.' "\*

The *Hadith* in this, as in so many other matters, reflects the thoughts of the best and the worst minds of Mohammed's companions. For instance, Mohammed, as reported by Abd Allah ibn 'Umar, tells us : " The world all of it is property, and the best property in the world is a virtuous woman." And again, as reported by Abu Hurairah : " A woman may be married for four things : her money, her birth, her beauty, and her religion. Get thou a religious woman, otherwise thy hands be rubbed in dirt ! "

On the other hand, Usama ibn Zaid would have us know that the Apostle said : " I have not left behind me a source of discord

\* *The Traditions of Islam*, by Alfred Guillaume, p. 103.

more injurious to men than women." And Ibn Umar: "A woman, a house, and a horse are bad omens."

There is also a tradition which, says Professor Guillaume, "must either be officially repudiated or for ever condemn the system which enshrines it: "Whenever a woman vexes her husband in this world, his wife among the *huris* of Paradise says: 'Do not vex him (may God slay thee!) for he is only a guest with thee. He will soon leave thee and come to us.'"

It is a logical inference from the Koran itself that men in Paradise are to be gratified by the possession of *huris*, but there will be no special place for the wives they had in this world.\*

Political power may sometimes be held by women, but the prophetic verdict on women in high places is recorded by Bukhari thus: "When the Apostle of God was informed that the Persians had made Kisra's daughter their sovereign, he exclaimed, 'A people that entrusts its affairs to a woman will never prosper.'"<sup>†</sup>

The subordinate position of women in the religious life is likewise fixed by another of the Prophet's utterances. He went out on the day of the victims and Bairam to the place of prayer, and passing some women he said: "O company of women, give alms, for I have seen that most of you will be inhabitants of hell." "Why?" said they. Replied he: "Because you curse much, and deny the kindness of husbands."

#### IV.

Turning now from Mohammedan Tradition to the law of marriage as found in their codes of jurisprudence, we will next consider the legal position of women in Islam. According to Mansour Fahmy,<sup>‡</sup> Islamic literature and Islamic law degraded woman more and more in the course of the centuries. The example of Mohammed and his immediate followers proved far more potent than the limitations of any definite precept. The increase of female captives from Mohammedan conquests was another contributing factor in the downward trend.§

\* Compare article by E. E. Calverley in *Moslem World*, vol. viii, pp. 61 ff.

† *The Traditions of Islam*, by Alfred Guillaume.

‡ *La Femme*, pp. 160-1.

§ *The Legal Position of Women in Islam*, by Ameer Ali Syed, P.C., C.I.E., LL.D., and *Mohammedan Law of Marriage and Divorce*, by Ahmed Shukri, LL.B., Ph.D. (Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1917). The first work is an apology, but vitiated by the omission of many facts. The second



In Al-Ghazali's great work, the *Ihya*, an encyclopædia of religious thought, a special chapter is devoted to the subject of marriage. He entitles it, "The Ethics of Marriage," and divides the subject as follows: "Marriage is praiseworthy" (citing the passage from the Koran and Traditions); "the benefits of marriage are five-fold: children, enjoyment of life, the establishment of home, social privileges and the training of the mind by administering the home." He then describes the ideal wife according to Mohammedan standards: "She must possess religion, a good temper, beauty, small dowry, be a virgin, become a mother, belong to a good family, and not be too closely related." The rights of a husband and wife are then detailed. Marriage is defined as "a kind of slavery." No one reading this chapter in Al-Ghazali would imagine that Mohammed had ever said, as he is reported to have said, "Verily Paradise lies at the feet of mothers."

A contemporary of Al-Ghazali, the celebrated Al Nawawi, wrote a famous compendium of Islamic law called *Minhaj et Talibin*, which is still used throughout the world of Islam, and has been recently translated into English and French. The following paragraphs deal with marriage and divorce:—

"A father can dispose as he pleases of the hand of his daughter, without asking her consent, whatever her age may be, provided she is still a virgin. It is, however, always commendable to consult her as to her future husband, and her formal consent to the marriage is necessary if she has already lost her virginity (p. 284).

"A slave cannot have more than two wives at a time, and a free man not more than four. A marriage concluded by a free man with five wives at once is null as regards all of them, but if he marries them one after the other, only the fifth one is void. Consequently the sister of the fifth wife can become the wife of the person in question, unless he must abstain from her on other grounds. Moreover, one has the right to take a fifth wife after repudiating irrevocably one of the four, even while the repudiated wife is still in her period of legal retreat; but this cannot be done if the repudiation is revocable (p. 292).

---

is both scholarly and unbiased. However, the author is far from orthodox Islam when he says: "As a statesman he, Mohammed, recognized polygamy as an ethnic condition, and he acted wisely in not interfering with it. Any radical innovation in this direction would have upset the entire fabric of Eastern society, and might have been fatal to Islam."

“ A free man can repudiate his wife twice, and a slave his once, in a revocable way ; but after this triple or double revocation, she cannot be taken back again until she has been the legitimate wife of another man.

“ A wife who abjures Islam loses at the same time all right to maintenance, even though she returns to the faith before the expiry of her period of retirement ; but a wife whose husband becomes an apostate continues to be maintainable by him during the whole time of her retirement.\*

“ At the first indication of disobedience to marital authority a wife should be exhorted by her husband without his immediately breaking off relations with her. When she manifests her disobedience by an act, which, though isolated, leaves no doubt as to her intentions, he should repeat his exhortations, and confine her to her chamber, but without striking her. He may not have recourse to blows, even where disobedience is manifested by an isolate act. Only where there are repeated acts of disobedience may a husband inflict corporal chastisement (p. 318).

“ In order that a repudiation should be valid, the law requires that the husband should be a sane adult Moslem. A repudiation may be pronounced in a state of drunkenness. A repudiation is valid, even where pronounced unintentionally, if the husband uses explicit terms ; but if he uses implicit, he must really intend to repudiate his wife (p. 327).

“ Where a husband and wife eat together some dates and mix the seeds, and the husband says to the wife ‘ If you don’t separate your seeds from mine you are repudiated,’ and the wife puts each seed aside, the condition of repudiation is not fulfilled, and the marriage remains intact, unless the husband wishes her to indicate which seeds were hers. When a woman has a date in her mouth, and the husband repudiates her on condition that she swallows it, and then changes his mind and makes it depend on her spitting it out, and then changes his mind again and makes the repudiation depend on her taking the date in the hollow of the hand, and the woman on hearing these words quickly swallows half the date and spits out the other half, the condition is not, considered to be fulfilled (p. 343.)

“ A wife must have the enjoyment of the premises she occupies, but her husband need not transfer the ownership to her. On the

\* Cf. *The Law of Apostasy in Islam*, chap. ii.

other hand, what she receives for her maintenance becomes her own, in the case of things that are consumed by use, like provisions. She may also dispose of them as she pleases ; only if she imposes upon herself privations that affect her health, in order to make a profit out of what her husband gives her, he has the right to object. As to things that deteriorate but are not consumed by usage, such as clothes, household utensils, or a comb, these things also become the wife's property ; though some authorities maintain that the husband is merely bound to procure her the enjoyment of them. A wife may insist upon her husband's giving her new clothes twice a year, *i.e.* at the beginning of winter and the beginning of summer, and where it is admitted that she becomes the owner of the things the husband is not bound to replace them in case of accidental loss " (p. 385).

*These laws of marriage seem hopelessly mediæval, but they have never been abrogated.* A judge of the High Court, Madras, has written a standard work on Mohammedan law for use in British India. He sums up the law of divorce as follows :—

“ Marriage may be dissolved in the lifetime of the husband and wife in any of the following ways : (1) By a *talaq* : Baillie calls a separation caused by the husband pronouncing certain appropriate words a ‘ repudiation ’ and all other separations for causes originating from the husband ‘ divorces ’ (Baillie 1.204).” The term “ divorce ” or *talaq* is used by the present author to refer to what Baillie calls repudiation or divorce pronounced by the husband or by some person duly authorized by him in that behalf. “ (2) By *ila*, *i.e.* the husband abstaining from connubial intercourse in accordance with an oath to that effect. (3) By *zihar*, *i.e.* the husband comparing the wife to a person within the prohibited degrees, on which the marriage may be dissolved by the Court on the application of the wife. (4) By *lian*, *i.e.* by the husband solemnly accusing his wife of adultery, and on the wife denying the accusation and each respectively imprecating the curse of God, on the husband for falsely accusing, and on the wife for falsely denying the accusation ; on which marriage may be dissolved by the Court. (5) By *khul* or *mubarat*, *i.e.* a mutual agreement between the husband and the wife to dissolve the marriage (for some consideration from the wife to the husband). (6) By the cancellation of marriage on account of physical defects in the husband or the wife. (7) By Court separating the parties whose marriage is irregular, or has been avoided by a minor on

attaining puberty, or a person of unsound mind on recovering reason.

“ The second and the third and sixth forms are by the act of the husband, the third and fourth partly by the act of husband and wife and partly by operation of law, the fifth by agreement, the seventh by the Court.”\*

## V.

Regarding the law of marriage, which is a contract rather than a sacrament, the legal authorities are agreed as follows :—

“ After a man has made the choice of a female for marriage, the law allows him to see her first. He, accompanied by some friends, goes to the house of the agent, and there settles the amount of the dowry which is paid at an early day. This is called the ‘ writing of the contract.’ The Moslem law appoints no religious ceremony or rites to be observed on the occasion of marriage. Mutual consent in the presence of witnesses is sufficient to make marriage valid. On the day appointed for the marriage the bridegroom, accompanied by some friends, goes to the place agreed upon. They are received by the guardian, or agent and some friends. Two trustworthy witnesses must be present. All persons then recite the *Fatiha*, i.e. the first chapter of the Koran, and the bridegroom delivers the dowry. The bridegroom and the agent of the bride sit upon the ground face to face and grasp each other’s right hand, raising the thumbs and pressing them against each other. Having passed a handkerchief over their hands, the Judge or Kadi generally pronounces a kind of Khutba or sermon, consisting of a few words of exhortation and prayer with quotations from the Koran and Tradition, on the excellence and advantages of marriage. He then requests the guardian or agent of the bride to say : ‘ I marry to thee my daughter for a dowry of such and such an amount.’ The bridegroom thereon says, ‘ I accept from thee her marriage with myself and take her under my care and engage myself to afford her protection, and ye who are present, bear witness to this.’ ”

What such protection is worth can be judged by the fact that the hero of Islam in the marrying and divorcing line was Mohammed’s own grandson Hassan, the son of Ali. “ During his father’s lifetime he successively married ninety or one hundred

\* *Principles of Mohammedan Law*, by F. B. Tyabji, pp. 131 ff. (Bombay, 1924.)

ladies, and notwithstanding his extreme good nature, divorced again, for a trifling reason, every one he had taken.”\*

Here we close the evidence from the Koran, the *Hadith*, and books on jurisprudence. Much more might be given. Yet in spite of all these facts modern apologists for Islam, such as Seyyid Ameer Ali, claim that “the Prophet Mohammed secured to women in his system rights which they had not before possessed; he allowed them privileges the value of which will be more fully appreciated as time advances. He placed them on a footing of perfect equality with men in the exercise of all legal powers and functions. He restrained polygamy by limiting the maximum number of contemporaneous marriages, and by making absolute equity towards all obligatory on the man.” It is worthy of note that the clause in the Koran which contains the permission to contract four contemporaneous marriages, is immediately followed by a sentence which cuts down the significance of the preceding passage to its normal and legitimate dimensions. The passage runs thus: “You marry two, three or four wives, but no more.” The subsequent lines declare “but if you cannot deal equitably and justly with all, you shall marry only one.” The extreme importance of this proviso, bearing especially in mind the meaning which is attached to the word “equity” (*adl*) in the Koranic teachings has not been lost sight of by the great thinkers of the Moslem world. *’Adl* signifies not merely equality of treatment in the matter of lodgment, clothing and other domestic requisites, but also complete equity in love, affection and esteem. As absolute justice in matters of feeling is impossible the Koranic prescription amounted in reality to a prohibition. This view was propounded as early as the third century of the Hegira. In the reign of al-Mamun, the first Mu’tazalite doctors taught that the developed Koranic laws inculcated monogamy. And though the cruel persecutions of the mad bigot, Mutawakil, prevented the general diffusion of their teachings, “*the conviction is gradually forcing itself on all sides, in all advanced Moslem communities, that polygamy is as much opposed to the teachings of Mohammed as it is to the general progress of civilization and true culture.*”†

\* *Mira’t-ul-Ka’inat*, vol. i, p. 697. This statement from a Persian book is corroborated by other accounts of Hassan’s life. His sobriquet was “The Divorcer.”

† Ameer Ali, *The Spirit of Islam*, p. 188.

We heartily endorse the sentiment expressed by Siyyid Ameer Ali in concluding his discussion. His apology, however, for the plural marriages of the Prophet of Arabia is utterly unconvincing. He says: "It was to provide helpless or widowed women with subsistence in the lack of all other means. By taking them into his family, Mohammed provided for them in the only way which the circumstances of the age and the people rendered possible."\*

## VI.

The place given woman in Mohammedan literature is in accord with that to which she is assigned in the Koran and Tradition. As far as the unexpurgated *Arabian Nights* are from King Arthur's *Knights of the Round Table*, so far is the conception of womanhood in Islam from that even of mediæval womanhood in Western lands. No higher authority on this subject could be quoted than the Dutch Orientalist, Dr. Snouck Hurgronje: "Moslem literature," he says, "it is true, exhibits isolated glimpses of a worthier estimation of woman, but the later view, which comes more and more into prevalence, is the only one which finds its expression in the sacred traditions, which represent hell as full of women, and refuse to acknowledge in the woman, apart from rare exceptions, either reason or religion; in poems, which refer all the evil in the world to the woman as its root; in proverbs, which represent a careful education of girls as mere wastefulness. Ultimately, therefore, there is only conceded to the woman the fascinating charm with which Allah has endowed her, in order to afford the man, now and then in his earthly existence, the prelibation of the pleasures of Paradise, and to bear him children."†

A Persian author, Ibn Moqaffa'a, who embraced Islam in the second century after Mohammed, and is considered among the best writers of his day, recommends men to watch very carefully and preserve their friendships; for, he says: "Friends are not like women whom we can repudiate if and when we choose." This author lived in an area remarkable for its frequent practice of divorce. His book otherwise abounds in broad-minded opinions and liberal views, but the scorn of womankind dominates it like a dogma. "Nothing," so he says, "is more disastrous for

\* Ameer Ali, *The Spirit of Islam*, p. 188.

† Translation from *Mekka*, vol. ii, p. 187.

religion, for the body, for well-being, for intelligence, and nothing wrecks ruin upon the mind so much as the love of women does."\*

There are, however, gleams of light in these dark shadows of Mohammedan literature. Exceptions which prove the rule. We have, for example, the life of that saintly woman, Rabia, daughter of Ishmael of Basrah, who lived a century after Mohammed, and who was celebrated as one of the earliest mystics. Once she was asked whether she ever thought of marrying. She answered, "The marriage contract can be entered into by those who have possession of their free-will. As for me, I have no will to dispose of; I belong to the Lord, and I rest in the shadow of His commandments, counting myself as nothing." "But," said Hassan, "how have you arrived at such a degree of piety?" "By annihilating myself completely." Being asked on another occasion why she did not marry, she answered, "There are three things which cause me anxiety." "And what are they?" "One is to know whether at the moment of death I shall be able to take my faith with me intact. The second is whether in the Day of Resurrection the register of my actions will be placed in my right hand or not. The third is to know, when some are led to Paradise and some to hell, in which direction I shall be led." "But," they cried, "none of us know any of these things." "What!" she answered, "when I have such objects to preoccupy my mind, should I think of a husband?"†

One of the great mystics in Egypt was Abd-ul-Wahbab Al-Sha'arani. He died at Cairo in 1565, and his grave is still a place of pilgrimage. He advocated monogamy, and his writings are marked by a moral purity, which is exceptional. He was not afraid to point out the blot on Mohammedan society, saying:— "We Sufis have entered into an engagement to espouse only one wife, and not to associate others with her. The man who has only one wife is happy; his means are sufficient to support his home; but as soon as he takes a second wife, the prosperity of his house decreases, and when he opens his money-box he finds it empty. A pure-hearted wife is a great happiness in the house. Oh, how often while I was weaving have I stolen a glance at my wife, the mother of my son Abdurahman, sewing garments for the poor. I understood then that I had happiness in my house. Often she opened her larder which sufficed us for whole

\* *La Femme*, by Mansour Fahmy, p. 154.

† *Mystics and Saints of Islam*, by Claude Field, (London, 1910.)

months, and distributed the contents to the poor, who quickly emptied it. May God be merciful to her.”\*

As early as the third century of Islam the classical author Jahiz, head of a philosophical sect, ventured to speak favourably of woman. Although he professes to agree entirely with the Koran, saying that man's superiority over woman is evident in everything, he nevertheless tries to persuade men to respect woman's rights, for, so he says: “He who pays reverence to the right of the father must not forget the right of the mother.” He is very far, however, from the tendency of the present time, in which woman is made man's equal in all actions of life, for he holds that the woman must not turn away from those things that include her proper function. Her mission is to be a mother and a wife. And Jahiz sharply criticizes the man who either from a kind of affectation or pedantry delivers himself to occupations which are the exclusive realm for women such as music, for instance.†

## VII.

One may well say that century after century Islam regulated and regarded the life of woman more and more solely as centred in man's convenience and pleasure.

Al-Ghazali in the fifth century has interesting things to say on the subject. This great mystic had enormous influence on the intellectual life of Islam. He teaches that woman must in no way be independent; she is indeed unfit to earn her own living because of her social condition. He looked upon life as being so serious that woman was a costly burden which had better not be attached as a weight to one's feet (Ghazali, *Ihya*, vol. ii, p. 22). After giving this opinion about woman, Ghazali prescribes how she is to behave and to regulate her life according to the ancient moralists. “She must,” he said, “lock herself up in her house and she is not to leave the place; she must not go too often to the top of her house, nor should she be seen; she must not talk too frequently to her neighbours nor go to call there; she has to look after her husband whether he be present or absent; she is to try to please him in all her doings, she must not cheat him either personally or in his property; she may only leave the house with his permission, and once outside, she must behave in such a

\* *Mystics and Saints of Islam*, by Claude Field (already quoted).

† *La Femme*, by Mansour Fahmy, p. 155.



way that she be covered if met unexpectedly ; she has to use only the least frequented roads, must avoid those streets crowded by foot-passengers, and she has to take great care not to be recognized " (*Id.*, p. 28).

Whether one reads Arabic and Persian poetry, Turkish fairy tales, Morocco folk-lore, or the adventures of the heroes of the *Arabian Nights*, the portraiture of woman is never pure and noble, and seldom heroic. The whole tendency of polygamy, slavery and concubinage with unlimited divorce was to create an unhealthy and degrading atmosphere, a sex-obsession with which all Moslem literature is besmirched. One of the most popular tales of the Arabian collection tells of various escapades and crimes by princes, and ends with the typical climax :—

“ Women are very devils, made to work us dole and death ;  
Refuge I seek with God Most High from all their craft and  
skaith.

Prime source are they of all the ills that fall upon mankind,  
Both in the fortunes of this world and matters of the faith.”

“ It is incredible,” writes Canon W. H. T. Gairdner, “ were it not a fact, how the typical erotic literature of Islam—sensual to the verge of pornography—begins as a matter of course with the time-honoured invocation of Allah and prayers upon the Apostle of Allah ; an Ovid’s *Ars Amoris* with a pious preface and conclusion ! Not that way, God knows, lies the solution of the sex-problem. Is it wonderful, then, that Lane and many others have remarked how religiosity and immorality can co-exist, often without exciting the slightest remark or the least sense of incongruity ? ”\*

Professor D. B. Macdonald sums up the whole discussion regarding the position of women in Islam when he says : “ I do not think that there can be any question that the position of women in Islam is practically due to the attitude of Mohammed himself. This is pretty well admitted in the attempts which have been made—and this is the common explanation and defense of the present day—to show that Mohammed’s position was peculiar ; that he did these things bearing upon women as a Prophet ; as a politician ; as a political leader ; for one reason or another. But to put the case in a word, I cannot conceive of

---

\* *The Rebuke of Islam*, p. 165.

anything that would have made such an enormous difference in the position of woman in Islam as if Mohammed, after the death of his first wife, had remained a monogamist, for one point; and, if, for another point, he had encouraged his wife to go with unveiled face, as was the custom, and is the custom to this day, for that matter, for the free women of the desert. That would have been enough; the woman question in Islam would hardly now exist. Every Moslem would have followed in that, as in everything else, the example of his Prophet. Monogamy would be the rule in Islam, while the veil would never have existed except for the insane jealousy of Mohammed.”\*

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Zwemer for his paper, and included in the vote the name of Colonel Hope Biddulph, who had kindly read the lecture. Proceeding, he said:—

The subject is not a very savoury one, and it would not be of much real service to any to go very deeply into the problems discussed. Addressing ourselves to the earlier sections into which the paper is divided, we note in Section I that among the early nomads in Arabia the condition of women was very much better than that which followed upon Mohammed's appearing in their midst. After twenty-one years of prophethood, there remained a condition very different from, and much worse than, that which prevailed at the first. The evil practices established by Mohammed were all given forth as coming from heaven, having been received from the angel Gabriel; and at length the women of Arabia, who had been comparatively free, were brought down into slavery—and slavery of the worst kind—to serve as playthings for men. The sanctions of the Prophet are hateful in their incidence, and may be left as explained in the paper.

Section III shows that, since the Prophet came, in the seventh century after Christ, his religion, partly based on Judaism, and partly composed of things picked up from the religions of other nations, had had a baleful effect upon family life. Women have known no privileges of faith, and now, after thirteen hundred years,

---

\* *Aspects of Islam*, p. 104.

they are beginning to rebel. In many quarters they have thrown aside the veil, and are moving about without the distinctive covering which the Prophet ordained. In a word, they are asserting their liberty and authority, and that is in the right direction.

One thing that surely shocks us more than anything else is that anything in the nature of a future life is, to all intents and purposes, denied to women; in fact, as we have heard, hell is full of them, while heaven is for the men, who are to find there also in another life nymphs, and many of them, provided for their eternal gratification. Should we not pray that, in the mercy of God, there may be spread among these people, who for many centuries have been debased and oppressed, a knowledge of Christ which will bring a moral and spiritual uplift to those who for many centuries have been under the heel of Islam?

The vote of thanks was carried with acclamation, and discussion proceeded.

Miss HAMILTON LAW, having worked among Mohammedian men, said she had always found them singularly courteous. Still, it is the custom of the fathers to force marriages on their daughters. She recently heard of a girl, in a village community, who ran away because she did not like the man who had been chosen for her. In the mercy of God the girl found her way to Mrs. Liggins, of the Egypt General Mission, and when at length her father heard that she was safe, he was overjoyed, and promised that she should not be compelled to marry a man she did not like. It is to be hoped (the speaker added) that the freeing of Mohammedan women will not be too rapid, as at present they are without training as to personal behaviour. Endeavour should be made to raise the men, in the hope that they will influence the women. Native soldiers in Egypt, taught smartness and punctuality by English officers, are often very particular in the choice of a wife.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES said: The quotation on p. 191, to the effect that Mohammed "was probably the most earnest champion of women's rights that the world has ever known," is characteristic of modern journalism. Hyperbolic—or, rather, vulgar—exaggerations of that kind are the academic way of calling one's opponent a

“liar.” Dr. Zwemer’s paper proves the assertion to be a falsehood. In reading Mohammed’s life, I have found it difficult to ascertain how many wives he had, as he seemed to capture for his harem every attractive woman that came into his power. His “legislation” on marriage and divorce shows how little regard he had for Scripture, in the inspiration of which he professed to believe. Evolution teaches that the human race is going—morally as well as intellectually—from bad to good, to better, to best. History teaches the opposite. Women in Homer’s time had a more honourable position than the women of later Greece. In Rome the purity of the family life was scrupulously guarded by the worship of Vesta and the sacrifice at the hearth—in which no “outsider” dared to join. Under the later Republic, and under the Empire, when divorce became easy and frequent, Rome gradually degenerated and went to pieces. The picture Tacitus gives of the conjugal laws of the pagan Germans compares very favourably with what we see to-day in Christian Europe and America. Dr. Zwemer shows that the same holds good of ancient as compared with modern Arabia.

It is noteworthy that great men who have set the world a bad example by divorcing their wives without good cause have usually failed in their progeny schemes. With all Solomon’s wives, we read only of one son that he left. Cæsar divorced his wife and married again, and he left no children. Charlemagne had, I believe, nine wives, and left only one son, who, although morally a far better man than his father, was utterly unfit to be a king, and had tragical trouble all through his reign. Mohammed himself had eleven wives, and left no sons, and only one daughter. Henry VIII had two divorces and six wives, and left only two daughters and a consumptive son, none of whom left any survivors. Napoleon wantonly divorced his wife, married again, and left only a sickly boy, who died young, and with him the whole posterity ended.

