réellement par l'Esprit qui agit dans la communauté des premiers croyants."[1] But the disciple is not above his Master. To most Christians I think it will appear reasonable that the human Jesus had at least as much claim to such inspiration as St. Paul.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS (*continued*).

HITHERTO we have been discussing such subjects connected with the study of Genesis as are dealt with by Dr. Driver in the introductory part of his volume, whilst making such references as were necessary to the main body of the work. We pass on to the commentary itself and to the essays which will be found incorporated in it. First in order is placed, as is natural,

THE CREATION OF THE WORLD,

and what is called the cosmogony of Genesis.

Here we come at once to the problems the elucidation of which is very often held to point to a divergence or opposition between science and religion. But, as has been already clearly laid down, when we read the Bible we are not reading in any particular book anything professing to form part of a scientific manual. What is described to us is narrated in popular language. When the book was written—no matter for the moment at what date—it was written by a man of his time, and not by a scientist of the twentieth century, and for men of this time. It would have been useless to have described the creation then in language such as many would understand nowadays. And, after all, we are still, many of us, far from possessing a deep acquaintance with science, and even the scientist himself takes up the language of the past and uses it. He still speaks of sunset and of sunrise, whilst he tells us, when he is talking scientifically, that the sun does *not* set, and that the sun does *not* rise. If it is permitted him to use such language as this in such an enlightened age, why should he put the writers of a less informed age out of court for expressing the broad facts of creation in similar language, and accuse them of contradicting scientific truth because they use the language and imagery of the time? But we

[1] "Autour," etc., p. 118.

must go further than this. We must investigate the question whether the writer, or writers—for we have allowed there may have been more than one—of the documents on which Genesis is founded do actually contradict or run counter to what may be taken to be absolutely ascertained scientific truths, putting on one side such *façons de parler* as we have mentioned above.

Take, for instance, the statement made in Gen. i. 5, that light came into being for the earth on the first day, whereas the sun and moon are first mentioned on the fourth day. These are simple statements; they do not deal with the question of the way in which light was produced, except to say that it was by the Divine fiat. We turn to science, and what does it tell us? The astronomer points to certain parts of infinite space in which there are what he calls *nebulæ*. There is light in the nebulæ, else we could not see them. He tells us that operations are at work there which will eventually lead to the evolution of a solar system like our own—a sun, with its accompanying planets revolving round it. There, at any rate, is light before sun and moon and stars. Now, to have told all this to a Jew all those centuries ago would have been unintelligible to him. But to tell him of light, and then to tell him of the sources of light for himself and for his world, would be but natural in any description of creation. There is no reason for, or need of, reading into the narrative anything that it does not state; all that is claimed for it is that there is nothing in it opposed to the discoveries of modern times. The mention of the appearance of light as anterior to the creation of the sun and moon is a very different thing from the use of ordinary language about the firmament, where all that is implied is the existence of waters held up, as it were, above the earth and separated from them, whilst above these upper waters, if we compare other passages in the Scriptures, were the throne and dwelling-place of God. It is obvious that the word is used figuratively of the dome of heaven, just as much as it is used figuratively of the earth (Isa. xlii. 5, xliv. 24). To come to another point: It is absurd to say that the words "God set" the sun and moon and stars in the firmament mean that He fastened them to it (like, I suppose, bosses in a shield). The word used in the Hebrew is endowed with very varied meanings, and one has only to refer to one passage (from the same document P, according to the critics) to see this. When in Gen. ix. 13 we meet with the words "I do set My bow in the cloud," are we to take them to mean, "I do fasten My rainbow to the cloud"? And yet both passages come from the same author, and we must give him the credit, with reference to the earlier one,

of being able to use his eyes and to observe that the moon, at any rate, was *not* fastened to the firmament, for if it had been it would have always occupied the same relative position to the sun and the stars if they also were fastened to it.

These are but details. We come now to the cosmogony of Genesis as a whole. Now, the present writer cannot claim to any great knowledge of natural science; he can only profess to approach the subject from what he ventures to call the common-sense view of it. In the first place, then, he finds that not merely theologians, but distinguished men of science, during the last century have tried one after another[1] to establish harmony between the ascertainable facts of science and the statements of the Bible, and, though difficulties have presented themselves with regard to their different theories, and some wild assertions have been made, it does not follow that the door is closed against all attempts at reconciliation, and that the scientist is to shut himself within his own barriers, and say, "No, you cannot effect anything of the kind!" For, after all, some of the statements made on behalf of science are but tentative. It must be remembered that science did not arrive at its present dogmatic assertions of scientific truth *per saltum;* on the contrary, it made many tentative hypotheses first, many of which proved to be mistaken. Just in the same way scientists or theologians may make tentative attempts at harmonizing science and the statements of the Bible; and because their particular attempts turn out to be mistaken ones, it does not follow that no reconciliation is possible. Moreover, those who question the Biblical narrative must be tied down to an exact use of terms. When it suits their purpose, the word "evolution" is made much of; on the other hand, when the theologian uses the word "creation," an attempt is made to pin him down to instantaneous work on the part of the Creator, and not to the inauguration of what is to develop gradually. It is here, I think, that we should look for an explanation of the relative antiquity of vegetable and animal life, and of fishes and birds or land animals, remembering all the time that the records of geology as presented to us now can scarcely be termed exhaustive. It is just as much a reading of ideas into the narrative from outside to say that in Gen. i. 11, 12 "vegetation is complete" as it is to attempt to make of its language a scientific explanation of the origin of things.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to venture upon an illustration of what I mean. If you ask anyone who has lived a great

[1] Dr. Driver mentions four attempts connected with well-known names.