According to Koranic law, every Moslem can have four wives, and as many “slave wives” as he can obtain. What is the result? Look at all the Moslem countries of to-day—Persia, Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, Afghanistan, Morocco, the Sudan, etc.—all backward, ignorant, degraded countries. The Moslems have a saying which well illustrates the way in which Mohammed was the “most earnest champion of women’s rights that the world has ever known.”

It is this: "If you want counsel about any project you are contemplating, go and ask advice of ten of your friends. If you have only five friends, go and ask each of them twice. If you have only one, go and ask him ten times. If you have no friends at all, go and ask your wife, and then do the opposite of what she advises you!"

The Rev. A. H. FINN said: Col. Lawrence's experience was, I believe, chiefly among the desert Arabs—Bedaween—whose Mohammedanism, I imagine, does not go very deep. It is likely therefore that their women would be freer and better treated than among stricter Moslems (though even they are in some degree kept secluded). In Palestine the bulk of the inhabitants—Fellahin, ploughmen, peasantry—called Arabs, though not of true Arab descent, are nominally Moslem, but their adherence to Islam is little more than a veneer over practical Paganism. Their women, too, have a considerable amount of freedom, and usually go about unveiled. But in the towns, among the old Arab families, the "hareem," plurality of wives, strict seclusion, veiled faces and shrouded figures in the streets, and facilities of divorce, still prevail.

It may not be generally realized that in India the Zenana system among the Hindus was entirely borrowed from their Mohammedan conquerors, and that largely as a measure of self-protection from the wantonness of the Mogul soldiery. In Burma the women enjoy a large amount of freedom socially and politically, mingling freely with the men, and always unveiled, yet religiously are treated as inferiors. According to Buddhist teaching, no woman can attain direct to Nirvana, and Burmese women are taught to utter aspirations that, in their next re-incarnation, they may be reborn as boys so as to be capable of reaching Nirvana.

The large order of yellow-robed monks—"Phoongyees," sometimes called Buddhist priests, but inaccurately, for they have no kind of priestly office—are treated with great respect, addressed and spoken of in specially honorific language, and reverently saluted in the streets. The companion order of nuns, said to have been founded by the Buddha at the entreaty of his mother and sister, meets with no such consideration, and is practically disregarded.

I have no right to speak authoritatively, but it seems to me that in no non-Christian religion are women treated as spiritually on an

equality with men. Even in the synagogue the Jewess is kept apart in a special gallery, and it is said that the Jewish man is taught to bless God that he was not created a woman! One of the notable instances of the indirect influence of Christianity has been in the remarkable uplift of woman toward her rightful position as the "help-meet for man."

Lieut.-Col. H. BIDDULPH said: This paper represents woman in a state of degradation and general inferiority; but is there not a danger at the present time of her going to the other extreme? The cry for "sex-equality" is a foolish one, and issues from those who fail to perceive Divine Order in creation. There can be no comparison as regards equality between creations so essentially different as the sexes. One is the complement of the other. As well compare the "eye" and the "ear," or "salt" and "sugar"; each has its own separate degree of excellence quite irrespective of the other. Christianity is the only system which gives to woman her due and proper place. Moving in her divinely appointed orbit, she possesses the dignity intended for her, and as man's counterpart and partner shares with him his life. Thus the mutual need of each for the other is experienced, and no question of comparison arises. The beautiful type, set forth by marriage, of Christ and the Church is broken by the modern woman's claim, and the only result is confusion and disorder.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS said: I have in my journeyings had a few opportunities of speaking on delicate subjects with Mohammedans, and occasionally rather intimately. One of the many things which I have against Mohammed is the bad example which he set in marrying a girl (Ayesha) of six, which marriage was consummated when she was only three or four years older. I was once talking with a Mohammedan, and I asked him, "Suleiman, are you married?" "No," he said, "not yet." "I will give you good advice; mind that you do not marry anyone under sixteen years of age." "That is too old," he replied. "You must marry them young, and make them obedient and humble. If they are too old they are likely to become too cheeky. No; I must marry a young girl, and train her up to my ways and likings." Who can tell the mental and moral

sufferings which these child marriages entail? The physical results I leave to others. A medical man might, in scientific language, be able to hint at, or partly describe, the wailings of injured and outraged childhood; I cannot. Every daughter of Eve has an inward feeling that God's way and plan is *one man one wife*, and not *one man and many wives*.

Another thing which I have against Mohammed is the dreadful invention of the purdah. In India and the East—in the lands of glorious sunshine undreamt of by us in England—women often suffer from diseases which are the direct results of being shut up in dark and sunless holes behind the purdah. Is it not strange that all these heresies, or Satanic and demoniacal religions, are closely connected with uncleanness, incest, libertinism, etc., which we label and throw on the dunghill as pornography?

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Lieut.-Colonel MACKINLAY wrote: The paper gives a good insight into the position of woman among Mohammedans, both in times past and at present. It is a humiliating statement of the wrongs which women suffer consequent upon Moslem selfishness, and the attitude sanctioned by the example of Mohammed. The inferiority of woman compared with man is consistently taught in the Koran.

Ease of marriage and divorce leads to immorality, and the effects of this are manifested upon the Moslem nations of the world. We of the West have reason to rejoice in our lot. Though not in every case models of moral perfection, we at least hold in special regard those among us who practise self-denial, truthfulness, and honour. How different are the Christian standards, set before us in the New Testament, when contrasted with the religion of Mohammed, who himself set an example of self-indulgence—an example which his co-religionists have been sadly keen to follow.

Mr. GEORGE B. MICHELL, O.B.E., wrote: May I add one note to Dr. Zwemer's valuable paper, a note which I think should not be overlooked? Mohammed professed to be an envoy from God; his book professes to express the mind of God, his religion professes to be DIVINE. The comparison of details, therefore, is not *relative*, but

*absolute* ; it should not bring an *improvement* on the bad ways of men, but the absolute *perfection* of what they ought to be.

According to this, the position of women in Islam ought to be ideally perfect. Is it so? Nay, in what respects is it *now*, after 1,300 years of the absolute sway of Islam in many countries, *better* than that of women in other religions? It certainly is much inferior, in every way, to that of Christian and Jewish women.

I travelled extensively for two years in Central Africa, in the meeting-place of Islam and blank savagery, and I say, without hesitation, that the position of savage, heathen women there is superior in every way to that of Mohammedan women.

Again, if Islam brought in the divine idea of the position of woman, why should it be necessary for Turkey, Iraq, and Egypt to modify the Islamic law with regard to marriage and divorce?

Finally, has the legislation of Mohammed with regard to the position of woman practically succeeded in abolishing the social evil? There is, alas! good reason to believe this to be worse in Moslem lands than in any other. And this is directly due to the Moslem law on polygamy, slavery, marriage, and divorce.

#### REMARKS BY THE LECTURER.

I am pleased with the comments made on a paper that was necessarily too brief to deal with all aspects of the problem. It is well to remember that important and wide-reaching reform movements are at present in progress. May we not hope that such ethical reforms will lead to the turning of many to Jesus Christ and His teaching? He alone can emancipate and redeem Moslem womanhood.



700TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 25TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

ALFRED W. OKE, ESQ., B.A., LL.M., F.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

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

As the Rev. President M. G. Kyle was in the United States, the CHAIRMAN kindly undertook to read his paper on "Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science."

---

*ANCIENT SODOM IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN  
SCIENCE.*

By THE REV. PRESIDENT MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.,  
Xenia Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

**A**N expedition to the Cities of the Plain by Xenia Seminary, in co-operation with the School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem, was planned and organized in the autumn of 1923. The work as planned was carried out the following spring-time, 1924. An official account of the work, somewhat technical in character, has been published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1924, and is soon also to appear in the annual volume of the American School. Those wishing a more technical discussion of the subject are referred to these publications. A somewhat more popular account of this expedition may now be of interest to the Members of the Victoria Institute.

No little preparation is needed to make successful such an expedition. Diplomatic arrangements had to be made at Jerusalem, for, at that time, Transjordan was just being organized as a separate government, now since that time become a part of the Palestine government. It was a rather interesting experience to receive the very first visas ever issued by the Transjordan government to any foreigners to enter the land. Naturally, also, such an experience aroused some apprehension; Moab had borne a bad reputation during some thousands of years for its treatment of strangers, and it was impossible not to wonder a little whether or not these visas might not prove to be mere scraps of paper. It is a pleasure to say that they were honoured to the utmost; everything was done that the Transjordan government in its poverty could do to make us safe and comfortable.

Considerable domestic arrangements also had to be made for our comfort in the region of the Cities of the Plain. Some day in the future that region may be a very popular health resort, but now, to say the least, the hotel accommodations at Sodom are far from luxurious, whatever they may have been in the days of Lot. So we carried along our own cook, and pots and pans for the cook, and victuals to put in the cooking-vessels, and even gasoline to cook our meals. We did, in fact, however, buy some bread in Kerak, and some meal out of which our muleteers baked some thick cakes of bread almost as big around as the head of a barrel, and cooked in the red-hot ashes. We even in extremes bought the thin, black cakes which the Bedouin women bake, very black and very dirty and very tasteless, but supposed, like some other very tasteless things, to be very nutritious. Eggs also we bought, one or two at a time, from the Bedouin women; they were clean on the inside.

Far more important and, for this audience, more interesting than either diplomatic or domestic arrangements was the composition and organization of a staff of experts for such an exploration. Some account of the personality of the staff will at one and the same time assure the strictly scientific character of the work and guard against any charge of sectarian bias in the conclusions reached, and all this to the end that the results of the expedition should receive acceptance in every part of the Biblical world. As the expedition was organized by Xenia Theological Seminary, naturally enough the president of the Seminary was the president of the staff, and as the work was in co-operation

with the American School at Jerusalem it was most appropriate that Dr. Albright, the director of the school and one of the most expert topographical scholars in Palestine, should be director of field operations. Our geologist was Professor Day, of Beyrout College, Syria, a scholar of many years' experience in Palestine, and already very familiar with the region to which we were going. These three in order represent the United Presbyterians, the Methodists and the Congregationalists. The next member of the staff, the proto-archæologist, the flint and old stone expert, was Père Mallon, a Jesuit priest of Ratisbon, Jerusalem; he is the well-known specialist in that field of research, and has many years of experience in Bible lands. A representative of the department of antiquities of the Palestinian government, Naaman Makhouli, who accompanied us, gave something of an official character to the expedition, and by his technical knowledge and perfect command of the local vernacular gave us most valuable assistance. Mr. Makhouli belonged to the Greek Catholic church of Palestine. There were two Fellows also—William Carroll, the Thayer Fellow of the American School, belonged to the Church of God in Ohio; Herbert H. Tay, a Fellow of Xenia Theological Seminary, was of the Brethren of California. Our surveyor and field botanist, Mr. Sukenik, a student of the American School of Jerusalem, was a Russian Jew educated at Berlin, and Mr. Kent, a student of Xenia Seminary, was also of the Brethren of California. In addition to the field staff, we had the advice of Mr. Dinsmore, of the American Colony of Jerusalem, the most expert botanist in the land. We submitted our evidence also on our return to the judgment of Père Vincent, a professor in L'Ecole St. Etienne, Jerusalem, the foremost Palestinian scholar in the world. And also to Phythian-Adams, of the Palestine Exploration Society; he was just at that time being ordained to the priesthood in the Anglican church. It is not likely that anyone will charge this combination of faiths with any sectarian bias. One thing united them all; they were all men of devout reverence for the Old Testament Scriptures, which gives the only ancient account of our field of operations. We all worked together in the utmost harmony, and our conclusions were, I think, without exception, unanimous.

There will be time on this occasion for little more than a statement of the results of the expedition, so that the account of the journey through central and eastern Moab to Kerak, and from that old city down the precipitous mountain side to the plain

down at the Dead Sea, must be passed over very rapidly. The thought of such a journey conjures up visions of camel-trains and flowing robes and black tents of Kedar. Truthfulness, however, requires me to say that the actual journey was much less romantic, for "Uncle Henry" (Ford motor cars) took us around as far as Kerak. We followed the great military road from Jerusalem down to Jericho, across the river by the Allenby bridge, and on by the old Roman highway to the up-land of Moab. At Amman we stopped a couple of days to complete our diplomatic arrangements with the Transjordanian government. Mirza Tewfik Pasha, the head of the department of Antiquities at Amman, proved indeed to us a friend at court. He is a genial, cultivated Turkish gentleman with a price on his head in the Turkish Empire, because he was too kindly disposed to oppress peoples. He introduced us to the prime minister, made application for the formal permit for our work, and within an hour there was placed in our hand a letter to the governor of Kerak, empowering and directing him to furnish us a military escort and aid us in every way possible in our expedition. These orders were carried out to the very letter.

We made arrangements at Kerak for muleteers, riding-horses and pack animals, went religiously through a rather formal coffee-drinking with the governor, and after about two days were able to set out to go down, down, down, to the region of the Cities of the Plain. We had come up about 5,000 ft. in travelling 100 miles, and now we descended those 5,000 ft. in going forward only some 10 or 12 miles. Mountain climbing always supplies thrills liberally enough, but going down the pack trail from the heights of Moab to the site of ancient Sodom has peculiar thrills of its own. We dismounted and walked when we could, and climbed when we could not walk, and slid when we could not climb. The mules, trained for their work, would stiffen their fore-legs on the sloping surface of a rock and slide down to solid footing. One mule, like some people in this world, would not keep in the beaten pathway and he went over the precipice; he fell a thousand feet. One of the Arabs recovered his pack, but the mule did not recover. He is a warning to all men and mules that will not keep in the beaten pathway. We were glad to find a camping place on the plain alongside of the camp of a garrison of fifty soldiers. They may not have been needed, but they gave us a comfortable feeling.

When our camp was settled we set out to explore this whole

plain from one end to the other and from the mountains to the sea, 25 miles north and south and from 2 to 5 miles in width, seeking everywhere for evidences of the old Canaanite civilization declared by the Biblical account to have been on the plain in the days of Abraham and of Lot. We rode and walked back and forth, and climbed the foothills and the mountains, traced old aqueducts and reservoirs, explored ruined castles on precipitous cliffs, and followed the water-course from the red sand-stone mountains of Moab to the sea. We dug down in the old ruins to virgin soil to see if any of them showed the civilization of Canaanite times. There were ruins galore, but they were Arab and Byzantine, with perhaps here and there some that were no more than Crusader work, but nothing that went farther back than 600 years A.D. As yet not a trace of ancient Canaanite civilization. All on the surface of the land there, and even in the depths of the ruined cities now there on dry land, is comparatively modern; nothing within 2,500 years of the time of Abraham and Lot.

We determined to search the water of the lower end of the sea that perchance we might find the ruins of the ancient cities under the water. A clumsy, wheezy motor-boat was on the sea; we secured it for a day, and incidentally for about 50 dollars, and set out to explore the shallow water. But that story must wait, for that very morning Père Mallon came into camp with the exciting news that he had found the old Canaanite pottery. The story of that find and the account of all these researches will best be told in the story of the results of the expedition, the story of "Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science."

## I.

There is now conclusive scientific evidence that what civilization the Bible represents to have been on this plain in the days of Abraham and Lot, and of Sodom and Gomorrah, was actually here. Even the silence of Scripture concerning the subsequent history of this place becomes, strangely enough, as we shall presently see, also a piece of scientific evidence. Necessarily the first point in the evidence is to establish the actual existence of Canaanite civilization on this plain in the Early Bronze Age, that is to say, the time of Abraham in Biblical history. We had long hunted for this evidence up and down the

plain unsuccessfully, and at last, on the day we set out upon the sea, this evidence came to us unexpectedly, as nearly all archæological evidence does come. It was found at last at Bab-ed-Draa. The place itself was already known, perhaps even the evidence of its antiquity had been observed, but, before the modern development of the science of pottery in Palestine, not understood. Here Père Mallon stumbled upon some open graves where the Arabs had been looking for treasure. Whether or not they got the treasure we have no means of knowing, but they had thrown the pottery out of the grave and this refuse was treasure to us. This pottery was the typical and very distinctive Canaanite product of the Early Bronze Age. It was found that these open graves were part of a cemetery of considerable extent, and alongside of it were the stone circles of a camping place, an open-air settlement. There had never been a city here ; it was not a place of permanent settlement, but a camp-site. Nor, indeed, was there any pottery, except that which came out of the grave. The cemetery and the camping place afforded no explanation in themselves. People camp at a place for a purpose, and they bury at a place that is convenient. Why in both cases here ? Alongside of the camping place were the unmistakable remains of a great Canaanite High Place ; it was typical in its character with its seven sacred pillars. I have said it was a great High Place ; probably it was *the* great High Place of the whole plain ; it was well elevated, as a High Place should be, and conveniently located for access from all parts of the plain. But there was other evidence of the importance of the place. A wall fortification some 1,200 ft. long, now largely a heap of stones, protected the place from encroachment from the wild tribesmen of Moab of the time before Moabite civilization began under Lot. No such costly defence measure would be taken, unless the place itself was of the first importance. This was a great place of worship to which the people came as the Israelites came to Gilgal ; they dwelt in these open-air settlements as the Israelites dwelt in booths at the feast of Tabernacles. Here also a burial place was arranged alongside of the camp and the great High Place of worship. Not all the people were buried here ; the number of the graves was very small in comparison with the population of the plain. Probably only the distinguished dead were buried here at the great place of worship ; here was a kind of Canaanite Westminster Abbey.

So, then, the civilization of the Early Bronze Age at the time

of the Patriarchs and of the great catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, which is represented in the Bible to have been here, was certainly here, and also the few weeks that we searched the plain and found nothing was, after all, not lost. The fact that there is no indication of civilization for the 2,500 years from the destruction of the Cities of the Plain to Byzantine times is exactly in accord with the silence of Biblical history to the end of Biblical times. It is one instance when the argument from silence becomes valid and the absence of evidence of civilization becomes positive evidence. If there be no soot in the chimney, it is evidence there has been no fire kindled in it. Civilization, like fire, always leaves traces. There being no trace of any civilization here from the destruction of the cities to Byzantine times, is exactly in accord with the silence of Scripture for the intervening period.

## II.

Another thing concerning this plain is now indubitably established by observation and experience, truly scientific evidence: this, namely, that the description concerning this region "like the garden of the Lord before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah," is the only correct description of the natural conditions of life on this plain. This will be a surprise to many as it was indeed to us. Writers who have come to this region, from the time of the early pilgrim down to Lynch and De Saulcy, Robinson and Tristram, on down to more modern travellers and soldiers, have seemed to vie with each other in the description of the horrible conditions of life on the plain. No fin ever cut the waters of the sea, no wing ever disturbed the stagnant air that hung over the plain, and all was death round about; the climate was intolerable, and miasmatic, and pestilential, and the water unfit to drink. Perhaps these writers came here in the hot season; more likely they wrote after they went home and under the spell of the horror of the tragedy that took place here. Our first surprise was to come unexpectedly upon a great water-course filled with boulders, and evidently, at times, the channel of a raging torrent. Even now there ran through it a stream, 1 ft. deep and 25 ft. wide, of as pure sweet water from the red sand-stone mountains of Moab as one might drink anywhere in the world. Little ditches or canals run here and there over the plain, and by this irrigation system fields of excellent wheat

and of grass knee-deep were all around us. The most beautiful fig orchards to be seen anywhere in the world are here, and here also are excellent vineyards and a little indigo cultivation. In Arabic times there was a great sugar industry here ; the aqueducts and reservoirs, and even the old sugar mills themselves, are still to be seen. The Bedouin are indolent and unenterprising and, moreover, have a very poor market for their produce, so they irrigate just enough to provide food and clothing for themselves, and their demands in this respect are easily satisfied. Long centuries have washed the soil pure once again from the salt and the sulphur, and proper irrigation here, making use of the water that is going to waste, could turn ten thousand acres into a veritable tropical garden. The winter temperature here could hardly be excelled anywhere in the world, 75° by day and 65° by night ; it is almost entirely free from mosquitoes, and the scenery is more beautiful and romantic than that of Egypt.

### III.

Now the heart of this story of discovery concerning " Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science " is that the great catastrophe did take place exactly as narrated in the Bible. The Biblical story of that event is related entirely from the standpoint of Divine Providence. It draws aside the curtain to let us see what God was doing, but it tells us very meagrely about what transpired in nature. On the other hand, whatever verification of the narrative scientific investigation can give must, of course, relate entirely to the natural effects of the catastrophe as revealed in the neighbourhood. Geologists for many years have been examining this evidence and displaying it to the world ; our expedition only observed it anew, and collated it for purposes of the Biblical narrative. The geologists Wright and Blankenkorn examined this region in the last twenty-five years and reached practically the same conclusion. The Biblical writers tell of the Divine agency ; the geologists know only the effect. The two together make the whole story. According to the Biblical story, a rain of fire and brimstone fell from heaven and destroyed the plain and all the inhabitants of it, except a few members of Lot's family, and consumed all that grew out of the ground. It is evident also from the story in Genesis that salt was mixed with the descending fiery rain. One of the refugees looked back, dallied along the way and was caught in the descending deluge



like some of those at Pompeii, only in this case the laggard was encrusted with salt.

The first fact to be noted is that this whole region was actually ruined and rendered uninhabitable for two millenniums and more. Even the details of the event may be made out with more or less distinctness. The Bible tells us that the deluge came down from the skies, but tells us nothing about how the salt and sulphur got up in the sky to come down. It tells us also of a fire, but gives no intimation of how it was kindled, whether by a Divine fiat directly or the Divine letting loose of lightning. We are also told of a vast column of smoke that went up as from a furnace to heaven, but we are told nothing of the source of the carbon that produced the smoke. The timing of the event is distinctly represented as being entirely in God's hands. The fire was held in leash till Lot be got out. Thus the Biblical story.

Though the Bible does not tell us the origin of the salt and sulphur; it clearly sets them forth as finished products, as real salt and sulphur. The examination of this immediate region throws much light upon the whole event. The findings of the geologists exactly accord with the Biblical story. A stratum of rock-salt lies along the western shore of the waters of the lower end of the Dead Sea, and constitutes the base of the conical mountain called Jebel Usdum; this stratum of salt is 150 ft. thick, and is now visible for about six miles. How much of it may be invisible under the ground at either end it is impossible to say. It is almost absolutely pure rock-salt. Overlying this stratum of salt is a marl filled with free sulphur in a very pure state. If one pick up a lump of it and apply a lighted match it burns very freely and with a horrible stench.

Again, certain changes in superficial geology in this region which have taken place in historical time are well known. The region is a burned-out region of oil and asphalt. The slime pits that were here of old are still evidenced by the asphalt that is found at the lower end of the sea; and that it is an oil region is certified by the expert knowledge of the Standard Oil Company. Before the Great War broke out they had brought in iron pipes for transport of oil from this region; the pipes were turned over to the military authorities to convey water along the route of the advancing army, and some of them may still be seen, now useless, being eaten up by rust, along the route of the march from Egypt to Palestine.

The geologists tell us that at some time which they cannot

determine, but which the Bible announces, something kindled the gases which always collect where there is oil and asphalt; there was an explosion which ruptured the strata, the rupture being now plainly visible, and the salt and sulphur were carried red-hot up into the heaven, and it literally rained fire and brimstone over that whole region. Then followed the smoke; and is there anything that makes a greater and denser volume of smoke than burning asphalt? Thus, while only in the Bible do we get an explanation of the events or learn the agency that brought them about, science is able to certify that the events actually took place.

#### IV.

But exactly where were the Cities of the Plain? Though the ruins of the cities were well known in ancient times, and are mentioned by Strabo "with a circumference of sixty stadia," by Tacitus (*Hist.* V-VII) and Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* IV, VIII, 4), no one in modern times has certainly seen any of these ruins. The High Place is known as we have seen, and, appropriately, it is a *high place*, and thus above the encroaching water of the lake. The location of the cities themselves must be determined by a process of deductive logic, though it is somewhat the fashion to look with disfavour upon deductive reasoning, because it has too often been based upon a priori premises, hence the result something of an assumption. But if the premises in deductive reasoning be first established by an induction of facts, then the conclusion is not only satisfactory, but is stronger than inductive reasoning, because the conclusion is drawn, not from one set of facts only, but from two or more sets of facts, and that according to the inexorable laws of formal logic.

In this case of the location of the cities the conclusion is drawn from several indisputable facts of different kinds. In the first place, the catastrophe certainly took place where the ruins of the catastrophe now are; ruins do not move around, *they stay put*. Place-names and local traditions may move even for long distances, as the name Zion at Jerusalem, or Megdel at the Lake of Galilee. Now the ruins of the great catastrophe of the Cities of the Plain and all the remaining undisturbed material are right here at Jebel Usdum. Here is the stratum of rock-salt, here the overlying marl mixed with free sulphur, and the region round about attests the disruption of the strata by an explosion

and the scattering of the salt and sulphur far and wide. Indeed, the whole region was so blasted that it took 2,500 years of climatic influence to wash these chemicals out of the soil and restore the plain again to its pristine condition "like the garden of the Lord."

In addition to this initial fact, our investigation established a number of other facts. This plain here is not very wide, seven or eight miles at the most. Lot, when he escaped from Zoar, because afraid to live any longer even there, went up into the mountain of Moab, which is to the east. Therefore the doomed cities from which he fled must have been west of Zoar, which would put them directly in front of this Jebel Usdum. Then the rivers which come down from the mountain to the sea converge on a point also directly in front of Jebel Usdum. Inhabitaney on the plain has always followed the water-courses. We pitched our camp there; the soldiers were camped there, the Bedouin villages are there, the Arabic and Byzantine ruins are there; everywhere in the Orient in ancient times they built near the water-supply. Indeed, the confluence of rivers the world over becomes the most favourable location for cities. So at the confluence of these rivers, once again in front of Jebel Usdum, the ruins of Sodom and Gomorrah are to be expected.

But everything immediately in front of Jebel Usdum is now underneath the water, not in the depths of the sea, however, which is 1,250 ft. deep, but only in a shallow part of the sea varying from a few inches to 35 ft. From the lower end of the sea, looking northward, a strange sight appears—the ghost of a forest, trees dead and bleached with the salt extend out into the sea from both the eastern and the western side. Of course, these trees did not grow in the salt water; they have been engulfed there. Plainly this part of the sea is an overflow and is rising. Within at most a hundred years these trees must have stood upon the shore; the sea, therefore, has been rising, a fact well known to those familiar with the region. I have been making observations on this sea myself for thirty-five years. When I first saw it there was a nice little picnic island in the north end of the sea; in 1912 this island had entirely disappeared, and was said to be under 4 ft. of water. Thus the sea had risen some 8 ft. to 10 ft. This year of the exploration, 1924, our motor came up directly over the place of the island; thus in the last one-third of a century the water has risen from 10 ft. to 12 ft. The causes

of this rise of the water supply the last facts of the minor premise of our syllogism.

The Dead Sea has no natural outlet by river ; thus the problem of the water-level in the sea is the problem of the equilibrium between inflow and evaporation. If inflow exceeds evaporation, the sea fills up ; if evaporation exceeds inflow, the sea tends to dry up. Anything that effects the evaporating surface determines the problem. A smaller pan sends up less steam than a larger one. Anything that will reduce the area of the sea would cause the water to rise. The enormous debris brought down by the Jordan and deposited in the upper end of the Dead Sea is constantly lessening the evaporating area in that part of the sea, and thus causing the sea to rise and extend its borders to establish the equilibrium between inflow and evaporation. In the days of Joshua the sea extended almost six miles further north to the region of Beth Hogla. Thus, as the centuries went by and the sea filled in at the upper end, it rose higher and spread out farther wherever it could, until at last it has run over the edge and recovered the lessening evaporating area. It could not run over the eastern edge, for the wall of Moab was there. It could not run over the western edge, for there was the highland of Judea. It could not run over the northern edge very far, for that was up stream. The only place the sea could enlarge its border much was along the southern edge, and when the water rose high enough, it ran over there on to this plain of the ruined cities and hid their shame from the eyes of the world. Not only were they visible in ancient times, as we have seen, but old men of Kerak still remember the time when camels forded the shallow water at the lower end of the main body of the sea, and an old Roman road is still visible which led down to this point to cross over. Thus all the evidence points to the shallow water in front of Jebel Usdum as the place where the ruined houses of the city rest beneath the flood. The High Place we have found, but it is unlikely that any now living will ever see the ruins of the houses themselves. Schemes for deflecting the water of the Jordan may possibly again lower the level of the sea and expose the ruins, though water used for irrigation is not destroyed, and, if it be not carried away from the neighbourhood altogether, would probably in the long run find its way to the sea as formerly.

## V.

One other subject connected with the Cities of the Plain awaits testing by scientific evidence. Lot is called the father of Moab, which, of course, does not mean that every inhabitant of Moab was a lineal descendant of Lot any more than it is implied that every American is a lineal descendant from Washington when he is called the father of his country. Lot was the progenitor of Moabite civilization. This civilization of Moab is also represented in the Pentateuch to have attained a high degree at Kir of Moab in the days of Moses. It is quite possible now to test both this *terminus a quo* and this *terminus ad quem*.

In front of the temple of Luxor there stands the base of a statue of Rameses the Great, which I uncovered in 1908. Around the base of this statue is a line of inscriptions giving the names of peoples whom the Pharaoh boasted as having been conquered by himself or his predecessors. Thus, a little before the Exodus, Moab was of sufficient importance to be the subject of a boastful inscription by Rameses the Great. This confirms the statement in the Pentateuch concerning Moses at Kir of Moab. We desired also to get the material evidence in the ruins at Kerak of this same event. For some days we did not find it, until at last our geologist found the ancient pottery on the precipice east of the town. At first it seems an absurdity that the ruins of the old city could be on the side of the precipice, until Dr. Albright pointed out that the present ruins immediately above this point were built by the Crusaders, who always cleared the ground before they built. They had cast the rubbish of the old Kir of Moab over the precipice, and there it lodged on the side; there was a great heap of it. Now the pottery here was not the pottery of the time of Lot and Abraham, but the pottery of the Early Iron Age or the end of the Late Bronze Age, exactly the time when Moses led the Israelites through this region. From this very point also a rock-cut pathway along the mountain-side led to a good spring of water in the valley, the water-supply of the ancient Kir of Moab. Along this pathway toward the spring we found a cave, and in the cave a passage-way cut through the mountain toward the citadel; we explored it some 600 ft., when it came to an end. They had begun to make a secret passage-way to the spring for water, as was customary in the

ancient walled cities, but, for some reason, the work was abandoned. The High Place of ancient Kerak was also found at almost the very highest part of the mountain on which Kerak is built, a flat rock with libation holes. A smaller High Place nearer the city was later found.

It is not so easy to determine the *terminus a quo* of Moabite civilization. Moab is a large territory; it was impossible that we could explore all of it, so that the evidence has not been exhausted. It is thus impossible to say yet that evidence of an earlier civilization than that of the time of Lot may not appear. We did, however, examine the region immediately above where the Cities of the Plain were located. There an old Moabite temple was discovered at Adar, the only Moabite temple yet known. It lies immediately above the plain, and the pottery showed nothing earlier than the end of the Early Bronze and the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age, which exactly corresponds to the representation of the Bible that Moabite civilization began with Lot's flight from Zoar.

The story of "Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science" is thus a very complete and satisfactory story. The civilization of the days of Abraham, which the Bible represents to have been on the plain at that time, is found to have been actually there, and the absence of any trace of civilization from that period down to 600 A.D. is in exact accord with the silence of Biblical history concerning this plain from the destruction of the city to the end of the history. The natural conditions of life on the plain also, as described in the account in Genesis, are exactly confirmed to-day—"like the garden of the Lord before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah." The great catastrophe described in the Bible did actually take place, and the cities are clearly shown to have stood in front of Jebel Usdum, where they lie under the waters to-day. The High Place of the plain, clearly a place of great importance from the fortifications, is now well known. And, last of all, the evidence makes it quite possible that Lot should be the progenitor of Moabite civilization, which certainly had attained considerable importance by the time Moses passed the old Kir of Moab.

Thus the story of "Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science" adds another instance to a long and ever-growing list of evidences of the trustworthiness of ancient documents. Criticism and archæology have been proceeding along parallel lines

in Bible lands. A destructive criticism has started from the presumed untrustworthiness of ancient documents, to essay the task of rewriting the documents and reconstructing the history of Israel. Archæology is proceeding toward the trustworthiness of ancient documents with ever-accumulating evidence. When that trustworthiness is established, any theory based upon the presumed untrustworthiness of ancient documents will come down like a house of cards. *Facts are final.*

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN moved a vote of thanks to the Lecturer for his deeply interesting paper. He welcomed the strong light thrown by Dr. Kyle upon a Biblical incident of outstanding significance, and recognized the treatment of the subject as having an important bearing upon larger issues. As we get to know more of the background of Bible story, to that degree are we the better prepared to enter into the meaning of the sacred record.

The vote of thanks was carried with acclamation.

Dr. THIRTLE congratulated the author on a paper which, while scientific in character, was cast in the mould of practical experience. Dr. Kyle gives us agreeable glimpses of investigations pursued with enthusiasm, and he succeeds in securing the interest of those who, at a distance, would accompany him in his work of research. It could be said with confidence that the expedition which he led was a pronounced success. It localized ancient Sodom, and threw light on the terrestrial aspect of a tragic occurrence, while by no means excluding from view the divine significance of a terrible judgment.

As a true investigator, Dr. Kyle suggests that there is more to come; further research may yield further light upon the city as it flourished in the days of Abraham. What might be lacking in the completeness of the story was made up by the logical force of the essay as a whole; for not only did the lecturer develop in argument all that he set out to show, but in the concluding paragraphs he rehearsed, in truly effective fashion, the story as previously told in greater detail.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: Much as we have enjoyed the reading of the paper, I feel sure that the enjoyment would have been

greatly enhanced if we could have had the pleasure of the presence of the Professor. He could have explained some points and expanded others that are all too briefly touched upon in the paper. I think that I am correct in stating that on more than one occasion sceptics have gone to the Dead Sea and come back awed and convinced by what they have seen, that the story of Genesis alone explains the condition of the place. The cause was sin and the result was divine judgment upon a race of people utterly depraved and wicked. The Epistle of Jude (*v.* 7) draws aside the veil, and shows the absolute need for their *extirpation*: they were given over to every vice, even going after "strange flesh." Sodom is set forth as an example, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire": it will never be restored (Ezek. *xlvi.*, 11).

You will remember that down on the eastern side there juts out into the sea a peninsula. I imagine that that peninsula once extended to what is now the western shore, thus making the Dead Sea separate from the plains to the south of it. As to that Sea, it is one of the mysteries of the world. It lies too low to "draw off" anywhere; it is a sea without an outlet, into which the Jordan basin empties as well as other streams. All the water is evaporated, thus causing a constant and copious supply of dew for the fertilization and refreshment of Palestine, and which once made the plains to be as "the garden of the Lord." I assume that some tremendous volcanic eruption blew "sky high" the dividing hills south of the Dead Sea and north of the plains. Down from the skies came burning sulphur and bitumen: a scalding rain of salt that suffocated, burnt up, and destroyed the wicked cities, letting in the waters of the Dead Sea, which then flowed over the plains. Whilst the Dead Sea north of the peninsula is about 1,400 ft. deep, the part south of the peninsula is in places only a few inches, and seldom more than 13 ft. deep.

I wish to call attention to the reference made by our Lord Himself to the Flood and the overthrow of Sodom. I refer to Luke *xvii.*, 26-29. According to the promise of Gen. *ix.*, 11, the judgment is not this time a flood of water, but a fiery rain; indeed, a foretaste of the final judgment yet to come (2 Pet. *iii.*, 7). Our Lord first describes what is happening on the earth *after* Noah had been shut in the Ark for a week, and then He describes what happened to Sodom *after* Lot had crossed the plain and was entering Zoar. The harvests



being over, all sorts of festivals were in full swing. The antediluvians took new wives into their "harems," and gave their daughters in marriage. "They ate, they drank, they married, and were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered the ark and (until) the flood came."

Think of those gluttonous, drunken, saturnalian feasts ; not one here and there, like the feast of Belshazzar, but almost everywhere ! Imagine how the floods invaded the banqueting halls ! See how the ever-rising waters enter the dancing saloons, and make their way into the nuptial chambers ! No mortal could record the event, but our Lord describes it for us.

Compare this with the overthrow of Sodom, and note the difference in the description. The morning light had come ; it was, say, 6 a.m. The angels lead Lot and his wife and two daughters out of the city ; see him on his weary way across the plain to Zoar. As he entered the little city, the sun rose above the high hills (Gen. xix, 23). Meanwhile, what had been going on in Sodom ? They were feasting (Isa. v, 11) ; "they ate and drank," but for the last time. The markets opened, goods were displayed, "they bought and sold." Outside men are "planting" in their farms and gardens ; workmen have begun their work and are building houses that were never to be finished, or finishing what were never to be occupied. A sudden deafening boom, the bright light of the morning sun is lost in thick darkness, dimly lighted up by burning sulphur and bitumen ; fumes of sulphur overcome every living thing ; from the sky falls a fiery rain, and within two or three minutes all is over, and Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, burnt up, disappear for ever.

Mr. F. C. WOOD wrote : The paper is further confirmation of the accuracy of the miracle, given in such graphic language in Gen. xix. That chapter raises the important question of, whence did Moses, about four centuries after that historic event, get so many precise details ? This same question may be applied to nearly the whole of the Book of Genesis, and much of other Scripture. Were the details written down at the time by eye- (or ear-) witnesses and handed on from father to son ? Were they matters of tradition, with the danger of much corruption from adding to or taking from, or were these historic matters given to Moses by divine inspiration ?

As the years roll by, I find myself more and more shut up to the latter view and, therefore, I am not in the least surprised to find Scripture in accord with the investigations made about Sodom and Gomorrah as given in the paper.

I have been much impressed with the fact that in nearly every case where discredit has been thrown by criticism on statements in Scripture, the incidents questioned are confirmed by other statements in other parts of Scripture, in the most natural way, and this is beautifully illustrated in the case of the miraculous destruction of the cities of the plain. All through the Bible this catastrophe is referred to, and treated as an actual event, the result of the direct action of God, as anyone may see by reading carefully the corroborating passages. I find from Young's *Analytical Concordance* that there are 29 such passages, and they are found in 15 books of the Bible, viz., Deuteronomy—2, Isaiah—4, Jeremiah—3, Lamentations—1, Ezekiel—6, Hosea—1, Amos—1, Zephaniah—1, Matthew—3, Mark—1, Luke—2, Romans—1, Peter—1, Jude—1, and Revelation—1. I believe this miracle of judgment is also referred to elsewhere, without the names of the cities being mentioned.

It is worthy of particular notice also that nearly all the 19 references in the Old Testament can be shown to be the actual words of Jehovah, while those in the Gospels were the sayings of Christ, and the remainder were by apostles of Christ. Perhaps much of the disbelief of some critics concerning the miraculous element in Scripture might be dispelled, if they could see that nearly all miracle in Scripture is confined by God to His dealings with His miraculous people, Israel, who, according to prophecy, are yet to experience His further miraculous operations. Given fulfilled prophecy, there should be no difficulty about miracle.

Section II of the paper is particularly interesting, as showing that at the present time there are indications that the region of Sodom and Gomorrah was originally as stated in Scripture, as "well watered everywhere . . . as the garden of the Lord"; so good for flocks and herds, that Lot chose that district and separated himself from Abram. The Bible statements concerning that region seem thus to be proved, as might have been expected, and prediction concerning the same region may be near fulfilment. In Ezek. xvi, 53-63, the Lord foretells that that region shall be blessed again, and shall

return to its former estate, at the time of Israel's future national blessing. This is associated with Samaria (synonymous with the Ten Tribes), and as that district is now being re-peopled and is flourishing again, it may indicate that the time is near at hand. The great restoration of the region of the cities of the plain will come about by another miraculous event, *i.e.* by the effect of the waters which will proceed out from under the threshold of the temple in the golden age of blessing, as predicted in the following words:—  
“Then said he unto me, These waters issue out toward the east country, and go down into the desert, and go into the sea: which being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed. And it shall come to pass, that everything that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever these rivers shall come, shall live: and there shall be a very great multitude of fish, because these waters shall come thither: for they shall be healed; and everything shall live whither the river cometh. And it shall come to pass, that the fishers shall stand upon it from En-gedi even unto En-eglaim; they shall be a place to spread forth nets; their fish shall be according to their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many. But the miry places thereof, and the marishes thereof, shall not be healed; they shall be given to salt. And by the river, upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed: it shall bring forth new fruit according to his months, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary: and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for medicine.” (Ezek. xlvi, 8-12.)

## 701ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 16TH, 1927,

AT 4.30 P.M.

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

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following:— The Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., from Associate to Member; Godfrey Hewett, Esq., Commander Paul Hewett, R.N. (ret.), C.B.E., Mrs. Robert Duncan, and Alan Stuart, Esq., M.Sc., F.G.S., as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN explained that Dr. Reuben Saillens had been ill, and therefore unable to prepare his paper, and that Lieut.-Colonel F. Molony, O.B.E., had kindly prepared a paper on "A Restatement of the Argument for Theism from Design," and this he now called upon him to read.

---

### *A RESTATEMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FOR THEISM FROM DESIGN.*

By LIEUT.-COLONEL F. MOLONY, O.B.E.

**W**HEN a man in digging a post-hole comes on a large stone, he works round it and levers it out: in military parlance, he "turns its flank."

The first time Wellington put his army in position to try and stop Napoleon's best marshal, Masséna, was at Bussaco, in 1810. But after a first repulse Masséna turned the flank of the position, and Wellington fell back, abandoning all central Portugal to the French.

The second time Wellington ranged his troops in line of battle in open country to stop Masséna was at Fuentes d'Onoro, in 1811. The French marshal turned his flank again, but this time Wellington made no long retirement, but changed front with part of his line, and thereby thwarted his opponent.

The gist of the following paper is, that we Theists will be well advised to "change front" in stating the old argument from design.

It used almost invariably to be stated in terms of living organisms or parts of the body. Apologists have dilated on the wonderful mechanism of the human eye. Dr. Row writes of the marvellous adaptation of the throat to produce sounds, the air to convey them, and the ear to receive them: and I dare say we shall most of us agree that the arguments deduced from these facts are perfectly sound and valid.

But evolutionists claim to have proved that all living organisms are endowed with the wonderful power of adapting themselves to their environment. Also of producing varieties, which, by natural selection and other laws, tend to make any improvement in an organism permanent. They claim that they can trace the development of the eye from the mere sensitiveness of parts of the skin to light, that there is thus no evidence that it was ever designed as a whole, and that the Theistic argument is based on nothing.

Thus our flank has been practically turned, and the question we should discuss is, shall we abandon the whole position, or "change front"? I propose to set forth an argument for the latter course.

#### A LITTLE-HEARD-OF ARGUMENT.

But I must first draw attention to the fact that most Theistic apologists seem to think we ought to adopt the former course, for we scarcely ever hear the argument from design stated now. Their idea seems to be that it offers too many points of attack: that it is, in fact, too "salient." Now we know that in the Great War the salient of Ypres was only held at a terrible sacrifice of life. Theistic writers are apparently afraid, that, if they urge the argument from design, it will provoke counter arguments, and many of our young people will lose their faith over the matter. This is likely to be so if we keep arguing from living organisms, because our opponents can throw so much dust into the eyes of those who are trying to choose whom to believe. Why not, therefore, transfer the argument to inanimate things? Then all counter arguments based on evolution become irrelevant.

I propose to confine my remarks to one chemical compound out of thousands: namely, water, teeming certainly with living

organisms, but itself without life. In connection with its nature we shall not so much as hear the word "evolution." I propose to trace the natural history and properties of water, and to show how necessary and useful it is to any living creature we can conceive of, but especially to man as he now stands upon the earth. We shall next see how water has worked for the intellectual and moral development of man, and finally deal with certain possible objections.

Water first comes to us in the form of rain or snow, which falls in minute particles that hurt nothing. It is so distributed over almost all the surface of the earth, sufficient areas being left rainless to remind us of the supreme value of water, and for another purpose which I shall touch upon later. The water which is not used by men, animals, or plants, cuts valleys, and by very slow but sure processes shapes the hills. It then runs off in streams which turn many of our mills; these streams unite to form rivers, often very valuable for inland navigation. Geographers point to Africa as a continent whose rivers are peculiarly unsuitable for navigation; but, if you look at a map on which the navigable parts of the rivers are marked, you will be struck by the fact that, even in Africa, there are enormous stretches of navigable water. Most of the harbours of the world are at the mouths of rivers. Thus the water reaches the salt sea, the world's great purifier and highway, of which more hereafter. From the sea the water is drawn up to form clouds; winds are provided to carry these once more over the earth. Acted on by complicated laws, the clouds condense and the water returns to us again as rain, thus completing a cycle from which we benefit at every step.

But just now I want to deal with two stages only. It is very important that our water should be pure. When we have to effect the purification of water we resort to distillation. But we have seen that Nature is continually applying this process on a vast scale. It is very remarkable how quickly light and air purify the water in running streams. A large town may turn all its sewage into a small river, but a few miles down the water is usable again, though at some risk, as we must allow.

At 32° Fahr. water freezes into ice and snow, and fortunate is it for man that it so does. To ride or drive against cold rain is much more disagreeable than against falling snow, while to walk out when it is snowing cannot be reckoned a hardship at all. Those who have to sleep out in the snow, if sufficiently fed and

clothed, seldom take any harm from the experience. In fact, if water did not freeze till zero Fahrenheit was reached, large areas of the world's surface in Canada, North Europe, and Siberia would become uninhabitable.

But there is a very remarkable point connected with the freezing of water, to which I wish to direct special attention by an extract from Roscoe's *Chemistry*, a statement which I have only altered by turning degrees centigrade into degrees Fahrenheit.

"When water is heated from 32° to 40° it contracts, thus forming a striking exception to the general law that bodies expand when heated and contract when cooling. On cooling from 40° to 32°, it expands again; above 40°, however, it follows this ordinary law, expanding when heated and contracting when cooled. Hence we conclude that water above or below 40° is lighter than water at 40°. This cooling goes on till the temperature of the top layer of water sinks to 32°, after which a crust of ice is formed; but if the mass of the water is sufficiently large, the temperature of the water at the bottom is never reduced below 40°. Had water become heavier as it cooled down to the freezing-point, a continual circulation would be kept up until the mass was cooled to 32°, when solidification of the whole would ensue. Thus our lakes and rivers would be converted into solid masses of ice."

This extract from Roscoe should be of peculiar interest to fishermen; as, if it were not for this exception to general law, all the fish in our rivers would, of course, be killed every winter.

Now, even if it be possible to believe that the general law about cooling bodies contracting came into existence by blind chance, who can believe that this marvellous variation of the law with reference to water cooled below 40° was not arranged by a Law-giver who saw that an exception was here necessary?

#### ORDINARY USES OF WATER.

The uses of water for the growth of plants, and for drinking, cooking, and washing, are so well known to all that I do not propose to enlarge upon them. As a Royal Engineer, I had a good deal to do with the supply of water, and was impressed by the ease with which it can be conveyed about and distributed by pumps and pipes.

Almost all our early factories were situated where water-power was available to turn the machinery. This is better known to those who live in the north of England and Scotland

than to those who live near London. Water-power is now being very much used in France and Spain for the generation of electricity. Lades (or what would in Devonshire be called leats) are run upon the mountain side for miles. The water is then taken into enormous pipes, often 4 feet or 5 feet in diameter, straight down the mountain side, to large turbines turning enormous dynamos, the electricity they generate being taken in high-power lines straight across country to wheresoever it may be wanted scores of miles away. Water is also used in hydraulic engineering.

The English made many canals to develop inland communication by use of water, but did not make them big enough; the French did, and still put their canals to much use. I saw one being prepared for electric traction; when that is ready, one man will be able to control a large barge.

A close study of history shows that water communication was enormously valuable in the past and greatly aided the progress of civilization. This comes out most clearly in the study of military history. Commanders who knew how to use the advantages of water transport were almost always successful: and, of course, this is only an index of its utility for general purposes. We are so used at present to railway and motor transport, that it is difficult to realize how greatly civilization would have been retarded if there had been no water transport in the past.

In Scotland one of the first centres of civilization seems to have been the shores of Loch Linnhe—surely because of the numerous inlets round that sheltered arm of the sea.

Before proceeding to the second part of my argument, let me remark that we make a great mistake if we suppose that Almighty God only desires to promote what we may call the softer virtues in man—love, mercy, pity, and the like. It is true that Christ gave most of His time to inculcating these, but may not this have been because the value of the intellectual and the harder moral virtues was already well understood in His day?

#### USES OF WATER FOR DEVELOPING THE INTELLECT OF MAN.

There can be no doubt that water and the seas have done much to stimulate man's mind and imagination, and thus to foster his intellectual development. For instance, Napier, in writing about warfare on land, frequently uses images and metaphors



taken from water and the sea. A case more familiar to all of us is the Bible itself, which is full of beautiful and telling word-pictures connected with water. It can, moreover, be shown that water has done much more than stimulate man's intellect; it has practically compelled him to use and develop his mental powers, in spite of that unaccountable laziness which overmasters most of us whenever we are called upon to think.

In countries like South Africa, one is much impressed by the way a good water-supply changes the very face of Nature. In some parts there are gushing springs, but, in general, artificial arrangements have had to be made to get the water to the surface and use it for irrigation, and where that is successfully done, almost anything will grow. We have all heard of the enormous areas artificially irrigated in the Soudan, India, and Australia. The Afghans are said to be extremely clever at irrigation. Now, of course, all this has meant, not only work, but thought. And to that men have had to add calculation, planning, co-operation, and organization—all greatly stimulated and aided by the obvious fact that the water obeys well-known laws. Or, rather, some of those laws are well known, but the engineer who needs to calculate how much water a certain pipe will supply under given conditions as to gradient, pressure, etc., will also need a good knowledge of mathematics.

The usefulness of the sea, and especially the tides, in making men think and calculate, is even more evident than the uses of water, which we have already noticed. One can only learn the art of sailing by continually thinking; there are no mysteries about it, and after an event has happened one can usually see clearly enough *why* it occurred. Foresight always pays.