deal in the country how often, in the course of his rambles, he has met with the body of a bird that has died a natural death, he will most probably tell you that he has seldom or never seen such a thing; and even the dead bodies of those that have perished by violent deaths so rapidly disappear that they are seldom seen. Arguing from this, it might be said that the bird population of this country is very small indeed, whereas, as a fact, we know it is not so. Well, then, are we bound to assume that there were necessarily no birds before the first appearance of them in geological strata? Again, do we even now know enough about the condensation of a nebula and the evolution of a stellar system from it to be able to say that the consolidation of its parts can only take place in one order? I venture to think not. And when one comes to the comparatively trivial question of carnivorous animals and their diet, one is tempted to ask learned men: Have they ever seen their domestic cats—carnivorous animals, if ever any are—eating, or, at any rate, chewing, grass? If it were wanted for their purposes they would hail this act as a survival of an old mode of life which had been supplanted by the development of carnivorous habits in some prolonged time of drought and dried up vegetation, and that the present dentition of the feline species is a modification of a previous one brought about by change of environment or other causes. But, further, we would draw attention to the following quotation from a well-known text-book, Nicholson's "Manual of Zoology" (7th edition, p. 813):

"The Carnivora are adapted by their organization for a raptorial life, and for a more or less exclusively carnivorous diet, though in exceptional cases the food is not of an animal nature at all."

We must be careful, then, to see that the generalizations we are asked to accept are not too wide.

We come next to the connection of this narrative of the Creation with the Babylonian cosmogony. It would, of course, be impossible to deny, and we should not wish to do it, that such a connection in some form or other is possible, or even probable, when we consider the history of Abraham and the place from which he came. But this is far from allowing that the account of Creation in Genesis was due to theories of the origin of things invented by the Hebrews themselves, or borrowed from their neighbours, or was "derived ultimately" from the Babylonian narrative as it stands now. Many centuries ago Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers became acquainted with earlier authors, such as Berossus, and with their account of the Babylonian cosmogony. The similarity between it and the Scriptural account was accepted

by them as a matter of course. They saw no difficulty in it. It remained for the present age to make this a reason for casting doubts upon the Biblical narrative, and to express itself startled that such a correspondence should exist.

To begin with, the whole atmosphere of the two accounts is different. There is nothing to correspond to the "In the beginning God created" of Genesis (i. 1). In the tablets, on the other hand, we have an account of the evolution of the Babylonian gods. It will be remembered that we have already mentioned the two forms that religions seem inevitably to take—an esoteric and an exoteric or popular form. If the Bible is a revelation at all, then the account of the Creation may have come in the first place from Babylon, and from Abraham or his ancestors, but it will stand side by side with and in elevating contrast to the corrupter form of the revelation which prevailed in popular belief in Babylon. If the Bible does not contain a revelation, then the account of Creation is a fiction, and it does not matter the slightest what was its source or whether it was a refinement of the Babylonian narrative by a Hebrew author or not.

But then, if this be so, the "Higher Critics" must not base anything upon it. They have no right to quote it as showing (*i.e.*, I suppose, proving) "that the world was not self-originated" (p. 32), or that "it sets God above the great complex world-process." If the cosmogony is an invention of man, matter may, after all, be eternal as much as God. We must not use it to prove the relation in which matter stands to God, or even that in which the first *anthropos*, or man, stood to God. We come back to the point we asserted before in opposition to that part of the Abbé Loisy's teaching, which is most *dangerous*, that a narrative can be *scientifically* opposed to the truth, *theologically* true.

It is scarcely necessary to spend much time on the question of the institution of

The Sabbath.

For many simple minds the assertion of Exod. xx. 11 will be sufficient: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." But we can go a little further than this. In the first place, there seems to have been something like weeks in the Assyrian calendar, though in the one which exists the nineteenth day is mentioned as well as the fourteenth and twenty-first, and the term *shabattum*, so far as we know, was not applied to these days, but only to the fifteenth day of the month (Pinches, 2nd edition, p. 527). This Dr. Driver

mentions; but I cannot find, secondly, that, in this connection, he mentions the occurrences of a period of seven days both in Genesis (vii. 10, viii. 10, 12) and on the Flood Tablets (ll. 130, 146). What he does say is that there is no indication or hint of the Sabbath being observed as a sacred day in pre-Mosaic times (p. 18). Now, the argument from omission is a dangerous one. Institutions of a religious kind are in sacred writings often taken for granted. Take the analogous case of the observance by Christians of the first day of the week which we find mentioned in the Acts. Now St. Paul, who is constantly writing about Christian practice as well as Christian doctrine, never in all his extant epistles writes a word about Sunday or its observance, though we know that he preached on Sunday at a Holy Communion service (Acts xx. 7). If we had had only his epistles, which are most, if not all, of them earlier than the Acts, it might have been argued with just as much validity as there is in the argument about the Sabbath that there is no indication of its being observed in Pauline times; and the same might be said of all the other epistles. Such observances are taken for granted by writers of all times; it is very seldom, for instance, that any particular notice is taken of Sunday or Holy Day in English history unless there be something special connected with it—as, for instance, the Battle of Agincourt being on St. Crispin's day, so markedly recorded by Shakespeare:

> "And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
> From this day to the ending of the world,
> But we in it shall be remembered."
>
> *Henry V.*

(*To be continued.*)

Art. IV.—BISHOP STUBBS AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.[1]

VISITATION charges, as a rule, perish with the using. The only one that can be said to have become a classic is the primary charge of Bishop Butler to the clergy of Durham. Yet there are not a few which acquired considerable celebrity in their day, and may still be read with profit by those who meet with them. Three very different men in the earlier part

[1] "Visitation Charges delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Dioceses of Chester and Oxford." By William Stubbs, D.D. Edited by E. E. Holmes, Honorary Canon of Christ Church and Vicar of Sonning, formerly Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. vi + 360. Price 7s. 6d.