All sailors have to study the tides; those who make coastwise voyages are thinking about them continually. At a very early stage of civilization men must have realized that the times of high and low water could be correctly forecasted. Then, when they came to construct banks as a protection to their cultivated lands against the sea, and to make jetties and piers, they noticed that the tides at full moon and new moon rise higher and fall lower than the average tides. Thus they were led on to make more and more careful calculations; and there are still some points about tides which are not fully understood.

Sailors who navigate waters out of sight of land are confronted by three questions to which some answer must be found: Where am I? What course ought I to steer? When may I hope to

reach my destination? All these questions call for calculation. The ancients steered as best they could by sun and stars. Then the mariner's compass was invented, and men began to record soundings on rough charts. Then they found the latitude by taking altitudes of the sun at noon, and, finally, the longitude by methods which are too complex for most men to tackle, for they involve the use of elaborate tables, logarithms, etc.

The necessities of navigation have probably done more to promote the study of mathematics than all the other uses of mathematics combined. There seems every reason to hold that the Creator of man's mind aimed to bring about this study, and designed the sea for this, among other, purposes.

#### INFLUENCE OF THE SEA ON THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT OF MAN.

But the sea fulfils a still higher purpose, and that is in promoting the development of moral qualities that are most necessary to man. We are accustomed to say that the conversation of sailors is "breezy," but what do we mean by that? Surely that their talk savours of the open air, that it is free from the shams and minor hypocrisies which disgrace so much of our conversation. When a sailor is asked a question, he answers it straight; he does not pause to consider how he can best display his own acumen in framing the answer. He is not over-careful to "save face," either yours or his own. He would as soon exaggerate in describing the weather as in naming a sum of money. Currents, winds, and waves will listen to no excuses, so the sailor soon has done with verbal evasions. Life at sea not only inculcates exact truthfulness, but also fortitude, promptness, and self-sacrifice.

Watch the sailor in the bows when a sailing ship is put from the port to the starboard tack. When the helm is put down he looses the starboard jib-sheet. But he does not immediately tauten the port one; he waits till the wind is coming a trifle from the starboard side, and then belays the port jib-sheet as tight as he can get it. If he acts too quick, the ship may fail to come round, and be on the rocks before she can gather way for another try; if he acts too slow, the jib will be too loose all that tack. The sea demands that things be done *just right*. A good illustration to this part of the subject is Robert Louis Stevenson's poem called "Christmas at Sea."

A full-rigged ship at dawn finds herself "embayed" with a

strong gale blowing dead on shore. All Christmas day she tacks and tacks under topsails alone, but can only just avoid going ashore. Near sunset the captain orders the top-gallant sails to be shaken out. The mate remarks that the ship will not stand it; the captain silences him by remarking that they must run some risk. So the extra sails are set; and, being new, they stand the strain. The ship is staunch; and, with the additional canvas, begins to sail faster. She makes less leeway, and, at nightfall, gets out of the dangerous bay.

The captain is not represented as a harsh task-master, but as a man of good judgment and patient temper. The point is, that Stevenson plainly implies that the actual conditions of sea life were disciplining the young man who is supposed to tell the story in a way his own parents had failed to do.

Allusion must also be made to the many true tales of heroism and self-sacrifice connected with water. We need only to mention the traditions of the sea, such as "women and children first," "captain last to leave a sinking ship," etc. The story of Grace Darling may be mentioned as typical of individual heroism; the soldiers and crew of the *Birkenhead* of corporate heroism. The point might receive an infinite number of practical illustrations. What heroic tales the word "Lifeboat" conjures up!

Greece, Italy, Spain, and France are all peninsulas, and they have had a great deal of coasting and other sea-borne trade. They have successively attained to predominance in the civilized world, and we are all agreed that Great Britain owes almost everything to the sea.

Here we must point out that it would be a mistake to think that the seas have of themselves provoked strife among the nations, except in a few cases over fishing rights. It is acknowledged that there is room for all upon the broad oceans. Sea battles have been always fought with a view to gaining advantages on the lands to which the water gives access. The necessities of navigation have promoted co-operation among the nations, and now they each provide lighthouses and buoys all along their coasts for the benefit of all.

#### THE BEAUTY OF WATER.

A strong argument for Divine design has been drawn from the beauty of Nature. The sceptic seeks to "turn the flank" of this position by pointing out that beauty is useful to living creatures; the beautiful bird or butterfly secures a better mate.

But if our argument be drawn from inanimate water, this counter-argument fails. And how very beautiful water is in all its many forms ! Who is not struck by the beauty of hoar frost on bushes, or snow on distant mountains, especially when the sun is low ?

If you visit a picture gallery, you will find that seventy to eighty per cent. of the landscapes have some water in them. There are many reasons for this. As the beholder knows that water is nearly flat, he gets from the windings of a stream, or outline of a lake, a fair idea of relative distances ; thus, water aids the perspective of every view.

As the forms of ground tend to be horizontal, the artist is often in need of vertical lines to contrast with his horizontal ones. Water helps in this, because it reflects vertical lines very clearly, and thus doubles their length. Artists seek for repetitions of forms and colours ; and, when painting, prefer to depict objects with soft outlines. Thus, reflections in water are always helpful, and often extremely beautiful. And, doubtless, many other sound reasons could be alleged in explanation of the fact that landscape painters love water. How beautiful are clouds, rainbows, waterfalls, and breaking waves. The beauty of water is incontestable.

In this connection you will probably expect me to say something about the beauties of a seashore pool, with its shells, sea-weeds and sea-anemones. But I purposely refrain from enlarging on these marked wonders of the sea, because they are mostly connected with life, and the nature of my argument restricts me to things without life.

Thus we see that water in its many forms is not only infinitely useful to man, but has also greatly promoted the development of his mind and of several necessary moral qualities. Have we not every reason to regard this as evidence of design on the part of the great Creator ? Is it conceivable that it all came about by pure chance ?

#### A PLAUSIBLE OBJECTION.

But we must notice an objection which will assuredly occur to the minds of many. Water, in the form of floods and storms at sea, has taken a terrible toll of human life. Are we to regard this also as being designed by God ? It seems clear that the sea could not have exerted the influence it has on man's mental and moral qualities if man had not greatly feared the penalties which it sometimes exacts.

Think of all the thought and trouble which goes to the making of a nautical almanack. Would that trouble ever have been taken if navigation were not a matter of life and death? The sea is only apparently capricious. A British fleet was anchored off Pondicherry in 1760, to assist in the siege of that French fortress. A storm came on, with the wind at first blowing off shore. The admiral foresaw that the wind would change, so he ran out to sea, but the other ships either did not see his signals, or preferred what seemed a safe anchorage, and many were lost.

It is almost true to say that life is never lost at sea without at least an error of judgment somewhere. The dangers of the deep have so promoted inventions that life is seldom lost now, except from collisions during fogs. Ships are in too much of a hurry. Of course, it is difficult for captains to withstand the general pressure put upon them to save time, but moral stamina of that sort is one of the very qualities which the sea was surely designed to promote.

Similarly, floods in rivers are not altogether capricious. Man knows that he ought to be prepared for a flood rising a few feet higher than the highest recorded. Such precautions are usually possible, and it is at our peril that we neglect them. This also goes to teach foresight, diligence and combination in self-defence.

But in regard to the loss of life, we need to bear in mind that we have no proof that, in the eyes of God, sudden death is such a terrible calamity as it is in our eyes. If there were no sudden death, men would live carelessly, and immorality would be promoted. The loss of life at sea has never been so heavy as to make any difference to the progress of civilization. If it could be proved that there are many sincere and effective death-bed repentances, then sudden death would certainly be a religious calamity; but the sceptic has no right to urge this argument against the Theist, because the sceptic does not believe in effective repentances at all!

To the materialist, the matter should simply be a balancing of the loss to the community, when a young man who might render effective services meets a sudden death, against the gain when an elderly man does so, and thus relieves the community of maintaining him in a useless old age. These probably balance, but the moral gain to mankind, by men having an inducement so to live as to be prepared for sudden death, is surely undeniable.

Thus we see that the loss of life from storms at sea and floods cannot be regarded as a serious argument against my contention

that we have many reasons to regard water in all its forms as having been designed by our loving Heavenly Father for the good of mankind.

#### CONCLUSION.

The oldest surviving poem in any modern language is said to be "The Song of Mother Sun," by St. Francis of Assisi. Matthew Arnold translates one verse thus: "Praised be my Lord for our sister water, who is very serviceable unto us and humble and precious and clean." Professor F. C. Burkitt translates it thus:—

"Be praised my Lord for sister water, sure  
None is so useful, lowly, chaste and pure."

But water is only one out of many thousand chemical combinations. Could more of these be examined, the argument for Divine design to be drawn from inanimate Nature would be seen to be overwhelmingly strong.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall all agree, I think, that the paper to which we have listened is characterized by versatility of treatment and a force of argument that is peculiarly impressive. Colonel Molony has given us no mere summary of positions maintained as commonplaces in text-books on Natural Theology. Quite clearly, he shows us that he is at once familiar with the arguments of schools and the objections of controversialists; and at the same time he furnishes proof of a personal grasp of the subject from many points of view, and, moreover, that he has gone to his thesis with a determination to safeguard essential positions by passing by, for the present at any rate, issues that are secondary to that which has specially engaged his attention.

The Colonel has acted wisely in demonstrating the argument from design as affording proof of the divine wisdom rather than as supplying an answer to the many questions that grow out of teleology. Given such proof of the divine wisdom, we may go further, and in proportion that we learn lessons of adoration, we shall doubtless in our hearts find in design more than, at the outset, critical disputation is prepared to defend. But in any case—at the very least—we learn from design that God is wise; and some of us may do more: we may

gather therefrom assurance of the unity of the Providential order. And all the while, as we advance in appreciation of the design that lies at back of things, so shall we grow in the knowledge of Him from whose hands all things have come.

Needless to say, we must ever be prepared for problems ; but as we grasp these and their solutions we shall surmount the objections of unbelievers, and find our footing made secure in regard to the Infinite God and His ways. For myself, I thank the Colonel very cordially for setting forth a vital argument on grounds which, though somewhat familiar, are essentially practical in their appeal to the common mind. The fact that, all through, his eyes were open to the objections urged against his argument adds considerably to the value of a clear and well-ordered restatement of a great theme.

In conclusion, the Chairman moved that the thanks of the meeting be given to the Lecturer ; and this having been done, discussion proceeded.

Dr. HAROLD MORTON joined in thanks to the Lecturer, and admired the astute way in which, Evolution, as he thought, having "turned our flank," he had transferred the fight unto an entirely different field—a field in which the word "evolution" had no application except in a figurative sense.

Personally, he did not believe that Evolution need be accepted. It is a pure hypothesis : but, even upon the evolutionary basis he could not perceive the difficulty of the argument from adaptation or design. It seemed to him that the argument remains in a twofold form. For example, the greatest name in the evolutionary field is that of Bateson. Bateson believed that there was much ground for supposing fresh forms to arise by *the dropping* of characteristics : and thus to conceive of the earliest forms of life as containing within themselves the whole complexity of the world. If this does not involve design in those earliest forms, design absolutely baffling in its immense complexity, language has little meaning.

Generally, design is taken to involve the idea of foresight, and the argument from design amounts just to this : that we cannot conceive of the adaptation in question without assuming the foresight of Intelligence behind it. On this basis Evolution leaves us the argument from design in the Organic Universe as the whole. But surely

Evolution leaves us the argument from design in the individual object also. The view expressed by the lecturer is very old, Aristotle having expressed just that view concerning Empedocles and his evolutionary theory, and the view taken is that the interplay between the resident forces of the organism and the forces of its environment must be a blind movement, since the products of this interplay far more often perish than survive, and for the greater part these forces work to no end at all. Yet this does not seem to bar out the idea of a foreseeing Intelligence behind : since Nature, or God, everywhere is profuse. For example, ninety-nine out of every hundred seeds perish. The wonderful effectiveness of the varied objects of organic nature to accomplish their purpose seems to remain just as much if Evolution be accepted as if Evolution be rejected. The conception of Evolution makes no difference to the facts of the earth, and it is in those facts that we find design : that is to say, we find ourselves, of sheer necessity, conceiving the adaptations of Nature to have been foreseen and intended.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : Colonel Molony is to be congratulated upon his attempt to turn his opponents' flank. The shorter arguments were, the greater conviction would they carry. But in this case the manœuvre had failed ; for the " evolutionary " position, in the widest sense of that term, was much stronger in regard to the inorganic than to the organic realm. This was the case whether we looked at the formation of worlds from nebulae, or the formation of elements by the modification of systems of electrons.

The form of argument presented by the author, enjoyed considerable popularity at one time, being applied to the composition of the atmosphere, the distribution of land and water upon the surface of the globe, the temperature of the earth's surface, etc. One of its chief drawbacks was the difficulty of determining the boundary between legitimate inference and fanciful speculation.

The argument from design had not, however, been abandoned : its form was now changed. It had taken a broader outlook, and dealt with the universe as an intelligible whole, which must be interpreted in terms of values for life and thought.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS said : Colonel Molony has taken a fresh instance of the argument from design for which we are grateful. It was Lord Balfour, speaking as President of the British Association



some years ago, who made use of the stronger argument, referred to by Mr. Leslie, from design in the capacity of the brain of man to conceive the Evolution theory. The argument from design appears to be regarded by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (i, 20, 21) as valid, yet disregarded by men, which is well illustrated by the reply of Charles Darwin to a correspondent who inquired whether his wonderful theory of Evolution did not prove the existence of a Creator, for his answer was that he had never been able to make up his mind whether the argument from design was valid, but of one thing he was certain, that, if there were a Creator, He never interfered with His creation! As St. Paul wrote: "They do not like to retain God in their knowledge" (Rom. i, 28).

No doubt each of us would best appreciate the argument from design if drawn from the subject with which he was best acquainted; and as a Bible student of over forty years, I myself feel that the marvellous structure and teaching of Scripture prove it to have a divine Author, and I would plead with those who deny the argument to give the Bible an unbiased reading.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES thanked the Lecturer for a very interesting paper. In vol. xlii of the *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* (1910) there will be found the report of a valuable paper, by Prof. E. Hull, F.R.S., on the abnormal conditions of water, as evidence of design in Nature. In addition to the argument relating to maximum density and freezing-point, Prof. Hull dwells on the incompressibility of water.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES said: In his remarks on the influence of the sea on the moral development of man, the Colonel did not mention anything about the moral mentality produced by sea-sickness! It might, at first sight, be difficult to see any connection between the two things; but at times there certainly is. I know a skipper who, though brought up from his youth to the craft of fishing, is the worst sailor I ever met, or heard of. His wife told me—and he admitted it—that when he got up in the morning and the weather was rough, he used to be sick in his bedroom in anticipation! And he never really conquered the infirmity; but he stuck bravely to his calling to the last, and he is now retired after a long and honourable career. He was also a "fisher of men," and in every port he visited, he would

get up—or join in—an open-air service. As an evangelist, he was, for many years, well known along the whole east coast of England. Which of us would have had the courage to stick to our guns against such an enemy as inveterate sea-sickness?

The Pondicherry incident (p. 245) is paralleled by Nelson at Trafalgar. He foresaw a storm, and when mortally wounded, and brought below, he ordered his captains to anchor. The captains thought they knew better, and did not anchor. The storm burst, and all the prizes except four were lost.

As to the part played in landscape scenery by water, there is an eloquent passage on this subject in one of J. B. Gough's lectures: "Our Father brews a drink for His own children in lovely places—down in yon grassy dell, where the red deer wanders and the child loves to play; down there where the brooks murmur, and the rills give out their music; far away on the mountain top; and again, on the wide wild sea. There brews He beautiful water; and beautiful it always is—dancing in the hail-storm, leaping and foaming in the cataract, or sparkling in the fountain. Beautiful water! See how it weaves a golden gauze for the setting sun, and a silvery tissue for the midnight moon! Beautiful water! rolling up the valley in the cloud-mists, or weaving the gorgeous rainbow—its warp, the rain-drop of the earth; its woof, heaven's bright sunbeam."

In this connection it is interesting to note that Huxley confessed that he could not account for our admiration of scenery on any principles of Evolution.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. J. A. FLEMING, F.R.S., President of the Institute, sent the following communication: I do not agree with the suggestion made in the beginning of this paper that the theory of Evolution has "turned the flank" of those who attach importance to the Argument from Design in support of the belief in a Divine Creative Power—as the origin of special organs of sense in the animal body. In a paper read last year to this Society, I pointed out that the term Evolution may legitimately be used to express the fact that organs and organisms do not make their appearance suddenly in perfect form, but proceed in stages from the simple to the complex, or rudimentary to final state.

In this sense we may also speak of the Evolution of any human invention, such as apparatus for wireless reception in broadcasting. If, however, the term Evolution is used, as it sometimes is, to denote a self-acting unconscious agency or operative cause—as, for instance, if any one asserts that an eye or an ear has been produced solely by Evolution—then that is an erroneous use of the term, and implies that Order, Adaptation, and Utility can result from the operation of agencies which are impersonal, and have no connection with self-conscious Mind or Intelligence.

In a book published some years ago, called *The Evidence of Things Not Seen* (S.P.C.K.), I have endeavoured to enforce the view that, “Since the Order, Adaptation, and Utility we see in Nature can only appeal to us and make themselves evident in virtue of our intelligence or powers of Thought; therefore they can only have arisen in consequence of the operation of an Intelligence and Thought which is independent of and outside of us.” In short, because it requires intelligence in us to perceive these qualities in the external universe, therefore they can only have been produced by Intelligence or Thought, and Thought necessitates and implies a Thinker.

The operation of unguided unself-conscious agencies in Nature, produces nothing but disorder, as when the sea waves mingle the stones on the beach, or the wind blows leaves from the trees. But the moment we see an Order of any kind, if it be only that of a row of trees at equidistant intervals, we unhesitatingly ascribe this order to the operation of a thinking Mind.

The progress of Biology may have rendered it necessary to restate carefully the Argument from Design, but it has not destroyed the validity of that argument. Nevertheless, there are unsolved difficulties such as rudimentary or unused organs in the animal body.

The author of the paper expounds in an interesting manner the properties of water, drawing the conclusion that there is Design and Purpose in all of them. There are some facts which are not mentioned in his paper which yet go to support his conclusions. For instance, water has a higher specific heat than any other liquid. That means that it requires more heat to raise the temperature of 1 lb. of water, 1° Fahr. than any other liquid. This is of great importance in the economy of Nature, because it follows that large masses of water change their temperature slowly. If it were not for that, a single night's frost might kill all the fish in a lake or river.

Then again, water has a higher dielectric constant than any other liquid, and is a more universal solvent. Hence its utility in washing, and for drinking, and other purposes in agriculture and the arts. Then it is neutral in its chemical operations, and is neither acid nor alkaline. It is non-inflammable and non-poisonous. If our oceans and lakes had consisted of alcohol or paraffin, the earth might long ago have become a burnt-out cinder. Then there are special utilities which follow from the capillary qualities of water, and its rise in fine tubes, making possible such effects as the rise of sap in a tree.

Other important qualities of water are its incompressibility and yet fluid properties, making it possible for actuating hydraulic machinery and transmission of power, and rendering also possible surface waves on it. We may well ask the Evolutionist to explain how it comes to pass that water has these remarkable properties, so supremely important in connection with animal, vegetable, and human life, which must have existed in it, ready for use, long before there was any animal or vegetable life on the earth at all.

We cannot find the answer to this question in terms of the mere spontaneous operation of physical forces or energies, but we find a sufficient answer in the words in Ps. cxi, 4 (P.B.V.): "The merciful and gracious Lord hath so done his marvellous works, that they ought to be had in remembrance."

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS wrote: To me and for me the Argument from Design is as strong as ever. It can never be superseded, and, using the Lecturer's military simile, it can never be "outflanked." The more I read and study, the more deeply I am impressed—I may say sometimes almost overwhelmed—by the evidences of design which I find everywhere.

I have just been reading some papers upon the structures of inorganic salts, and looking at models suggesting schemes explanatory of the arrangement of atoms in molecules. All speak (to me) of our omnipotent omniscient Creator, God. He is findable in the finite littlenesses, as well as the infinite immensities.

Some months ago, on the wireless, in an address on Evolution, the speaker said: "A century ago all this was quoted as proofs of design, but we now know (*sic*) them to be proofs (*sic*) of Evolution."

Such language is a mystery to me. I ask them *how?*—and they glibly reply, “Evolution.” I demand *why?*—and the same words given as an answer.

I can conceive of a man persuading himself that Evolution was and is a mode or method along which the Creator has worked, or is working, His plans; but I cannot understand the mentality of an intelligent being who can regard Evolution as both a cause and a mode.

702ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 30TH, 1927,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the following as Associates:—Herbert Brand John, Esq., and the Rev. Canon A. R. H. Grant, D.D., C.V.O.

In the absence of Professor R. Dick Wilson, D.D., his paper on "The Radical Criticism of the Psalter" was read by the HON. SECRETARY.

---

*THE RADICAL CRITICISM OF THE PSALTER.*

By PROFESSOR R. DICK WILSON, D.D.,  
Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

**B**Y the radical criticism of the Psalter, I mean such criticism as has been devoted to the overthrow of the traditional view of the date and authorship of the Psalms, individually and collectively. In this short paper, I shall confine myself to a consideration of the attack of the critics upon the *prima facie* evidence of the Psalter as represented in the headings.

This is the most important and far-reaching of the attacks that have been made upon the historical character of the Psalter. If, as many critics assert, it is a fact that the headings are absolutely untrustworthy, it follows that the dates and occasions of the Psalms as well as the purpose for which they were composed are also, in large measure, purely conjectural. For no one can

deny that upon the face of them about two-thirds of the Psalms claim in the headings to have been written by certain persons or schools, and that many of them give further information about the occasion or purpose of the composition and about other matters of importance. What, then, is the evidence for and against these *prima facie* claims of the headings?

In answering this question, I shall present first the arguments from analogy based upon (1) extra-Biblical literature, and (2) the prose and poetical literature of the Old Testament outside the Psalter; then I shall proceed to consider (3) whether these headings can have been written at or near the time which the *prima facie* evidence indicates, (4) whether there is any inconsistency between the headings and the contents of the Psalms to which they are a superscription, and (5) whether the headings of the Psalms can have been handed down from the time indicated in the headings and what probability there is that they have been handed down accurately.

#### I.—HEADINGS IN ORIENTAL LITERATURE IN GENERAL.

(A) It is an almost universal custom in Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian to give a superscription or subscription, stating the author, purpose, and often the date and source of the document:

1. In Sumerian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "To Ningirsu the powerful champion of Inlil, Urbau the patesi of Lagash," and "In the house of Ningirsu, his king, the statue of Gudea the patesi of Lagash."\*

2. In the Babylonian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "I, Hammurabi, the mighty king, king of Babylon . . . when Anu and Bel gave me the rule over Shumer and Accad . . . dug the Hammurabi canal,"† etc. Of the legal inscriptions from the time of Hammurabi, it may be said that in general they give the object of sale, the names of the contracting parties of the business, the agreements, the oath, the names of the witnesses and the

---

\* Jensen in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* (abbreviated as *KB*), III, 1, 19, 27. Thureau-Dangin, *Die Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königsinschriften*. So, also, in the numerous contract and other inscriptions written in Sumerian (Thureau-Dangin, *id.*).

† *KB*, III, 1, 123.

date of the contract.\* The Babylonian letters always give the name of the writer and of the addressee.†

3. In the Assyrian royal inscriptions, *e.g.* "I, Ramman-nirari, the illustrious prince . . . when the sirlala (?) of the temple of Ashur . . . was fallen . . . built it anew . . . Month Muhur-ilani, day 20, the archonate of Shalmaneser."‡ Compare the following from Ashurbanipal: "In the first year of my reign grasped I the *sissiktu* of the great god (Marduk) . . . and prayed to his godhead: Remember Babylon,"§ etc. For the headings in the Assyrian contracts, *see* Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents*; and for the Assyrian letters, *see* Harper's *Assyrian Letters*.

4. In Egyptian, we have royal, biographical and contractual documents from as early as Senefru of the IIIrd dynasty.|| Thus Khufu of the IVth dynasty begins one of his inscriptions: "Life of Horus: Mager, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Khufu, found the house of Isis and built his pyramid beside the temple."¶ From the reign of Senefru comes the biography of Methen, the earliest of that long and numerous series of biographies, which were doubtless the prototype from a literary point of view of the biographies of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph. The earliest longer biography is that of Uni under Pepi I of the VIth dynasty. He begins his inscription by saying that he was Uni, chamber-attendant under the majesty of Teti and prophet under Pepi, afterwards becoming judge and general-in-chief.\*\* Nekonekh, a steward of the palace during the Vth dynasty, made a testament in favour of his children, in which he endowed them with two pieces of land which King Menkure had conveyed to him.††

The adding of a date to documents begins as early, at least, as the time of Khafre of the IVth dynasty. Thus, the will of Nekure, the king's son, is dated: "1 year of the twelfth (occurrence) of the numbering,"‡‡ etc. Again in the Vth dynasty one of the Sinai inscriptions of King Dedkere is dated in the "year after the fourth occurrence of the numbering."§§

For Egyptian letters, *see* the Tel-Amarna tablets as edited

\* Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtskunde*, XXXI.

† King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*.

‡ *KB*, I, 4-9.

§ Streck, *Assurbanipal*, II, 265.

|| *See* Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 75 f.

¶ *Id.*, p. 85.

\*\* *Id.*, pp. 135-44.

†† *Id.* p. 101.

‡‡ *Id.*, p. 89.

§§ *Id.*, p. 120; *see also* p. 137.



by Winckler or by Knudtzon, and the letters of Pepi II of the VIth dynasty\* and of Sesostriis III,† and of many others.‡

(B) Now that these ascriptions of authorship were not confined to royal decrees, to contracts, and to letters, but were given to poetical compositions, also, is evident from the following testimonies :—

The teaching of Amenemhet I (2000–1970 B.C., according to Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 222) has the heading : “ Beginning with the teaching, which the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt; Sehetepibre, son of Re: Amenemhet triumphant, composed : “ He saith for his son.”§ Of this composition, Breasted says : “ There is no serious reason why it should not be attributed to the old king, whose ‘ teaching ’ the introduction distinctly states it is.” Further, he adds, “ there seems to be no chronological order . . . in the historical statements,” and says that “ there is no reason to doubt their truth.”

The Tale of Sinuhe is “ a piece of fine writing in poetical form, which breathes an air of reality.” The only date in the poem is the year 30, second month of the first season, on the 7th day when Amenemhet I “ ascended to heaven.” The tale begins with the heading : “ Hereditary prince, count, wearer of the royal seal, sole companion, judge, local governor, king (among) the Beddwin, real confident of the king, his beloved, the attendant, Sinuhe, saith,” etc.||

The list of the good works of Sesostriis II is contained in a poem with the heading : “ Year 3, third month of the first season, day —, under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkere, son of Re, Sesostriis triumphant,” etc.¶

The hereditary prince, Sehetepibre, wrote a poem in the reign of Sesostriis III, which is preceded by an enumeration of the prince’s titles and honours, followed by the heading : “ The beginning of the teaching which he (*i.e.* the prince) composed for his children.”\*\*

The hymn of Thutmose I, also, begins with a heading giving the date and the title of the king, and the hymn itself narrates his principal wars.††

\* See Breasted, *Egypt*, I, p. 350.

† *Id.*, V, p. 140.

|| *Id.*, p. 233.

\*\* *Id.*, p. 326.

† *Id.*, p. 363 f.

§ *Id.*, I, p. 230.

¶ *Id.*, p. 242.

†† *Id.*, II, p. 29.

The hymn of victory of Thutmose III has the heading : " Utterance of Amon-Re, lord of Thebes ; Thou comest to me, thou excellest, seeing my beauty, O my son, my avenger, Menkheperre (*i.e.* Thutmose III), living forever."\* This hymn refers to all of the principal campaigns of this great king.

The hymn of Amon begins : " Utterance of Amon, king of gods : My son, of my body, my beloved, Nibmare (*i.e.* Amen-hotep III),"† etc.

Compare the heading in the Utterance of Amon-Re, lord of Thebes to Menmare (Seti I),‡ and the Utterance of Ramses II to Osiris, and especially the poem which the scribe Pentewere (Pentaur) made, or copied, from a writing in the " year 9 ; second month of the third season, day —, of Ramses II."§

The celebrated hymn of Merneptah is headed " year 5, third month of the third season, third day . . . of Merneptah," and concludes with the strophe :

" The kings are overthrown, saying ' salam ! '   
 Not one holds up his head among the nine bows.   
 Wasted is Tehenu,   
 Kheta is pacified,   
 Plundered is the Canaan, with every evil   
 Carried off is Askalon,   
 Seized upon is Gezer.   
 Yenoam is made as a thing not existing,   
 Israel is desolated,   
 His seed is not ;   
 Palestine has become a widow for Egypt   
 All lands are united, they are pacified ;   
 Every one that is turbulent is bound by King   
 Merneptah, given up like Re, every day."||

In the psalms used in the Babylonian temple services, some of them going back to 3000 B.C., we find two, at least bearing the name of the author.¶ These psalms frequently have subscriptions (corresponding to the superscriptions of the Hebrew Psalter) giving the name of the god addressed, the instruments

\* See Breasted, *Egypt*, II, p. 263. † *Id.*, II, p. 361.

‡ *Id.*, III, p. 56 f.

§ *Id.*, p. 142.

|| *Id.*, III, pp. 259-64.

¶ Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, VIII, pp. 286, 317.

of music employed, the character of the psalm, and the name of the copyist, and the date when the copy was made.\*

The hymn of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, made about 650 B.C., contains in the heading the name of the god, the occasion of the hymn, the author's name.†

The poems of Homer, whenever written, were probably composed as early as the year 1000 B.C. (the time of David and Solomon), and, as far as we have information, were always and rightly ascribed to Homer. So, also, with the poems of Hesiod and Tyrtæus, all from about the time of Isaiah.‡

It is vain to appeal to the anonymous character of many of the Arabic poems collected in the *Hamasa* or Anthology of Abu Tamman in the ninth century A.D. All admit that fifty, or more, of the Hebrew Psalms are anonymous. The question is, could some of them, or half or more of them, have been correctly ascribed to David, Solomon, Moses and others? The fact that many, or even most, of the early Arabic poems are anonymous, does not prove that the poems ascribed by Abu Tamman to Nabigha, Antara, Tarafa, Labid, and other pre-Islamic poets, were not rightly so ascribed. So, also, that some of the authors of some of the Syriac and Greek poems are unknown does not show that it was not the usage of the poets who wrote in these languages to affix their names to their compositions. It is not fair to argue from the fact that the Psalms of Solomon have headings, and that it was the custom of the times immediately preceding or following the birth of Christ to use them, that the headings of the Psalms of David must have been invented then. For, first, since the headings are nearly all found in the Septuagint in a substantially literal version, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Psalms of David and their headings, however late, come earlier than the Psalms of Solomon. Secondly, the Syriac version of the Psalms of Solomon omits the headings. Thirdly, the Odes of Solomon, at least in the only copies we have of them, have no headings. Fourthly, there is a uniformity in the headings of the Psalms of Solomon which indicates a single author of all of them; whereas, there are forty-nine different varieties of the headings of the

---

\* Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, VIII, *passim in loc.*

† *Id.*, p. 176.

‡ Munro and Allen, in the article "Homer," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Psalms of David.\* Fifthly, the Psalms of Solomon in Greek employ the dative of the article uniformly before Solomon, whereas the best Greek MSS. of the Septuagint use the genitive. Lastly, a great number of the hymns in the hymn-books of all of our churches are anonymous; but, nevertheless, no one doubts that most of them are correctly ascribed to such authors as Bonar, Dix, Doddridge, Faber, Havergal, Kelly, Longfellow, Lynch, Montgomery, Palmer, Toplady, Watts, the Wesleys, Winkworth, Wordsworth, and others.

## II.—THE ANALOGY OF THE REST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Moreover, the analogy of the Hebrew literature of the Old Testament would lead us to expect that the poetry would have headings. Nearly all of the books have headings; and even chapters have frequently a special heading. There are at least ten special headings in Genesis; every one of the twenty separate legal documents of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy has a superscription or subscription expressly attributing it to Moses, and in many instances specifying time and place;† the longer books of the prophets have headings with names and dates, and chapters often have statements of the subject-matter of the following section frequently accompanied with data concerning the time and place of the delivery.‡

That, according to the *prima facie* evidence, headings of Psalms were common in all ages of Hebrew poetry is evident from the following instances recorded in the Scriptures:—§

1. The blessing of Jacob, recorded in Gen. xlix, begins: "And Jacob called unto him his sons," etc.; Amenemhet I begins

\* See *The Princeton Theological Review (P.T.R.)*, 1926, p. 34.

† See further, my *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, p. 41 f.

‡ There is a remarkable similarity between the datings of the early Biblical documents and of those of Babylon and Egypt. For example, in Gen. ix, 28, and x, 32, we find the phrase "after the flood." Compare this with the dating of the years of the reign of Sumulailu (the second king of the dynasty of which Hammurabi was the sixth), "the year in which the city of Kish was destroyed," "the year after that in which the city of Kish was destroyed," and so on to "the fourth year after that in which the city of Kish was destroyed." (King, *op. cit.*, p. 217.) Compare the three similar datings of the years of Samsu-iluna, the successor of Hammurabi (*id.*, p. 247).

§ See *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 33.

with the words: "He saith . . . for his son"; and Sesostris III begins his poem: "The teaching which he composed for his children."

2. Exod. xv, 1, begins: "Moses and the children of Israel sang this song to Jehovah."

3. In Num. xxiii, 7, we read that Balaam "took up his parable and said, Balak the king of Moab hath brought me from Aram," etc. (Cp. Num. xxiii, 18; xxiv, 3).

4. In Deut. xxxi, 30, we read: "Moses spake" the words of chap. xxxii.

5. In Deut. xxxiii, 1, it is said: "This is the blessing with which Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death."

6. In Judges v, 1, it is said: "Then sang Deborah and Barak."

7. In 1 Sam. ii, 1, it is said: "Hannah prayed and said"; then follows the poetical prayer.

8. In 2 Sam. it is said: "David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan."

9. In 2 Sam. xxii, 1, it is said: "David spake the words of this song in the day that the Lord delivered him," etc.

10. According to Jonah ii, 2, Jonah prayed and said in poetry verses 3-10.

11. In Habakkuk iii, 1, the superscription reads: "The prayer of Habakkuk, the prophet, upon Shigionoth."

12. The Book of Proverbs begins with the title: "The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel." Chap. x has the heading: "The proverbs of Solomon." Chap. xxv begins: "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out." Chaps. xxx and xxxi also have special headings.

13. The Song of Songs begins: "The Song of Songs which is Solomon's."

14. In 1 Chron. xvi, 7, we read: "Then in that day (*i.e.* the day when, according to v. 1, they brought the ark of God and set it in the midst of the tent), David delivered first *this psalm* to thank the Lord into the hand of Asaph and his brethren."

15. In 1 Chron. xxix, 10, we read: "David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and David said, Blessed be thou," etc.

16. Isa. v begins: "I will sing now to my well beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard."

17. Isa. xii begins: "And thou shalt say in that day: I will praise thee, O Lord," etc.

18. Isa. xxxviii, 9, says: "The writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick and was recovered of his sickness."

### III.—THE DATES OF THE PSALM HEADINGS.

Having thus shown by analogy that headings for some at least of the Psalms are to be expected, it is proper to inquire, first, whether there is anything in the headings found in the Hebrew Psalter that shows that these headings cannot have been original or true? Having already shown by the analogy of the Egyptian and Babylonian hymns that headings of such literature were in vogue long before the time of Moses, and that the Scriptures outside the Psalter ascribe poetical writings to Jacob, Moses, Deborah, David, and others, it is only necessary to show further that there is no indication in the language of the headings, or of the Psalms headed by them, that will controvert the *prima facie* evidence of the headings themselves. The treatment of the headings may for purposes of investigation be divided into a consideration of the authors, aims, dates, and occasions, kinds of psalms, musical instruments, directions to the choir, and references of various kinds. Owing to the limitation of time and space allowed in this paper, I shall confine myself to the seventy-three psalms ascribed in our *Textus Receptus* to David.

1. Probably, no one who knows anything about the history of Israel and the rise of kingdoms will deny that there was a David; nor does there seem to be any sufficient reason for denying that he lived the life described in the Books of Samuel. The Jews and Christian scholars of all ages have seen no incongruity between the life and the Psalms. Since most of the commentators become eloquent with praise of the lament over Saul and Jonathan (which they commonly assign to his

authorship), it must be admitted that he ranked high as a poet, even if that lament had been his only production.

2. The aim of all the Psalms is to give glory to God, the Shepherd and King, the Help and Comforter, the Hope in life and in death of all who trust in Him. Such aims are timeless. Moses, Isaiah, David, may have had them in their time as well as any of the heroes of Maccabean or later times.\*

3. It is alleged as an objection to the genuineness of the titles that they frequently agree with statements made in the Books of Samuel. This is certainly no proof against their genuineness. But suppose the opposite were the case, that the occasions stated in the headings disagreed with the events recorded in Samuel? How quickly the critics would seize upon the discrepancies as evidence against the titles.†

4. That musical instruments are mentioned in the headings is in harmony with what we find in the subscriptions of the Sumerian psalms.‡

5. Since many kinds of psalms were recognized by the Sumerians as early as the time of Abraham, there is no reason for doubting that the songs of Israel, also, may have been designated by more specific terms such as *maskil*, *miktam*, etc., as early as the time of David.§

6. The fact that the directions to the choir and various other notes were not understood, even at the time when the Septuagint-translation was made, testifies to the probability that these directions and notes were so ancient that their exact meaning had already, as early as the second century B.C., passed from the memory of the Jews. The further fact that many of the most important of the words in these notes and directions do not occur in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, the Zadokite Fragments, or of the Talmud, adds conclusiveness to the supposition that they were not of late origin.

Some words, it would appear, had already ceased to convey an assured sense to the Jewish translators of the Septuagint, and of the later versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, the

---

\* *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 368.

† *Id.*, 1926, p. 391 f.

‡ See Langdon, *op. cit.*, and *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 360.

§ *P.T.R.*, 1926, p. 353.

Syriac Peshitto, and the Latin of Jerome. This would not have been the case with so many words, if the headings had been added to the Psalms only a short time before they were translated into Greek, nor if they had been directions intended for the singers of the Second Temple whose ministrations had been continuous from the times of Zerubbabel, or Ezra, or Simon I. It is a most extraordinary fact that most of these words are not found in use in the Hebrew of the Talmud, and that some of them are pointed differently in the *Textus Receptus* from the way they were read by the early translators. Ancient technical terms in use in the service of the First Temple may have ceased to convey a meaning; but how could these technical terms have been added after the Captivity and the knowledge of their meaning had passed completely out of the minds of men before the time of the Maccabees? Are we to suppose that the alleged editors of the Psalms who inserted the headings had so little common sense as to put in a lot of words and phrases and notes that no one understood? These are questions for the radical critics to answer. As for us, in view of the proved general accuracy of the Old Testament records where they can be tested, it seems that the only proper conclusion as to the headings is that they were in the time-honoured standard copies of Psalms which had been handed down from before the destruction of the First Temple, and that the learned Jews who made the early translations were already ignorant of their meaning; but, recognizing them as an integral part of the copies before them, did their best to render them. The ignorance of the translators is no argument against the accuracy of the records preserved in the headings; much less is it a reason why we to-day should reject the headings as late, un-historical and valueless. So far as any one *knows*, they are original, historical, and true.

#### IV.—THE HEADINGS AND THE CONTENTS OF THE PSALMS.

There is said to be an inconsistency between the headings and the contents of the Psalms which follow. This assertion is based upon (1) the alleged character of the vocabulary which is assumed to contain Aramaic and Hebrew words, especially words for God, that could not have been used in Hebrew documents as early as the headings indicate; and (2) upon psychological or philological considerations, or æsthetic judgments, which are derived from the presumption that David or some other



writer would not, or could not, have written such a composition, at least on such an occasion as that mentioned in the heading.

1. As to the first of these assertions, I have attempted to show in my article on Aramaisms in the Old Testament\* that Aramaisms may have been employed in a Hebrew document as early as the time of David, and that most of the words called Aramaisms are not Aramaisms at all;† and as to the allegedly late Hebrew words (which, being found also in the Talmud, are supposed to point to a late date of an Old Testament document containing them), I have shown by my collection of such words that they occur in every book of the Old Testament and in all parts, except *mirabile dictu* in Isa. xxiv–xxvii, Prov. xxx, 1–9, Zech. iii, and the Asaph Ps. lxxix, all of which are supposed by the critics to be among the latest parts of the books to which they belong! In fact, aside from manifestly and demonstrably foreign words, it is impossible, with our present knowledge of the history of the Hebrew language, to determine the date or authorship of any Hebrew document upon the basis of the vocabulary contained in it.‡ These statements about the vocabulary are most fallacious when they are based upon the use of the words for the deity that are found in Old Testament documents. In a series of articles published in the *Princeton Theological Review* for 1919–21, I have collected all the names of God from the Koran, the New Testament, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical works of the Jews, and from the Old Testament. In an article in the same *Review* for January, 1927, I have applied the results of my collection to the Psalms, with the conclusion that not one of the numerous statements made with regard to the date of the Psalms is true, in so far as it is based upon the use of any particular name for God. The worst of all the illusions on this subject are those put forth by Professor Cheyne in his Bampton Lectures for 1889. There is absolutely no foundation in literature for his statements that such words or phrases as “the Name,” “the Holy One,” “Jah” (or “Yah”), “Elyon,” and “Shaddai” are signs of lateness, much less of Maccabean times; and his statements as to the words for “Lord” and “God” are mostly absurd and groundless assumptions.

---

\* *P.T.R.* for April, 1925.

† *Id.* for January, 1926.

‡ *Id.*, 1926, p. 22.

2. The allusions in the Psalms do not favour a late origin. Of the seventy-three proper names of countries, rivers, cities, mountains, and persons, occurring in the body of the Psalms, there is not one which could not have been used by David.\* None of the kings later than Solomon are mentioned and none of the prophets later than Samuel. Persia and Greece are passed by in silence. The kings of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, the names of Alexander and his successors, are ignored, as well as those of Hezekiah, Josiah, and the Maccabees. It has been assumed from the use in it of *mo'ed*, to denote a "place of meeting," that Ps. lxxiv is Maccabean. Since this word does not occur in any other place in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, it is difficult to determine when it may have been used first. The word does not occur in this sense in any other language, dialect, or place, but always in the sense of a set time or festival. That there were such places of assembly at an early date seems evident from Joshua xviii, 1; xxii, 12, where the people were gathered together at Shiloh, and Num. xvi, 42, where the congregation was gathered together. Of course, the place where they were gathered might be called a *mo'ed*, a "place of assembly," the *edah* being called together at the *mo'ed*.

The allusion to a "captivity" in the Psalms is no evidence of origin later than the capture of Jerusalem. For, first, of the two words used in Hebrew to denote the idea of "captivity," *gala* and its derivatives are never found in the Psalter; *shava*, also, is never found in the Psalter, and *shevuth*, the only one of its derivatives which is found, occurs only in xiv, 7; (liii, 7); lxxxv, 2; cxxvi, 4. This word is found also in Hos. vi, 11; Amos ix, 14; Zeph. ii, 7; iii, 20; Deut. xxx, 3. Evidently, there were numerous captives and captivities before the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

Again, whereas king and Pharaoh are mentioned, why do we never find *pahath*, *sagan*, or *satrap*, or any Greek title of ruler? Why, also, is there no mention of phalanx or elephant, nor of Rome or Sparta, words which characterize the book of First Maccabees; nor any direct and certain trace of any knowledge of the great wars of freedom fought by the noble sons of Mattathias? And why is no High Priest ever alluded to by name? Josephus gives the names of fifteen High Priests from

---

\* *P.T.R.*, January, 1926, pp. 11-13.

Jeshua to the year 150 B.C., and Ben Sira eulogizes at length one of the Simons; but the Psalms refer only to Aaron (nine times) and to Phinehas (twice).

Finally, the things for which men fought and died, from Zerubbabal to the days of Judas Maccabæus, are scarcely noticed in the Psalms. The Sabbath is never mentioned, except in the heading of Ps. lxii. The Passover, Tabernacles, and Purim are never referred to, and the pilgrim festivals (*haggim*) but twice. The *korban*, the heave-offering, and wave-offering, and the fire-offering do not occur; and the word for law (outside of cxix) never is found in Books II and V. Besides, the common word for singer (*meshorer*), used twenty-eight times in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, is never employed in the Psalter, but in its stead, *sharim*, a word found also in 2 Sam. xix, 35; 1 Kings x, 12.

#### V.—THE TEXT OF THE HEADINGS.

Lastly, let us consider whether the headings have been, or may have been, handed down from the time that the *prima facie* evidence indicates.

1. It is a noteworthy fact that there can be no doubt about the accuracy with which the text of the headings of the Psalms has been transmitted to us from the time when the earliest translation known to us was made about 200 B.C. As far as the Hebrew manuscripts and editions up to A.D. 1526 are concerned, we find that Kennicott and De Rossi give for about four hundred of them the collations of variants from the *Textus Receptus*. These collations show that the phrase "by David" occurring in the heading of seventy-three Psalms is probably in all cases correct. The phrase is omitted eleven times in MS. 133; ten times in MSS. 93, 111; five times in MS. 171; twice each in MSS. 173, 180, 238; and once each in MSS. 89, 117, 148, 214 of Kennicott, and MSS. 554, 640, 645, 680 and 874 of De Rossi; and it is added once in MSS. 30, 128, 219, 253 of Kennicott, and in MS. 551 of De Rossi. Altogether, there is an omission of the phrase in any MS. only in twenty-one of the Psalms and an addition in only two. There is one omission, or more, in only fifteen of Kennicott's MSS., and in five additional ones collated by De Rossi; and additions in four of Kennicott's and one of De Rossi's, making a variation, or more, in only twenty-five out of four hundred MSS.

Again, since "by David" should occur at the head of seventy-three Psalms in each one of the MSS., it follows that we ought to have the phrase 400 times 73, or 29,200 times in all. It appears to have been omitted fifty-one times altogether; or once in 582 times.

Further, if we judge of the value of the testimony by the age of the MSS., we find that the only MSS. dated by Kennicott before A.D. 1200 that have any omission are No. 180, which omits "by David" in Pss. cxxii and cxxiv; No. 89, which omits it in Ps. lxvii; and No. 214, which omits it in Ps. lxvii. Since Nos. 89 and 214 are among the poorest of the MSS. with regard to general accuracy, it is obvious that their testimony is comparatively valueless. So that it appears that the witness of the Hebrew manuscripts of the Psalter, so far as the authorship by David of seventy-three Psalms is concerned, is overwhelmingly and in most cases unanimously in favour of the text of the received Hebrew Bible. In almost all, if not all, cases, MS. Kennicott 222 seems to have omitted the headings. It is a wonder that more of the Psalters have not done so, especially since they no longer convey a clear meaning and afford little aid in the singing of the Psalms.

In the primary versions, we find:—

(1) In the Aramaic Targum, "David" is omitted in the texts of Walton and Lagarde, though found in that of the Paris edition, from Pss. cxxii, cxxxi, and cxxxiii.

(2) Jerome's version is the same as the Hebrew, except that in some MSS. of Ps. xxii "of David" is omitted.

(3) The fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian agree with the Hebrew, except that Aquila and Symmachus omit David in Ps. cxxxvii (cxxxviii).

(4) As to the authors of the Psalms as given in the Peshitto-Syriac version, the following may be said:—

(a) The Ambrosian Codex and the Sachau MS. ascribe all the Psalms to David.

(b) The Ooroomiah Psalter ascribes twenty-four Psalms to David, and the Mosul edition twenty-six.

(c) The Paris and London Polyglotts omit "David" in five Psalms and add it in seventeen (thirteen of them being found also in the LXX). The condition and history of the

Peshitto text are such as to make it impossible to use the present editions as witnesses of the original Hebrew text of the headings of the Psalter.\*

(5) The Greek Septuagint omits one author given in the Hebrew (*i.e.* Solomion) in Ps. cxxvi (cxxvii); and one MS. or another adds the author in about twenty cases. Most of this testimony as to the variation of the LXX from the Hebrew is rendered doubtful by the fact that one or more of the ancient versions from the LXX are found in almost every case to agree with the Hebrew as against the Greek.

2. It being certain, then, that the headings of the Psalms have been handed down with substantial correctness from 200 B.C. to the present time, the further question arises: Is it probable that headings written in the time of David, or even of Jacob and Moses, may have transmitted without material changes down to the time when the Greek Septuagint was made? We think that it is for the following reasons:—

(a) Parts of the classics have been handed down from pre-Christian times with almost absolute agreement with the best texts of our best editors.

(b) There are Babylonian documents still existing in two copies made at 1,500 years apart, in which the variations are few and unimportant.

(c) Parts of the Egyptian Book of the Dead, though we have five independent copies written from 3000 B.C. to the time of the Ptolemies, are found to be exactly the same in all the copies.†

(d) It is certain that the spelling of proper names of the Old Testament agrees absolutely in almost every case with the spelling of the words in contemporaneous documents outside the Bible.

(e) Lastly, as an *ad hominem* argument, let me say that there never has been a critic who did not proceed on the assumption that every word and even letter of the Old

---

\* *P.T.R.*, July, 1926.

† *A Scientific Investigation, etc.*, p. 93 *f.*

Testament text as found in our *Textus Receptus* is correct, whenever it suits the critic so to do. This affords a presumption in favour of the Hebrew text in common use, which the radical and destructive critics have striven in vain to overcome. The question of the trustworthiness of the headings of the Psalms is bound up inextricably with that of the headings of all prose and of all the other poetical works of the Old Testament. To maintain successfully that these headings are in general false is to fly in the face of the *prima facie* evidence of all the literature of the Bible, and of all the analogies of nearly all the literature of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, Arabia and Syria. Let us rest the case upon the facts and the evidence.

#### CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS.

The CHAIRMAN said that the paper was for experts, and he would like to hear a body of experts debating on it. He could not claim to be an expert himself on the Psalms. His studies in criticism had led him more into the New Testament, and after years of study he had reached certain conclusions.

One conclusion was, that the critics almost always approached the Scriptures with a pre-supposition in their minds. For this reason, very much of the criticism might be met, not by going outside the Bible, but by letting the Bible tell its own story and illuminate its own dark places by its central light. The moment one is willing to admit the supernatural, the Bible is seen to have a wonderful unity of its own.

Dr. Dick Wilson's paper shows what a great amount of internal evidence there is. His way of dealing with the headings of the Psalms shows real wit, and his criticism of the critics is witty in the best sense of the word. There was not time to point out all the good things, but it was certainly very striking that there should be no anachronisms in the Psalms and their headings. This was more than a negative argument; it amounted to a strong positive argument for their traditional place.

The Chairman proposed a warm vote of thanks to Dr. Dick Wilson for his paper and the light it threw on a subject that very few, outside of experts, knew anything about.

## THE MUSICAL TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

Dr. THIRTLE, as an invited speaker, followed with an address, in which he said: The subject before us is one of great importance in Biblical criticism, and one which for long years has exercised many minds. In his paper, Dr. Dick Wilson has placed before us facts not generally known, and not duly recognized, regarding the ancient practice of supplying documents with titles; and with comparative ease he has proceeded to show that a like feature is distinctive in regard to constituent sections—some long, some short—of the Old Testament Scriptures. In particular, he has brought before us the inscriptions standing over the Psalms; a feature of the Psalter which only too frequently has been treated as possessing little or no authority; in fact, expositors have shown a disposition to pass by the inscriptions altogether, as though they have no claim for consideration. In conclusion, Dr. Dick Wilson has argued that as the inscriptions stand in the text, they must be received.

It does not appear that, in some particulars, the inscriptions make a well-defined appeal to the Lecturer's mind, for his paper, while clear in its treatment of the literary titles, makes no contribution to an understanding of the problems involved in what are known as the Musical Titles, associated with the formula "To the Chief Musician." Notwithstanding this apparent neglect, however, Dr. Dick Wilson finds no difficulty in urging the implicit acceptance of the inscriptions upon those to whom, in essential details, they bring no cogent message. For example, words that, in days gone by, were "explained" to mean musical instruments, to be symbolical of choir-masters, to stand for the names of tunes, and to serve as catchwords of old songs, and are still the sport of lexicographers and commentators, come to us with little help offered on the part of Dr. Dick Wilson.

While, after the manner of the Lecturer, conservative scholars have urged acceptance of the titles without distinction, and, what is more, without exception, notwithstanding unsolved questions, it has seemed to be inevitable that others should follow a different course. A generation ago, after a minute examination of Jewish thought on the subject, a distinguished Jewish scholar, Adolph Neubauer, dealing in particular with the Musical Titles, declared that their meaning was "early lost"; and with this the great

Franz Delitzsch agreed: "The key to their comprehension must have been lost very early." Neubauer proceeded to add that the Septuagint and the other early Greek and Latin translators offered no satisfactory explanation of most of the titles; and herein he was right, as the gatherings given to us in the paper just read abundantly show. While it is clear that Dr. Dick Wilson knows of the existence of the Musical Titles, yet he gives us no sort of lead as to an understanding of them. Were he present to-day, I would ask him some questions, for the reason that his paper, as I must repeat, offers no solution of the problem as a whole, and in a manner that can appeal with strength and candour to the inquiring mind. In brief, he says: "The analogies of other literatures show that the inscriptions are proper; and as the inscriptions are in the sacred text, although they may lack meaning, we must accept them, approve them!"

#### DISCRIMINATION OF INSCRIPTIONS.

For myself, I can say nothing of the kind. Because certain terms, admittedly technical in character, coming from ancient times, have proved a source of confusion among scholars, who have reached no agreement as to their meaning or application, I, for my part, see no reason for a quiet contentment in face of ignorance, admitted and declared. My disposition to-day is the same as it was when, over twenty years ago, I gave to this problem a treatment as elaborate as that furnished by Dr. Dick Wilson, and, what is more, I brought to the consideration of the subject facts and observations regarding literary composition and book transmission in by-gone days, which seem to have received little attention at the hands of Dr. Dick Wilson.

I may not now, in discussing his paper and not submitting a paper myself, go into details beyond saying that, in the matter of the Psalms inscriptions, I discovered an element of confusion in the Hebrew text as it has come down to us, and I demonstrated the fact to the satisfaction of a host of scholars in many lands. Let me explain: I found that certain words, introduced by the clause "To the Chief Musician," which originally followed individual Psalms, had, in the course of time, been amalgamated with other words which rightly stood over the Psalms which immediately followed them. The result was a fault in the transmission of the



text. A typical case may be instanced :—At the top of Ps. lv we read : “ Maschil of David,” a literary description of the Psalm which followed. That inscription is in its right place. At the close of that Psalm, that is, Ps. lv, there should have stood : “ To the Chief Musician, on Jonath elem rehokim ”—“ the dove of the distant terebinths.” This latter formula, however, in the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, and in translations of the Psalter based thereon, stands over Ps. lvi, another Psalm of David. Is there any sort of response to this Musical Title with its dove catchword in Ps. lvi ? None whatever ! But look again at Ps. lv, and find “ the dove of the distant terebinths ” specifically mentioned in v. 6 : “ Oh, that I had wings like a dove, for then would I fly away and be at rest : then would I wander far off,” etc. ; and in v. 17, as though enriching the figure, we meet with the “ cooing ” of the dove.

Here, then, we have one of many Psalms in which the constituent features of a Temple Psalm—with *superscription* as to author and *subscription* as to musical use—are completely vindicated ; and if we go back to days when the Psalms followed one another in unbroken succession, with nothing between but the inscriptions—no numbering being expressed—we can easily realize how it was that the *subscription* lines became amalgamated with the *superscript* lines, with complete and persistent confusion as the result. With this form of things in mind, I scrutinized the entire Psalter, and was satisfied that the Chief Musician note, in many cases with some appended name or catchword, *e.g.* Shoshannim, Gittith, etc., always and of right belongs as a *subscription* to the Psalm preceding that over which it has stood for two thousand years !

If argument is required to show that the Psalter in its origin must be traced back to the time of the Israelitish kingdom—and cannot have come into being in the Greek period—that proof is supplied by the fact that, when the Septuagint translation was made, say, in the second century B.C., the normal features of a Temple Psalm had passed out of knowledge ; and so it comes about that already, in the Septuagint version, the inscriptional material had become amalgamated, with results tending to deplorable misunderstanding.

Let the emergent facts be borne in mind—the formula “ To the Chief Musician,” and so forth, should appear, and in every case, as appended to the Psalm preceding that over which it actually

stands. The other titles—those that are literary, *e.g.* Psalm, Song, Prayer, Maschil, etc., often with descriptive clauses, are in their right place, and describe the Psalms over which they are found. Let it be understood, however, that the case is not one of lines being shifted, but simply one of inscriptional material having become amalgamated, instead of being discriminated. Words that should have followed a Psalm have been divided off in a mistaken way, and combined with words which belong as headings to the Psalm which succeeded. This, of course, means that the numbering figures of the successive Psalms are in their wrong place. The words attached to the musical note, as in Ps. lv—which often throw light upon the Psalm which precedes—serve no conceivable purpose when attached to the Psalm that follows. In the resultant confusion, simple words have lost their meaning, and been subjected to unprofitable speculation for long centuries.

If we would know as a fact beyond doubt and controversy the true form and features of a Hebrew Psalm, duly assigned for Temple use, we have such a Psalm within our reach, standing alone, or apart from other Psalms, and consequently so placed that it cannot have taken anything from a preceding composition nor have yielded anything to one following. I refer to the third chapter of the Prophecy of Habakkuk, which begins, *A Prayer of Habakkuk the Prophet upon Shigionoth*—this last form being a word which appears in the singular over Ps. vii—*Shiggaion*; and then this Psalm ends with words that correspond with those found so frequently in the Psalter: *To the Chief Musician on my Stringed Instruments*. Here we have the features already specified, given with clearness, because the Psalm stood alone by itself. And this harmonizes with Oriental practice in ancient times, for in the prayer-forms and songs of Assyria, as found in tablets and cylinders unearthed during recent years, there have been discovered inscriptions at the close, as well as at the beginning, of poems, and those at the close frequently bring in catchwords corresponding with those met with in the Psalms of David. I am thankful to observe that Dr. Dick Wilson makes this point clear in his paper.

Once more, let us make an inference that is obvious beyond dispute, and which tells strongly for the antiquity of the Psalter. If, in the time of the Massoretic interpreters and their predecessors, with the help of a tradition that was marvellously vital, as well as in the time

of the Septuagint translation already mentioned—and going back to the second century B.C.—there had been anything like an intimate knowledge of Israelitish practice in the matter of Temple Psalms, confusion, such as we have found and described, could not have crept into the material. How certain it thus becomes that the Psalms as compositions belong to times long anterior to the Greek period, indeed, before the time of the Exile with its synagogue religion, and go right back to the days of ancient Temple worship, the glory and simplicity of which were never recovered by the returned captives!

#### THE POET-KING DAVID.

I may not carry further these words of explanation. Suffice it to say that my book, *The Titles of the Psalms*, by following the clues described, furnished traces of an Israelitish Calendar and much beside in our familiar Psalter, and beyond all question secured David, the poet-king, in his proper place as the sweet singer of Israel. The book to which I refer came out in its second edition over twenty years ago, was described in numberless papers, magazines, and reviews; was included in lists of works of research and learning, both Jewish and Christian; was reckoned with in books of Scripture Introduction and in Bible Dictionaries—these so numerous that I have lost count of them; and further, the positions maintained have been embodied in translations of the Psalter and of the Holy Bible, not only in Great Britain, but in Continental Europe, Central Africa, and Islands of the South Seas; and yet, in this late day, Dr. Dick Wilson seems to be unaware that a straightforward and reasoned attack has been made on the critical position as a result of research designed to set forth the meaning of the Musical Titles, and to do so in a manner which goes far to demonstrate the authority of the inscriptions as a whole; for the discovery of the fault makes for strength, not weakness, and, consequent upon that discovery, nothing is lost from the text.

The reasoned attack to which I refer still awaits reply. It was my privilege to unfold and maintain a point of view which has commanded the attention of scholars of world-wide fame, and it is my pleasure in this connection to recall the words of a Jewish Rabbi whose name is one to conjure with throughout the world. He wrote me to say that, in the discovery which I made, "God had

given me some of His own wisdom." That discovery, I may add, overflowed into another volume, also to be found in the library of the Victoria Institute, *Old Testament Problems*, a book which likewise, in part, deals with the Psalter, and was also issued twenty years ago.

Vindicated and explained, shown to be not only ancient but understandable, the inscriptions of the Psalter, after due discrimination, may be accepted with confidence, and commended to others for a like place in a well-balanced mind. They take us back to the days of the Judæan kingdom, and throw light—at once national and religious—upon the Psalms with which they are connected. I am all the while with Dr. Dick Wilson in demanding respect for every title, whether literary or musical. The misunderstanding of the Musical Titles, however, has made it difficult for the more simple literary titles to be accepted; but, with the former explained, there can be less reason for the perverse to regard the latter with suspicion. With due understanding of the Musical Note, radical criticism meets its reply.

Why do I trouble the Institute with affairs that seem to be my own while discussing the paper before us? I do so, not merely to expound views that demand attention, but to show, first, how easy it is for a scholar to be one-sided in his outlook, as in this case Dr. Dick Wilson seems to have been, failing to see that work has been done in a direction that deeply concerns his own convictions; and, secondly, to show with what surprise I found, in a paper which set out with promise, no single word by which scholars could, with mental self-respect, be encouraged to accept the inscriptions of the Psalms as a whole. Surely, to receive the titles, or some of them, as dumb and unmeaning words—recall the statement of Neubauer and Delitzsch, that the key was "lost very early"—is not to occupy strong ground, either from the point of view of literary fact or of respect for Holy Scripture in its text and context.

I thank God that reckless critics have not had it all to themselves, and that Dr. Dick Wilson's failure to make substantial contribution to the problem does not mean that the case of the Psalter stands where it did so recently as twenty-five years ago. In regard to the view I have set forth, I said the first word—but not the last. It may be for Dr. Dick Wilson and others to carry to a still greater point of conviction the solutions to which I gave years of research.

In conclusion, Dr. Thirtle seconded the motion that the thanks of the Institute be given to Dr. Dick Wilson for his paper, and the same was carried unanimously.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said : We shall all, I feel sure, recognize the large amount of research, patience, and skill displayed in this paper. A great quantity of details drawn from many sources—some of them recondite enough, such as hieroglyphic, cuneiform, early Arabian, and so on—have been worked into a closely reasoned chain of argument. Yet I must own to feeling a little disappointed on finding that the paper deals chiefly with the Titles to the Psalms. Apart from these, arguments against the critical assertions may be drawn from the contents of the Psalms themselves. Thus, in Ps. li, there are indications which go far to establish the Davidic authorship, while the few points on which the critics rely to prove a late date can be shown to tell in the opposite direction. My remarks are intended to supplement, rather than criticize, Professor Dick Wilson's arguments.

The fact that so many of them are anonymous is fair reason for concluding that the Psalms have not been assigned arbitrarily or at haphazard. The fact that many Psalms are given to authors of no special distinction—Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and the sons of Korah—points in the same direction. The critical view takes it for granted that the titles were added in later times, but this is sheer assumption ; there is nothing to show that they were not penned by the author himself. Unlike our English versions, both Hebrew and Greek treat the title as an integral part of the Psalm. Thus, the heading to Ps. l, "A Psalm to Asaph," is taken as part of v. 1, while the lengthy headings of Pss. li, lii and liv are actually numbered vv. 1 and 2.

Nor is there reason for asserting that Psalms have been assigned to a particular author or occasion because of a supposed appropriateness in the contents. What is there in Ps. vii to indicate that "Cush the Benjamite" was the enemy denounced? It would apply equally well to any enemy of David or any one else. Still, more markedly, there is not a word in Ps. xxx to suggest or fit in with "the Dedication of the House," while the alternation of depression and exultation fits in exactly with David's state of mind when he

dedicated Araunah's threshing-floor for the place for the House (1 Chron. xxii, 1).

On p. 266 of the paper there are some remarks on the words "mo'ed" and "captivity." "Mo'ed," in Ps. lxxiv, 8, has been rendered "synagogues" (A.V., R.V.) or "places of assembly" (R.V.m), though LXX has "festivals" (*heortas*). So it is nowadays the fashion to insist that "Ohel Mo'ed" must mean "the Tent of Meeting." Yet, not only is the word the recognized term for "set feasts" (Lev. xxiii, 2), but, in Gen. xxi, 2, it is used of "the set time of which God had spoken," where the idea of meeting is quite unsuitable. May not the word be derived from the root *Ya'ad*, to appoint or fix? Then the "Ohel Mo'ed" could be the *appointed* place, and that could also give a suitable meaning to Exod. xxv, 22, and kindred passages, "I will appoint to thee there" (Greek has *gnōsthēsomai*, but in Exod. xxix, 43, *taxomai*). The idea of meeting persons is usually expressed by a different word, *Likrath*.

That "captivity" does not always refer to Babylonian captivity is clear from Judges xviii, where "until the day of the captivity of the land" (v. 30) is equated to "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (v. 31). That captivity (of the land, not the people), then, was the one in which Shiloh was destroyed.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES, M.A. : In Appendix 65 of the Companion Bible on the Psalm-Titles will be found valuable information for all who see the importance of this special study, and in a footnote the Editor adds : "These facts have been discovered and admirably set forth by Dr. J. W. Thirtle in his two works on this subject, viz., *The Titles of the Psalms : their Nature and Meaning Explained* (1904), and *Old Testament Problems* (1907)." The value of the Companion Bible is greatly enhanced by its treatment of the Psalms.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., writes : One of the strongest arguments in favour of the contemporary dates of the headings of the Hebrew Psalter appears to me to be that which is brought forward in para. 6, p. 263. When the LXX translation was made it is obvious that the Jewish translators were in many cases ignorant of the meanings of the headings, and had not even tradition

to guide them aright ; for some words are merely transliterated, and others translated wrongly, in all probability. Further, it is conceded by all that many of these headings embody liturgical directions. Now, nobody invents directions which convey no meaning to himself or to others, and the only antecedent event in Jewish history which accounts for this ignorance, and complete break in liturgical tradition, is the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, and deportation of the inhabitants to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar.

Further, when a remnant returned two generations later, we learn from Nehemiah and Ezra how poverty-stricken they were, and under what adverse circumstances they began to try and rebuild their national life at Jerusalem. In fact, history explains this ignorance and break in traditional knowledge, and the inference is irresistible that the Hebrew Psalter titles concerned carry us back to the worship and liturgy in Solomon's temple, and that some are contemporaneous descriptive headings, and others liturgical directions. The fact that the LXX Psalter includes intelligible titles and liturgical directions not contained in the Hebrew is a further confirmation ; for the additional directions refer doubtless to post-exilic temple worship ; and the additional titles reflect later tradition or opinion, which was not founded on documentary evidence.

Finally, I would say that I have used the words "Headings" and "Titles" in a general manner, and not to the prejudice of Dr. Thirtle's opinions as to "subscripts," with which I am in agreement.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS writes : The list of the analogies of the Old Testament might, I think, be much expanded, at any rate, it might include Hezekiah (Isa. xxxvii, xxxviii), Jeremiah (xxxii, and parts of Lamentations). Also in the New Testament, Zacharias (Luke i, 68, 79) and Mary (Luke i, 46, 55). Another fruitful field of investigation might be the analogies of Psalms with Psalms (*e.g.* one of the Passover Psalms (cxvi)). I think one can say that the "Jewish" people were not only a Psalm-singing nation, but also a Psalm-making people. Yet how few Psalms there are, and how few are called David's ! There is only one to which the name of Moses is attached (xc)—possibly xci is also from his pen. How many have no names at all ! What restraint ! 150 Psalms in 1,000 years—say fifteen a century, or one about every seven years.

What is a Psalm ? Praise ? Prayer ? Exhortation ? Prophecy ? Consecration ?—yes all that, and more also. I have a definition. It is : “ Communion with God.” Thus the soul speaks with God, and God speaks to the soul. Out of many I instance Pss. 1, 15 ; xlvii, 10 ; xci, 14, 16.

MR. PERCY O. RUOFF : The traditions of Princeton have been amply maintained in this learned paper, the chief value of which, so it seems to me, is that its argument is susceptible of expansion. Professor Wilson has made out a case which shows that if the “ radical critics ” are pressed with regard to their specialized attacks on the Psalms and their headings, they will find themselves inextricably involved in a much larger problem, viz. they will have to face and answer the question of the entire organic literature of the Old Testament. The paper shows how strong is the argument for the true historicity of the Psalms and headings, judged, not only by the positive features recorded, but also on the negative side by the notable absence of certain historical allusions. After all, the crucial evidence is the internal evidence, as the Chairman has forcibly pointed out. The Psalms, and at least many of their headings, can, without question, be supported by collateral historical references. I am grateful to the American professor for his well-reasoned paper.



703<sup>RD</sup> ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,  
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, JUNE 13<sup>TH</sup>, 1927,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE PRESIDENT, DR. J. A. FLEMING, F.R.S., IN THE CHAIR.

Before the proceedings began, a warm welcome was extended to the President by the Chairman of Council, Dr. J. W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., on behalf of the Institute, on this his first official appearance in his new capacity as President. The whole company rose to signify their cordial association in this welcome.

The PRESIDENT then called upon the HON. SECRETARY to read the Minutes of the previous Meeting, which were confirmed and signed. The following Elections were announced:—As a Member, the Rev. Alfred Swann, M.A.; and as Associates, F. V. Appleby, Esq., C.E., M.Sc., and the Rev. R. E. Dowle.

He next invited the Lecturer, Dr. Alfred T. Schofield, who, he said, needed no introduction, to read his paper on “Time and Eternity.”

---

ANNUAL ADDRESS.

---

*TIME AND ETERNITY.*

By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D. (*Vice-President*).

I.

**M**Y only comfort in writing a paper on a subject of which I know so little is that probably others do not know much more. For neither philosophers, psychologists, nor metaphysicians can by searching find out much about it. Let us see what we do know.

Man undoubtedly sees (spiritually) more than he can comprehend, for he is not all merely human. If in his body he has a touch of the beast below him, in his spirit he has something of the Divine above him. Man is thus tripartite in another way than in body, soul, and spirit. It would appear that the relative proportions of each part vary exceedingly: some men being described as animal, or even bestial; others, where the spirit is in excess, are mystics. This paper would probably interest the latter class most.

To man, the Divine is thus, in medical language, “Homologous,”

because there is something of it in humanity. Were it not so, and all were "Heterologous," or alien to man, this paper would be impossible.

Before man, therefore, is no stone wall, but glass, through which he cannot pass, but sees dimly (1 Cor. xiii, 12); for all glass in the Apostle's day was only semi-transparent, and not much could be seen through it.

Were it not so, man could not apprehend the Divine at all; but though he can apprehend God, he cannot comprehend Him. Man has thus an interest in the Infinite (of which Eternity is a part) which would be impossible had he not in himself a link with the Divine. The Bible states that this link has been much damaged by sin; but can now be restored by the new birth; so that man can thus know God in part, though not "as he himself is known." "Now we see through a glass darkly, but *then* face to face" (1 Cor. xiii, 12).

We are here, therefore, to see how much we can now perceive through our dim glass; for "now" refers to Time, and "then" to Eternity. Dr. Weymouth translates 1 Cor. xiii, 12: "Now we see through a glass, and are puzzled"; the Revised Version suggests "as in a riddle"; the Greek word actually being "enigma." Perhaps the best word is "obscurely," instead of "darkly." We cannot fail to note the triple repetition of "time" and "eternity" with three "nows" and the "thens" in 1 Cor. xiii, 12, 13.

NOW (Time)	{	we see through a glass darkly . . . we know in part . . . abideth faith, hope, love . . .
THEN (Eternity)	{	face to face . . . as we are known . . . love abides alone . . .

The second clause gains greatly by a more literal translation (R.V.): "Now we know in part, but then shall I know *fully*, even as also I have been known *fully*" (*i.e.* from Eternity). The word "fully" here denotes that perfect knowledge which belongs to the Divine (*epignōsis*), but which is here given to the human. Such words may be uttered, but to understand them is beyond the power of the highest intellect; for if finite can reach to infinite, there is no longer finite and infinite.

A belief in this present dim perception was shared by ancient and modern philosophers—Socrates in a remarkable way, Plato,

Kant, James, F. W. H. Myers, etc. ; and it is well to note this. For it is the crowning glory of the human race that we are able to grope at all, and that it is possible to read a paper on such a subject before the Victoria Institute. It is not therefore for us to complain if the subject is obscure ; and that we are groping after it in semi-darkness. The wonder of wonders is that we can understand in any way what we are groping for, and that large numbers of us believe that there is a life outside time altogether.

Time and Eternity are well contrasted in the threefold view we have just given. *In time* we are as *children* and are puzzled, we partly know, and what we do see is through the two eyes of the spirit—faith and hope. *In eternity* we are as *men* face to face, we then know fully as we have been ever known, the two eyes of faith and hope are gone, and love abides alone. This certainly implies a great general development of mental power, and throws light on our present possession of embryonic powers of spirit ; in the wonders of telepathy, hypnotism, individual and collective, second sight, etc., which are so puzzling now, and are only cultivated with extreme risk.

Respecting the wonders of Divine love, may I be allowed to quote some rather fantastic lines, believed to be a rough rendering of Akdamut, a well-known Aramaic poem, centuries old, and well known to the Hebrews. (I am indebted to our Chairman for this information.)

“ Could I with ink the ocean fill,  
 Were the whole sky of parchment made :  
 Were every stick on earth a quill  
 And every man a scribe by trade :  
 To write the love of God to man  
 Would drain the ocean dry ;  
 Nor could the scroll contain the whole  
 Though stretched from sky to sky.”

## II.

Turning to a consideration of Time, we are practically forced to associate space with it. The two are, indeed, said to be inseparable, and not to exist apart, and we cannot really think of time without space. Time and space are respectively duration and extension. Dean Inge writes :—“ Philosophic mystics say that neither space nor time is ultimately real. They may look

with favour on Professor Alexander's theory, that time is a fourth dimension; but they are unlikely to agree with Bergson, who gives a supreme metaphysical value to duration. They accept St. Paul's tripartite psychology of body, soul and spirit."

Objectively, time and space are regarded as having real existence. Bishop Berkeley declares time and space to be nothing but a succession of ideas. Space alone is not real objectively to man. Time objectively is real to man when change occurs, not otherwise, as we have seen. Concepts of time and space set inevitable limits on human thought which the Divine absolute life transcends. There is no limitation to the Eternal or the infinite.

It is rather startling to find that the word Time is not derived from the Latin *tempus*, but was in old English *tima*, which is derived through the Danish and Norse from the same root as "tide"; the basic concept of time being change and not duration. Time apart from change is as unknown as is any change in eternity. The familiar lines in our much-loved hymn—

"Change and decay in all around I see;  
O Thou, who changest not, abide with me"

become charged with a deeper meaning as they reach us with the voices of Time and Eternity.

All change, it would appear, must not only take place in time, but is its essence; for where there is no change there is no time. We would here also suggest that by "change in time" we refer to that which is external to ourselves, and not to development of soul or spirit. It is interesting to note that the military term of "marking time" is very significant, as it does not connote duration of any kind, but consists of incessant change of feet. We should also remember that we are now and always in eternity. Death is not the entrance into eternity, but the exit from time. Till then we are in time, which is that portion of eternity marked out for us by change. Time and change are practically synonymous, as we often experience when in a reverie, or light doze; hours seem no longer than a moment, and all sense of time is lost, simply because there is no change.

During this period we are in eternity, which is simply the cessation of time or change. In some cases we find we have thus lost all sense of duration, which to most means "time"; but in some our friends never tell us how long we have been sitting, and we are not conscious that for a space "time has been no

more." Time also often disappears to the sick, in hospitals and elsewhere, while, when in a semi-comatose state, weeks may appear as hours. Time, however, is ever connected by us with duration, though this is not its primary meaning.

Perhaps the most definite expression of time found in the Bible is in Luke iv, 5, *en stigmé chronou*—"in a moment of time." It is not certain, however, that this is not exceeded in brevity by "the twinkling of an eye," one-fifth of a second (1 Cor. xv, 52). Humanity cannot readily think of eternity save in terms of time, even when it tries to imagine or define it; but it is possible even now to read our past, present, and future in the light of eternity, and thus, "through a glass darkly," to get somewhat of a Divine view of them.

### III.

We often speak of what we cannot really conceive, *e.g.* time being "swallowed up by eternity," though we may know vaguely what we mean. Speaking as to "eternity," I feel almost justified in stating that it is a thought not found in any human language. I say "almost," because I do not know all human languages; but judge it very improbable that the lesser-known tongues should contain thoughts not expressed in European speech. We will look at the word in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and English. The word in the New Testament for "eternal" is *aiōn*, which literally does not mean eternal at all, but an age. It is better rendered by "eternal" than by "everlasting." Everlasting may be used to mean eternal, but eternal never means everlasting.

We cannot in our thought exclude duration from Time, but it forms no part of Eternity. I speak here in the language of men, and that is ever relative. In the absolute, "duration" may raise us above all ideas of Time, and equal Eternity; though obviously it does not mean "duration" as used relatively by us.

Eternal life is constantly spoken of without any relation to time; but solely with reference to its quality and its Giver. *Aiōnios* is applied to God Himself, and cannot therefore mean merely "everlasting" or non-ending. In Matt. xxv, 46, *aiōnios* would be better translated, as in the R.V., by "eternal." "Everlasting" is purely a time-measurement and should never be used for "eternal." *Aiōnios* is 54 times used for the state of the blessed in heaven, and 7 times for those in hell. The literal

meaning of *aiōn*, as an age, or a fixed number of years, should not be insisted on, for it ceases then to mean "eternal"; and the state of the saved and lost have a definite end.

Seeing, as I have already said, that the word is applied to the existence of God, and is everywhere used for "eternal," such a meaning is seen to be impossible. There is no other word for "eternity" but this in the New Testament (in the Old Testament Hebrew *olam*).

Turning for a moment to the Latin equivalent, *æternus*, we find it far more expressive than the Greek; and indeed it has been said that it seems expressly formed to lift us out of time notions, and from this world to the next. It is certainly the best word in human language (with its English equivalent—*eternity*).

*Olam* (Hebrew) is as expressive, but is so constantly used in a purely relative sense in the Bible, being associated with human and earthly things, that its original force of "concealed" or "hid" is lost, and it becomes almost a time-measure.

In the same way, when we turn to the English language, we find in the Old Testament the Hebrew *olam* translated "for ever"—"The earth abideth for ever" (Eccles. i, 4), etc., which cannot mean eternal. *Aiōnios* is rendered "ever," "eternal," and "everlasting"; of these, we judge "eternal" is the best and "everlasting" the worst. It is, of course, constantly used in its time-sense of "age-long," to which "everlasting" is equally inappropriate.

We must now briefly review what we know of Eternity; always remembering that the wonder is, not how little we know, but that we can postulate anything about it at all.

Dr. Johnson defines "eternity" as "duration without beginning or end." I must confess this seems to me rather an accurate description of "endless time" than of "eternity." Some of my audience may suggest that the two are the same. This I venture to question.

John Locke says: "By repeating the idea of any length of duration we have in our mind, with all the endless addition of numbers, we come by the idea of eternity." This statement is far from clear. Its chief interest seems to be the way in which he seems to agree with Johnson, that, after all, eternity is some sort of duration, which is very doubtful.

Montgomery says: "Eternity is a moment ever standing"—a decided, though obscure, advance in definition.

There can be no "duration" in Eternity, if it be true that in it one moment and a million years are the same, and that neither have any "duration." It is therefore probable in Eternity 1,000 years will be with us as now with God, as one day. We must ever remember that Eternity is absolute, infinite, and Divine, while Time is ever relative, finite, and human. The two cannot be therefore co-related, but are essentially different in thought. Everlasting or eternal punishment refers primarily to its changelessness, and not to its duration.

Many years ago, in Painswick Parish Church, my attention became riveted on a large brass tablet, on which was engraved the magnificent prophecy of Isa. lx, 19, "The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory." I find the wonders of this verse as fresh to-day as when it seemed to talk to me in that Church, and told me that the "now" (with its sun and moon) was TIME and CHANGE and HUMAN, that the "then" (shall be) was ETERNAL and CHANGELESS, and DIVINE.

My audience will pardon me if I mention a third truth that I seemed to hear that day: that if in eternity there is no change, whereas it is the essence of time, I can never age a day if my spirit dwells there, for age belongs to time only. We can dwell in spirit in either; but in proportion as we live in eternity we have discovered the secret of perpetual youth.

#### IV.

Let us return, and consider for a moment "eternity" in its relation to God. Exod. iii, 14, is the best and absolute declaration of eternity as a fact and not an idea, a concept, nor a philosophic theory, "I AM THAT I AM." The margin of the R.V. gives it, "I AM BECAUSE I AM," or "I AM WHO AM," which do not bring us further light. What the verse does give us is an unique view of the fixed and changeless present of Eternity, and the absence of all past or future; Time, on the contrary, being all past and future with no fixed present.

If we believe in God, there can be no doubt that here is something beyond the relative, outside Time, and humanity, or earthly thought or language; an eternal present, with no past or future; in short, the fact of an absolute Eternity is inseparable from God. This is the picture of Eternity in the Old Testament. How far different is the same presentment in the New,

where God has revealed Himself in Christ the God-man. He, when He declares Himself, does not express the truth in the transcendent language of Exodus, but, speaking to us after the manner of men, seeks to bring to our apprehension that which in its essence we cannot fully comprehend.

“From Him which is, and which was, and which is to come.” “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty” (Rev. i, 4, 8). It is true that here, as in Exodus, we get a declaration of the Divine; but being now revealed to us in Christ in whom “dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” Eternity is expressed to us here in terms of time.

We must, however, remember the revelation of the Son, born of a Virgin in time, here precludes the absolute and transcendent picture of Eternity in Exodus, which verily passes all understanding, while the language of Revelation does not.

We must never, however, regard Eternity as a mere negation of Time. It is more; it is an essential fact of the existence of God. It is worthy of remark that the chief attributes of our Lord—truth, love, light, wisdom, &c.—are not connoted with time. Of course, God has an endless existence, but this alone is no expression of Eternity. God and Eternity, the Infinite, and the Absolute, are, then, expressions of the attributes of God in relation to time, space, and creation. As to time, He is Eternal; as to space, He is Infinite; as to the relative (creation), He is Absolute.

Eternal life consists in the knowledge of God; and this shows that the antithesis of life and punishment in Matt. xxv, 46, is really a true one; as “life” consists in the knowledge and love of God, while “punishment” connotes its absence, and the consuming fire of God. Alford well remarks on this antithesis: “The *zōē* here spoken of is not bare existence, which could have ‘annihilation’ for its opposite; but blessedness and reward, to which punishment and misery are antagonistic terms.”

In connection with love it is truly a sublime thought, cognate to our subject, that the I AM has but two abodes; for, “Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth Eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit” (Isa. lvii, 15). The “I AM” is His name for ever (Exod. iii, 15). He also “lives” for ever (Deut. xxxii, 40), and from “everlasting to everlasting,



thou art God." And perhaps personally most precious of all : "The eternal God is thy refuge" (or, R.V., "dwelling-place"), and underneath are the everlasting arms (that is, the changeless and eternal care of God Himself) : of which we may say, in the language of Ps. xxiii, one is called "goodness" and the other "mercy." The Hebrew is always *olam*, which, as we have shown, would have answered more to its derivation were it not equally applied to things of time. This is almost a necessity of the human brain, for man must ever connect Eternity with Time.

## V.

I should like, before closing, to add a word about "punishment," so inseparably connected with eternity in Matt. xxv, 46. It must be remembered that to the Jews eternity was a strange thought. Even endless time was never a part of the Jewish figurative teaching in the Talmud concerning Gehenna (which was the valley of Hinnom). It always included the hope of exit after a longer or shorter period. In this connection it is interesting to note that "punishment" (*kolasis*) gives here no prospect of termination, and that for two reasons : (1) It is connected with eternity, and this involves (2) cessation of all change. The condition seems absolutely fixed. I think, however, we also should remember that most of our crude, unreal, and unjust ideas on eternal punishment lie in the persistent ideas of time wrongly connected with it ; and especially the constant concept of duration, with which Eternity has no connection.

It is also too often forgotten that, as we shall see in *kolasis*, there is nothing vindictive. It is a question of "what a man sows that shall he also reap," *i.e.* as we leave this world, so must we take the place in the next, for which we have made ourselves fit. As Professor Gwatkin (Camb.) observes, "This is not a decree, it is mercy ; for Heaven would be hell for one who does not love God." It is worthy of note here that while God has specially prepared two homes for the saved—in Heaven for His heavenly people (John xiv, 2), and also in the earthly kingdom of Heavenly rule in Matt. xxv—*He who "will have all men to be saved" has absolutely prepared no place for the "lost."* Nothing remains, therefore, but that they share the fate of the great enemy of souls, whose lie they have preferred to God's truth. Of course, God alone knows who these are.

We must note, too, that in the "fire" and "worm" we are

dealing with symbols. The former, I would suggest, is the aspect of God against sin (Heb. xii, 29), whereas the "worm" is clearly the remorse of wilful neglect. The sentence, therefore, is neither vindictive nor arbitrary; but is the inevitable result of the life lived.

## VI.

Two words are used for the punishments of men—each word once. They are: *Kolasis* (Matt. xxv, 46) and *timōria* (Heb. x, 29); but are very far different in their force and meaning. We must remember that the former is the fate of those who reject the Jewish messengers in the last days: while the latter expresses the terrible destiny of those who degrade and deny the Son of God Himself, who count His blood an evil thing, and who insult the Holy Spirit—a threefold sin that is without a parallel in the Word of God. The "punishment" for such is *timōria*, a truly awful word. Dr. Young gives the force of "restraint" to "punishment" in Matt. xxv, 46. Bagster calls it "pruning." Dr. Bullinger says *kolasis* is the relation of the punishment to the sinner, while *timōria* is the relation of the punishment to the punisher. The former contains the idea of correction, the latter of vengeance. With this the new Liddell and Scott Lexicon agrees.

The use of *timōria* three times in the New Testament also fully bears this out. It describes the Pharisees' vengeance on the Church, carried out by Saul in Acts xxii, 5, and xxvi, 11; while in Heb. x, 29, it is God's avenging the threefold unparalleled insult to the Godhead. Archbishop Trench gives instructive light on the classical use of the word *kolasis* by Philo, Josephus, Plato, Clement, Aristotle, and others. With them it has reference to the correction and bettering of him that endures it, and is much milder than *timōria*. The Archbishop, however, wisely adds: "It would be a very serious error, however, to attempt to transfer this distinction in its entirety to the words as employed in the New Testament. Matt. xxv, 46, is no corrective, and therefore temporary, discipline, and in Hellenistic Greek we find the severer sense, with no necessary underthought of the bettering through it of him who endured it."

Moreover, it is "eternal," which we have shown precludes change.

\* *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 24. By R. C. Trench, Archbishop of Dublin.

While, however, we may not press the old classical limitation of the word, we must be struck with the totally different meaning and terrible force of *timōria*, which is reserved for an entirely different class of sinners, in Heb. x.

Though I fear I have done little in this monograph towards increasing the knowledge of my subject, I trust I have made somewhat clearer the radical distinction between Time and Eternity.

#### DISCUSSION.

Dr. J. A. FLEMING, F.R.S. (in the Chair), said : I am sure that I am expressing the feeling in the minds of all present in saying that we are very grateful to Dr. Schofield for the suggestive and extremely interesting address he has given to us. The subject is one which, in a rather different aspect, has been much before the minds of scientific men ever since Einstein published his searching investigations into the concepts of Time and Space. The starting point of these investigations was the important research of Michelson and Morley, in 1887, on the velocity of light. Those experiments proved that the speed of light is independent of the motion of the source of light and of the motion of the observer. In other words, it is an absolute constant of Nature. When this fact came to be translated into mathematical language by Einstein, it was found to involve revolutionary changes in our ordinary and previous ideas of Space and Time, and that the measurement of these depended upon the frame of reference.

Everyone can see at once that this is the case with a velocity. In a railway carriage, a traveller may be moving at forty miles an hour with respect to a fixed point on the rails, but he is at rest with regard to the carriage itself. The same is true of Space and Time. If a clock were flying away from us with a speed approaching that of light, it would appear to record time much more slowly than a similar clock at rest by the observer. Hence our measure of the duration of any event depends on the frame of reference.

Dr. Schofield has turned our thoughts at the end of his address to the very serious subject of future retribution. We know what libraries of books have been written on this subject, and on the meaning of certain Greek words in the New Testament. It has always

seemed to me, in thinking over these matters, that we should beware of projecting into the future state those ideas of Time and Space which have been formed in us by our present state of existence and by the powers and limitations of our own bodies. When death removes from us these physical bodies, our capacities and limitations may be greatly changed. Hence I think Dr. Schofield has made an instructive statement in saying that Eternity is not endless time, but something belonging to a different category.

Subdivision of Time into past, present, and future is due to our present mental and bodily limitations. It does not exist for the Divine Creator. The name by which He designated Himself to Moses, which was also applied by our Lord Jesus Christ to Himself, viz. "I AM," is only appropriate to one for whom Time is only an ever-continuing present.

There are many suggestive vistas of thought opened up by this paper, but as many others will desire to speak on the subject, I shall conclude by asking you to record a very hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Schofield for his impressive and thought-stimulating address.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said : The central thought expressed in the paper, on p. 284, l. 17, that "Time apart from change is as unknown as is any change in eternity," is certainly involved in difficulty. The human mind has no faculty to understand an eternity of any sort which does not involve the idea of successive events. Timeless stagnation is unthinkable ; at least, it does not represent the Bible view. The concluding chapters of the Book of Revelation evidently refer to eternity, and therein reference is made to God's servants *servings Him*. There is every suggestion in this of the activities of personalities, and consequently development stage by stage. The difficulties involved in Dr. Schofield's discussion of Eternity are apparent from the fact that he uses the term Eternity in more than one sense. On p. 282 he sets out three contrasts between Time and Eternity, evidently making the latter word refer to the future ; but on p. 284 he says : "We should also remember that we are now (and always) in Eternity." Also there seems some confusion of thought in the presentation in the paper of the Eternal God and the Eternity which He inhabits. When Christ said, "I give unto my sheep eternal *life*," it is difficult to conceive that He meant anything other than infinite duration,

which had features corresponding in kind, though not in degree, with what man now understands by the term "life." No doubt the lecturer is right in referring to eternal life as qualitative; but is this the whole truth? There is an interesting quotation from Olympiodorus, on the subject of Eternity, in the *New Oxford Dictionary*, as follows:—"The eternal is a total now exempt from the past and future calculations of time, and totally subsisting in a present abiding now; but the perpetual subsists indeed always, but is beheld in the three parts of time—past, present, and future."

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said: The paper raises problems philosophical and exegetical. The difficulties inherent in the concept of time—or, to speak more accurately, the time co-ordinate of the space-time continuum—have caused much perplexity, at least since Zeno shot his paradoxical arrow into the air. The view, however, that the time co-ordinate is not ultimately real is also attended with numerous difficulties. For example, change is necessary to consciousness, and succession to any theory of ends; or, perhaps, to any "values" whether moral, intellectual, or æsthetic. Attempts are being made to combine the two views, which would, perhaps, accord with the twofoldness of reality which appears to be involved in the Incarnation.

Exegetically, I would urge that the Bible is not a scientific textbook. Were its terms metaphysical definitions they would be incomprehensible to the unlearned, and if expressed in the thought-coinage of one age, would become unintelligible in a later age; whereas the Bible is for all men and all times. I much admire the author's brilliant literary gifts, but when he ventures upon the technicalities of philosophy, his language becomes too vague and inconsistent to be discussed in detail.

In conclusion, I would congratulate the author upon the measure in which he has succeeded in striking a blow at the widespread (but superficial) error that Eternity is endless duration.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS expressed himself as in substantial agreement with Dr. Schofield, save that he thought the judgment described in Matt. xxv had a much wider bearing than Dr. Schofield's reference to "the Jewish messengers in the last days" (p. 290) implied. He pointed out the distinction in Ps. xlix between what is stated of the

redemption of the soul being costly and being left alone (R.V.) for ever (representing *olam*) in *v.* 8, and the man living for ever (or alway, R.V., representing a different word in the Hebrew text) as a parallel to not seeing corruption (or death) in *v.* 9. The Revisers had changed the rendering "for ever" into "alway" in *v.* 9, in order to make clear the distinction between what had reference to the eternal existence of the soul (*v.* 8) and what only contemplated the duration of this present life (*v.* 9).

He called attention to the statement in Heb. ix, 14, that our Lord offered "Himself by (His) eternal Spirit without blemish unto God," the absence of the article before "eternal Spirit" showing, according to Bishop Westcott and Dr. Moffatt, that our Lord's own timeless Spirit, or personality, was indicated. It was this that gave a value to His Sacrifice which was eternal and therefore beyond the reach of time.

He appreciated Dr. Schofield's paper, because it cleared away certain crude ideas of eternal punishment which had burdened many and showed that the final state, both of bliss and of misery, was not a question of time at all.

Lieut.-Col. HOPE BIDDULPH remarked that the eternal life of a believer did not rest on the meaning of words translated in our version as "eternal" or "everlasting," but on the word of Christ, who said to His disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

Rev. A. H. FINN said: Having only seen the paper after entering the room, I do not feel able to discuss the main subject, but there are one or two details calling for comment. On p. 282, "Now we see through a glass darkly" (1 Cor. xiii, 12) is quoted as enabling us "to see how much we can perceive through our dim glass." Am I wrong in thinking that the word used means "a mirror," and not a glass *through* which we can see? On p. 282, and again on p. 283, we are told that in eternity "love abides alone." Am I wrong in thinking that St. Paul asserts that "now *abideth* faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love," in which there is no word of love abiding alone? On p. 286 there is some comment on the word *olam*. Though the word may be derived from *alam*, "to hide, or conceal," yet it is not safe to determine the meaning of a word from its ultimate derivation; we have to ascertain what meaning it

has acquired in actual usage. Critics, for instance, have insisted that because *torah* is derived from *horah*, "to point out, or direct," therefore it only means "direction." Yet there can be no doubt that it has acquired the meaning Law, and nothing else.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: Though the paper is interesting, as one would expect as issuing from its author, it seems to cast more light on side-issues than on the main question.

Ought we not to distinguish carefully such phrases as "a suitable *time*," "keeping *time*," the "*times*," from Time in general? The basic idea of the lecturer that Time is necessarily connected with "change," and that Eternity is not so, hardly seems well founded. He appeals to the derivation of *time* and *tide* as being the same, but this is only through the A.S. verb *tihan*, "to say, show," but I do not think the sense of *change* is inherent in the Greek *chronos* or *kairos*, in the Latin *tempus*, or in the Hebrew *yôm* or *êth*, or for that matter in the English word.

The idea of an Eternity of no change is not attractive, and seems to run counter to Scripture, e.g. John xvii, 3: "This is *life* eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent," which seems to predicate never-ceasing development and progress in Divine knowledge. How the fate of the impenitent is ameliorated by being "changeless," instead of endless, is not clear.

Should not "time" on p. 284, and indeed in several places, be "sense of time"? When we sleep we are simply unconscious of our surroundings, of space as of time, but space is not annihilated, and if we oversleep ourselves, we may be in blissful ignorance of the passing of time, but it does pass. In fact, when we are conscious, it is "change" which tends to annihilate time, and "no change" to prolong it. "Swallowed up by eternity" (p. 285): is this a quotation? and, if so, would the lecturer let us have the authority?

On p. 285 we read, "Duration forms no part of Eternity." This sounds a hazardous statement. Is not the Hebrew *olam* constantly connected, as the Greek *aiônios*, with Eternity. Of the former, Dr. Handley Moule used to tell his students at Ridley Hall that "the root idea of *olam* is mystery connected with duration." This agrees with Gesenius—"unsearchable duration." To quote

Moule again : " In every passage in the Hebrew, except two, and they quite exceptional, *alam* implies *duration of time*."

In such a phrase as " Let the King live for ever," his death is put out of sight : and when the word is applied to mountains, it is by hyperbole, which in no way affects the general sense. As for *aiōnios*, Aristotle says its root is *aei*, and, as Dr. Moule says, " such endlessness is implied by this word, whose tendency is infinite extension to as long *duration* as the subject spoken of will allow." The distinction on p. 286 between " eternal " and " everlasting " is not very satisfying, as the two words are etymologically the same, and also by long usage.

The tendency of the paper, in spite of its literary charm, seems to be to enshroud in mystery a subject which, however limited our knowledge of it may be, is revealed to us in the Scriptures in language that is simple and unaffected, and which illumines while not defining the theme.

Rev. J. J. B. COLES, in proposing a vote of thanks to the Chairman, said that the Institute was fortunate in having for its new President one who was not only a specialist in Electrical Science and in matters relating to Wireless Telegraphy, but also in many branches of up-to-date scientific investigations. He trusted that during the period of his tenure of office there might be a nearer approach to a true synthesis of Philosophy, Science and Religion. We who, in common with all other students, adopt inductive methods of scientific inquiry and the comparative study of phenomena, and who *also* accept a Divine revelation from God as to all questions of origins and future destinies of men, are in a much stronger position than those who argue on evolutionary lines alone. The advanced Science of to-day has nothing to teach us as to origins or as to a future life, thus demonstrating that a true synthesis of knowledge can never be attained on evolutionary principles alone.

The transcendent question of Eternity, the subject of Dr. Schofield's most interesting and suggestive paper, is beyond the full comprehension of the creature's finite intelligence, whether of angels or of men. In the glorious Person of Christ—the True Reality—the relative and the absolute meet, and in and through Him alone is eternal life to be found. The truth as in Him



transcends all mere scientific knowledge, as Sir Isaac Newton and other believing leaders of thought have readily acknowledged.

In conclusion, Mr. Coles remarked : The Members of the Victoria Institute are, by God's grace, in a wonderful position of advantage. Under the encouraging leadership of our new President, Dr. J. A. Fleming, F.R.S., let us pursue our studies with all confidence and thankfulness.

#### WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Miss C. TINDALL writes : Dr. Schofield's paper leads me to believe that he inclines to a less severe view of "everlasting punishment" than that which many theologians used to hold, but that he fears to weaken the deterrent force of our Lord's words. In Gehenna, was it not the fire which endured, and not the thing which was being consumed ? As fresh refuse was cast in, the worms and the flames would still be ready to consume it. "The earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

Dr. W. BELL DAWSON : We may better understand Time and Eternity by considering the conditions when God existed alone, before the creation of the material Universe. We thus realize that God is quite independent of time and space, and that He is unaffected by their existence or non-existence. Yet there is sequence in His thoughts and plans, because there is ground for the belief that He had the whole plan of creation in mind, from its beginning to its culmination, before He began the work.

Philosophers tell us that our conception of Time is primarily due to the consciousness of sequence in our thoughts. Hence we cannot divest ourselves of the idea of Time unless we could cease to think. Our only means of measuring Time is by motion. The day is measured from the rising of the sun until it sets ; the month is measured by the successive phases of the moon in its course around the heavens. We measure the hours and minutes by the motion of the hands of the clock. Although the fact that Time is passing may impress itself upon us because of sequence, yet we have no

means of knowing the length of Time, or duration, apart from movement.

It seems evident from all these considerations that there was no need for either Time or Space before material things came into existence. We may thus regard Time and Space as concomitants of creation. To us they are necessary accompaniments of the material elements in our nature. What Time will mean to those who have the spiritual bodies of the resurrection state, in the new heavens and the new earth, we cannot, perhaps very definitely grasp.

REV. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S., writes: Our thanks are due to the beloved physician for his thought-provoking address. He has frankly admitted the existence of various opinions upon both its subjects, and ungrudgingly conceded to us the liberty of differing from those he has expressed. I must confess that although I can agree with many things he has said, I must differ from a few others.

(1.) First of all, I cannot help thinking that the idea of "Time" is an abstraction which the human mind has made from the observation of its own existence, and of the constitution and course of Nature. Time and duration must not be confused. We measure duration by moments, hours, days, etc.; but Time is independent of our measurements. It is "duration" which has change for its essence, not Time. One moment follows another like inches upon a tape-measure, but there is no change in the moments, and no change in "Time." The "change" and changes are in ourselves and in the universe around us. It would thus be more correct to say that Death ends our present duration of life, and is an exit from the material or temporal universe into the eternal, than to say that it is an exit from the unmeasurable abstraction we call Time.

(2.) This will be still more evident when we consider Eternity. The Scriptures give us more light on the subject than Dr. Schofield has recognized. Eternity is that realm of existence upon which we enter at death. We then quit the Time-state, the material, the physical, and enter upon the Eternal. But it cannot be true that there is no duration and no change there. Of the Eternal God alone can it be said that He knows no change, and has no experience of

duration. It is rather strange that the Lecturer has never once used the word "succession," for no finite being can possibly have the whole of the thoughts of his entire existence present at once, or he would not be finite. There must be succession. We may reasonably ask: Did Moses and Elijah know no succession of thought, and no change, when they came to the Mount of Transfiguration and talked with our Lord about His coming *exodus*? Was there no change in Heaven when the Devil and his angels fell? Did the angel know no change when he was caused to "fly swiftly" to Daniel? Will the redeemed know no change when they are re-clothed in their resurrection bodies, and come with our Lord in the clouds of heaven? Surely there is change, duration, and succession implied in all these events, and it may not be so much amiss therefore to speak of "time being swallowed up by eternity." We may thus, as the author admits, "remember that we are now and always in eternity" (p. 284).

(3.) Turning to the words used, I am not prepared to admit that the Latin is more expressive than the languages of Scripture. *Æternitas*, "eternity," and *æternus*, "eternal," "continual," "lasting," have nothing to commend them above the Hebrew and the Greek terms. The Hebrew, *olam*, it is true, is an elastic word, as Hebrew words often are; but it is evidently used in Prov. viii, 23, for eternity before the creation: "I was set up from *everlasting*." In Deut. xxxiii, 27, it comprehends all eternity: "Underneath are the everlasting arms"—*zerō' -ōth 'olam*, "the arms of eternity." Wonderful language! Nor do the Greek words appear less satisfactory. Retaining the idea of succession, as we must for all things finite, they too are fit to fill us with awe and wonder. We have *aiōn*, an "age," an indefinite period, as in Heb. i, 2, and xi, 3, the "ages" or "days" of Creation; and in Eph. ii, 1, *ton aiōna tou kosmou toutou*, "the age of this kosmos." Then we have "the age of the ages" and "the ages of the ages" (1 Tim. i, 17). The accumulation of thought here is staggering. The human mind cannot grasp "an age" of an indefinite period of time, and "an age" consisting of "ages" of indefinite periods and "ages" of indefinite periods consisting of ages of indefinite periods. It is more than a repeating decimal going on for ever, or a line produced *ad infinitum*; no mathematical formula can express it; it is an involution beyond our

powers of thought. We may well stand amazed at the grace that can bring us poor frail mortals out of this Time-state of temptation, sin, and conflict, and bring us into that Eternal State of everlasting spiritual stability and strength.

With regard to the righteous and the wicked in the future, I will add nothing, except to say that we can, perhaps, all agree that "eternal life" is the life of eternity, and "eternal punishment" the punishment of eternity, be it what it may.

#### AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Dr. SCHOFIELD, in reply, said: I am very glad that our distinguished President and Chairman has approved of an essential point in my paper—that Eternity does not connote "duration."

Mr. Percy O. Ruoff endeavours to show confusion of thought in my paper. On examination, however, it appears that what he really complains of first is the limitation of the human mind. His next reference to the Book of Revelation is very unfortunate; for the "serving" is clearly in "time," *i.e.* during the thousand years. It is a common error to suppose, as Rev. John Tuckwell actually says on p. 298, that when we "enter" (a wrong word, for we are in it now) Eternity we "then quit the Time-state" (*i.e.* for ever); for we shall find ourselves again continually under time limitations, at any rate as long as the world endures. Surely our Lord did not leave Eternity when He entered the conditions of time. It seems very difficult for any of my critics to conceive that the two may go on together. I have not pointed this out in my paper, because I thought it needless to such an audience. To me, time appears to be those portions of Eternity that are marked by "changes."

Mr. Ruoff sees further confusion in my reference to the "nows" and "thens" in 1 Cor. xiii, where I say "then" refers to Eternity in the future, although in p. 284 I say we are now in it. It is clear Mr. Ruoff requires me to point out to him, that although always in Eternity, *now* we are also in "Time": *then* we shall not be. He next observes that "when Christ said, 'I give unto my sheep eternal life,' it is difficult (for Mr. Ruoff) to conceive anything but infinite duration." Surely this expresses Mr. Ruoff's limitations rather than my confusion.

The Rev. A. H. Finn points out that St. Paul never says that love abides alone: but when faith is changed to sight, and our hope is fulfilled, it surely does, and the remark is permissible.

The Hon. Secretary has many criticisms. He takes exception (p. 295) to "change" being a root idea of "time" though this is supported in the last edition (just out) of the *Ency. Brit.* in its article on the subject. His gloss on John xvii, 3, seems to contradict 1 Cor. xiii, 12, where the *epignōsis* of knowledge appears to preclude all development.

A serious mistake is made by the Hon. Secretary in the next paragraph, when he confuses the "*fate of the impenitent*" with my remarks on our *false ideas* concerning it. The two are very different. He next speaks of "sleep," on p. 284, where it is not named: a "reverie," or "brown study" being what is referred to. In sleep, sense of space is lost, but in a reverie the space of the room is there; all that is lost is the sense of time. Dr. H. Moule no doubt rightly pointed out the connection of *olam* with duration; and this is because, as I have said, it is constantly connected with time in the Bible.

I regret I do not agree with Miss C. Tindall's remarks.

The Rev. John Tuckwell, M.R.A.S., definitely states the error I alluded to when replying to Mr. Percy O. Ruoff. On p. 298 he says it "is an exit from the temporal universe into '*the eternal.*'" We confess we had not heard before of the latter. He says, "We then quit (for ever) the Time-state," and adds, "it cannot be true there is no duration" (in the Eternal), but does not say "why?"

Why, at the end of his reply, he adds to "the punishment of eternity" the words "be it what it may," is difficult to understand, when the Word of God tells us what it is.

## GENERAL INDEX TO THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE VICTORIA INSTITUTE.

A GENERAL INDEX to the first forty-three volumes of the Journal of Transactions of the Institute (No. I., 1865, to No. XLIII., 1911) arranged alphabetically under both the names of the Authors and the Subjects, was issued with Volume XLIV., and can also be obtained from the Secretary in separate form, bound in cloth, for one shilling the copy.

### CONTENTS OF THE LAST SIXTEEN VOLUMES.

#### VOL. XLIV.

- Annual Address. Modern Unrest and the Bible. By Sir ANDREW WINGATE, K.C.I.E.  
 The Genealogies of our Lord. By Mrs. A. S. LEWIS, LL.D.  
 Natural Law and Miracle. By Dr. LUDWIG VON GERTELL.  
 The Greek Papyri. By the Rev. Professor G. MILLIGAN, D.D.  
 The Conditions of Habitability of a Planet, with Special Reference to the Planet Mars. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.  
 The Historicity of the Mosaic Tabernacle. By the Rev. Professor JAMES ORR, D.D.  
 The Real Personality or Transcendental Ego. By SYDNEY T. KLEIN, Esq., F.L.S., F.R.A.S.  
 Difficulties of Belief. By the Right Rev. THE BISHOP OF DOWN.  
 Some Lucan Problems. By Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY.  
 Archæology and Modern Biblical Scholarship. By the Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S.  
 Adaptations in Plants and Animals to their Conditions of Life are the Result of the Directivity of Life. By the Rev. Professor G. HENSLOW, M.A.  
 International Arbitration in the Greek World. By MARCUS N. TOD, Esq., M.A.  
 The Influence of Babylonian Conceptions on Jewish Thought. By the Venerable Archdeacon BERESFORD POTTER, M.A.  
 Index of Authors and Subjects in 43 previous volumes.

#### VOL. XLV.

- Annual Address. From Suez to Sinai. By ARTHUR W. SUTTON, Esq., J.P., F.L.S. (Illustrations.)  
 Immortality. By the Rev. A. R. WHATELY, D.D.  
 Present Day Factors in New Testament Study. By the Rev. Professor R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.  
 The Fact of Prediction. By the Rev. JOHN URQUHART.  
 Vision in Sacred and other History. By the Rev. J. H. SKRINE, M.A., D.D.  
 Methods of Biblical Criticism. By the Ven. Archdeacon WILLIAM SINCLAIR, D.D.  
 Pompeii. By E. J. SEWELL, Esq.  
 The Bearing of Archæological and Historical Research on the New Testament. By the Rev. PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D.D. (being the Gunning Prize Essay, 1912).  
 The Samaritan Pentateuch, and Philological Questions connected therewith. By the Rev. J. IVERACH MUNRO, M.A.  
 The Origin of Life, what do we know of it? By Professor G. SIMS WOODHEAD, M.A., M.D.  
 Old Testament Criticism, its Position and Principles. By the Very Rev. H. WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

## VOL. XLVI.

- Annual Address. Jerusalem, Past and Present. By Colonel Sir CHARLES M. WATSON, K.C.M.G., C.B., M.A. (*Summary.*)
- The Fall of Babylon and Daniel v. 30. By the Rev. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.
- Japan, and some of its Problems, Religious and Social. By the Rev. Prebendary H. E. FOX, M.A.
- The Christian Doctrine of Atonement. By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.
- Is the so-called "Priestly Code" of Post-exilic date? By the Rev. Chancellor LIAS, M.A.
- The Character of the Bible inferred from its Versions. By the Rev. T. H. DARLOW, M.A.
- The Number of the Stars. By SYDNEY CHAPMAN, Esq., B.A., D.Sc., Chief Assistant at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.
- The First Chapter of Genesis. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.
- The Latest Discoveries in Babylonia. By T. G. PINCHES, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.
- Frederic Godet, Tutor of Frederick the Noble. By Professor F. F. ROGET.
- The Composite of Races and Religions in America. By the Rev. S. B. McCORMICK, D.D., Chancellor of Pittsburg University, U.S.A.
- The Supremacy of Christianity. By the Right Rev. Bishop J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Dean of Manchester. (*Summary.*)

## VOL. XLVII.

- Annual Address. The Unity of Genesis. By Professor H. EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D.
- The Principles of World Empire. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.
- The Life and Work of Homer. By Professor D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, D.Litt.; Laudian Professor of Arabic.
- Modernism and Traditional Christianity. By the Rev. Canon E. McCCLURE, M.A., M.R.I.A.
- Present Position of the Theory of Organic Evolution. By Professor ERNEST W. MACBRIDE, M.A., F.R.S.
- Traces of a Religious Belief of Primeval Man. By the Rev. D. GATH WHITLEY.
- The Spectra of Stars and Nebulae. By Professor A. FOWLER, F.R.S. (*Abstract.*)
- The Determination of Easter Day. By Dr. A. M. W. DOWNING, M.A., F.R.S.
- Astronomical Allusions in Sacred Books of the East. By Mrs. WALTER MAUNDER.
- The Zoroastrian Conception of a Future Life. By Professor J. HOPE MOULTON, M.A., D.Litt.
- Mahâyana Buddhism and Christianity. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, M.A., D.D.
- Weights and Measures of the Hebrews. By Professor ARCHIBALD R. S. KENNEDY, M.A., D.D.
- The Old and New Versions of the Babylonian Creation and Flood Stories. By T. G. PINCHES, Esq., LL.D., M.R.A.S.

## VOL. XLVIII.

- Annual Address. The Influence of the War on Religious Life in Great Britain. By the Rt. Rev. BISHOP J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Dean of Manchester.
- The Spectra of Stars and Nebulae. By Professor A. FOWLER, F.R.S. (*Full Report.*)
- The Movements of the Stars. By Professor A. S. EDDINGTON, M.A., F.R.S., Plumian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Cambridge.
- The Principles governing Bible Translation. By E. J. SEWELL, Esq.

- The Unity of Isaiah. By the Rev. Chancellor LIAS, M.A.  
 The Fulfilment of Prophecy. By the Rev. A. H. T. CLARKE, M.A. (*Abstract*).  
 The Psychology of St. Paul. By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.  
 Inscriptions and Drawings from Roman Catacombs. By the Rev. Prebendary  
 H. E. FOX, M.A.  
 The Influence of German Philosophy in bringing about the Great War. By  
 Professor D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, D.Litt., Laudian Professor of Arabic in the  
 University of Oxford.  
 The Connection between the Vulgate Version of the Bible and the Theology  
 of the Western Church. By the Rev. H. J. WHITE, M.A., Professor of  
 New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London.  
 Thanksgiving Service, May 24th, 1916.  
 Commemoration Meeting, May 24th, 1916, in celebration of the Fiftieth  
 Anniversary of the First General Meeting.  
 The Tidal Wave on the Off Side of the Earth from the Moon. By Professor  
 EDWARD HULL, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.

## VOL. XLIX.

- Annual Address. The Distances of the Stars. By Sir FRANK W. DYSON,  
 M.A., F.R.S., Astronomer Royal.  
 The Influence of Christianity upon Other Religious Systems. By the Rev.  
 W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, M.A., D.D. (Fourth Gunning Prize Essay.)  
 Christian Mysticism. By the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, M.A., D.D., Dean of  
 St. Paul's.  
 Islam and Animism. By the Rev. S. M. ZWEMER, M.A., D.D.  
 From World Dominion to Subjection: the Story of the Fall of Babylon. By  
 T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Assyrian at University  
 College, London.  
 The Conscience. By CLEMENT C. L. WEBB, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College,  
 Oxford.  
 The Significance of the Geography of Palestine. By General Sir CHARLES  
 WARREN, G.C.M.G., F.R.S.  
 The Witness of Philology to the Truth of the Old Testament. By the Rev. J.  
 IVERACH MUNRO, M.A.  
 The Prerequisites of a Christian Philosophy. By the Rev. A. R. WHATELY,  
 D.D.  
 The Emphasis of St. Luke. By Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY.  
 The Relations between Science and Religion as Affected by the Work of the  
 Last Fifty Years. By the Very Rev. H. WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

## VOL. L.

- Annual Address. The Future of Education. By Professor D. S. MARGOLIOUTH,  
 M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.  
 Prehistoric Man; His Antiquity and Characteristics. By WILLIAM DALE,  
 Esq., F.S.A., F.G.S.  
 The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch. By the Rev. A. H. FINN.  
 Sunspots and some of their Peculiarities. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq.,  
 F.R.A.S.  
 The Reserved Rights of God. By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.  
 Why We Die. By Major W. McADAM ECCLES, M.S., M.B., F.R.C.S., R.A.M.C.  
 The Gnostic Conception of the Cross. By the Rev. Canon J. A. MACCULLOCH,  
 D.D.  
 Terrestrial Magnetism. By SYDNEY CHAPMAN, Esq., M.A., D.Sc.  
 Germanism. By the Rev. Chancellor LIAS, M.A.  
 The Church and the Army. By the Rev. Canon JAMES O. HANNAY, M.A.



## VOL. LI.

- Annual-Address. The Literary Marvels of St. Luke. By Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY.
- Christian Sanity. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.
- The Influence of Christianity on the Position of Women. By Miss C. L. MAYNARD, First Principal of Westfield College, University of London.
- The Philosophy of Bishop Butler. By the Rev. H. J. R. MARSTON, M.A.
- The Personal Influence of Great Commanders in the Past. By Major-General Sir GEORGE K. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., C.I.E.
- The Teacher's Vocation. By MONTAGUE J. RENDALL, M.A., Head Master of Winchester College.
- Plants of the Bible. By ALFRED B. RENDLE, Esq., M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., F.L.S.
- The One in The Many, and The Many in the One. By Professor H. LANGHORNE ORCHARD, M.A., B.Sc.
- The Mosaic Calendar, as a means of dating approximately certain Ancient Writings. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.

## VOL. LII.

- Annual Address. Freedom and Discipline. By the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.
- The Ruined Cities of Palestine, East and West of the Jordan (with 4 plates). By ARTHUR W. SUTTON, Esq., J.P., F.L.S.
- The Psychology of the Female Mind. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.
- India. By Sir ANDREW WINGATE, K.C.I.E.
- The Silences of Scripture. By the Rev. A. H. FINN.
- Simile and Metaphor in the Fourth Gospel. By the Rev. Professor A. S. GEDEN, M.A., D.D.
- The Walls of Jerusalem at Various Periods. By ERNEST W. G. MASTERMAN, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S.
- The Pentateuch of the Samaritans: When they got it, and Whence. By the Rev. J. E. H. THOMSON, M.A., D.D.
- Babylon in the Days of Nebuchadrezzar. By Professor THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, L.L.D., M.R.A.S.
- Monumental Art in Early England, Caledonia and Ireland. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop G. FORREST BROWNE, D.D.
- The Meaning of the Æsthetic Impulse. By the Rev. STEWART A. McDOWALL, M.A., D.D.

## VOL. LIII.

- Annual Address. The Old Testament and the Present State of Criticism. By the Very Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.
- Human Psychology—Experimentally Considered. By DAVID ANDERSON-BERRY, Esq., M.D., LL.D.
- Some Reflections on How Empire came to Us, and can alone be Conserved. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop E. GRAHAM INGHAM, D.D.
- Motherhood. By AMAND ROUTH, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.P.
- Predictions and Expectation of the First Coming of Christ. By Lieut.-Colonel F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., late R.E.
- Public School Education. By the Rev. H. COSTLEY WHITE, M.A., Head Master of Westminster School.
- Joshua's Long Day (Joshua, chapter x). By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.
- Fetichism—in Central Africa and Elsewhere. By WILLIAM HOSTE, Esq., B.A.

- Religion in Mesopotamia. By the Rev. Canon J. T. PARFIT, M.A.  
 The Tripartite Nature of Man. By the Rev. JAMES GOSSET-TANNER, M.A.  
 The Book of Daniel: Some Linguistic Evidence regarding its Date. By the  
 Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.  
 The Roman Wall in North Britain. By the Rev. Prebendary H. E. FOX, M.A.

## VOL. LIV.

- The Annual Address. Modernism. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Dean of Durham.  
 Darius the Median and the Cyropædia of Xenophon in the Light of the Cuneiform Inscriptions. By the Rev. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.  
 The Bible in the Twentieth Century. By Miss C. L. MAYNARD, First Principal of Westfield College, University of London.  
 The Invisible is the Real, the Visible is only its Shadow. By SYDNEY T. KLEIN, Esq., F.L.S., M.R.I.  
 Some Difficulties of Evolution. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.  
 Christianity in Roman Britain. By WILLIAM DALE, Esq., F.G.S., F.S.A.  
 Discussion on Sunday Observance.  
 Seven Decisive and Suggestive Scenes in the History of the Secular Contest between Conscience and Power. By THEODORE ROBERTS, Esq.  
 The Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. By the Rev. J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.  
 The Times of the Gentiles in Relation to the End of the Age. By the Rev. E. L. LANGSTON, M.A.  
 The Readers for whom Matthew wrote his Hebrew Gospel. By the Rev. J. E. H. THOMSON, M.A., D.D.  
 The Witness of Archæology to the Bible. By Miss A. M. HODGKIN.

## VOL. LV.

- Annual Address. The Two Sources of Knowledge, Science and Revelation. By E. WALTER MAUNDER, Esq., F.R.A.S.  
 Romance and Mysticism. By the Rev. CHARLES GARDNER, B.A.  
 Is Inspiration a Quality of Holy Scripture? By the Rev. WILFRID H. ISAACS, M.A.  
 Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch which shows that the Higher Critical Theories of its late Composition cannot be reasonably held. By the Rev. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.  
 The Forces behind Spiritism. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.  
 Value and Purpose of the Study of Comparative Religion. By the Rev. Professor A. S. GEDEN, M.A., D.D.  
 Relativity and Christian Philosophy. By the Rev. J. J. B. COLES, M.A.  
 Irrigation of Palestine. By ALBERT HIORTH, Esq., C.E. (With lantern illustrations.)  
 Occultism: at the Bar of Philosophy and Religion. By DAVID ANDERSON-BERRY, Esq., M.D., LL.D.  
 Assyro-Babylonians and Hebrews—Likenesses and Contrasts. By Professor T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.  
 Religious Controversy between Christians and Jews of To-day. By the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN-WILLIAMS, D.D.

## VOL. LVI.

- The Annual Address. The Philosophy of Modernism. By the Rev. CHARLES GARDNER, B.A.
- Egypt in the days of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen. By WILLIAM DALE, Esq., F.G.S., F.S.A.
- The Problem of the Pentateuch from the Standpoint of the Archæologist. By the Rev. M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., President of Xenia Theological Seminary, U.S.A.
- The Historical Value of the Book of Jonah (being the Gunning Prize Essay for 1923). By E. J. SEWELL, Esq.
- Geology in its relation to Scripture Revelation. By Professor GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A.
- The Johannine Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. By the Rev. HAROLD SMITH, M.A., D.D.
- Telepathy. By WILSON EDWARDS LESLIE, Esq.
- The Influence of Calvin down the centuries on the Religious and Political Development of the Protestant Nations. By Professor F. F. ROGER, Lecturer on the English Language and Literature in the University of Geneva.
- The Making of Men. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.S.
- Deuteronomy a Mosaic Book. By Professor E. NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A.
- The True Harmony of Man. By Colonel HARRY BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., R.E.

## VOL. LVII.

- Annual Address. The Capture of the Unconscious. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.
- The Worship of Idols in Assyrian History in Relation to Bible References. By Professor T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.
- Great Britain and the Palestine Mandate. By Brigadier-General Sir WYNHAM DEEDES, C.M.G., D.S.O.
- Seismic Phenomena. By Dr. DOROTHY M. WRINCH.
- Psychology in the Light of History: A Study in Heredity. By AVARY H. FORBES, Esq., M.A.
- The Early Civilization of Amurru: The Land of the Amorites—Showing Amorite Influence on Biblical Literature. By Professor ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D.
- Nature and Supernature. By the Rev. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A.
- The Antiquity of Man according to the Genesis Account. By the Rev. President M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary, U.S.A.
- Psychotherapy. By EDWIN L. ASH, Esq., M.D.
- Revelation and Evolution: Can they be Harmonized? By Professor GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A. (Being the Langhorne Orchard Prize Essay for 1925.)
- The Land of Punt and the Hamites. By Professor EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A.
- A Review of Philosophic Tendencies since Hegel. By Professor H. WILDON CARR, D.Litt.

## VOL. LVIII.

- Annual Address. The Silence of God—How is it Explained? By Professor HOWARD A. KELLY, M.D., LL.D., and the Rev. DAVID M. M'INTYRE, D.D.
- Scientific Criticism as Applied to the Bible. By GEORGE B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E., Consul-General at Milan.

- Notes on the Discoveries at Ur and Tel al-Obeid, and the Worship of the Moon God. By Professor THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.
- Modern Science in the Book of Job. By Lieut.-Commander VICTOR L. TRUMPER, R.N.R., M.R.A.S.
- A Philosophic Exponent of Latin Culture: Alexandre Vinet, Protestant Divine and Literary Critic (1797-1847). By Professor F. F. ROGET, of Geneva.
- Revelation. By the Rev. Canon V. F. STORR, M.A., Canon of Westminster.
- The Problem of the Septuagint and Quotations in the New Testament. By the Rev. Canon A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.
- The Koran and its Doctrine of God. By the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON, D.D., Ph.D.
- Religion and Science. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.
- Evolution. By Major LEWIS M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

## VOL. LIX.

- Annual Address. Time and Eternity. By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.
- Evolution and Revelation. By Professor J. A. FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. (President).
- Man and his God: The Origin of Religion among Primitive Peoples. By Captain T. W. E. HIGGENS.
- The Comparative Chronology of Ancient Nations in its bearing on Holy Scripture. By GEORGE B. MICHELL, Esq., O.B.E.
- The Identification of the Pharaohs of the Pentateuch. By the Rev. G. A. FRANK KNIGHT, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.E.
- Babylon in the Days of Hammurapi and Nebuchadrezzar. By Squadron-Leader P. J. WISEMAN, R.A.F.
- The Completed Legend of Bel-Merodach and the Dragon. By Professor THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S.
- The Predictive Element in Holy Scripture. By the Rev. A. H. FINN.
- The Place of Woman in Islam. By the Rev. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D.
- Ancient Sodom in the Light of Modern Science. By the Rev. President M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia Theological Seminary, U.S.A.
- A Restatement of the Argument for Theism from Design. By Lieut.-Colonel F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E.
- The Radical Criticism of the Psalter. By Professor R. DICK WILSON, D.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A.