ORDINARY MEETING, May 3, 1869.

The Rev. W. Mitchell, M.A., Vice-President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were confirmed, and the following Elections were announced:

Members:—The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, The Palace, Derry; W. Shepherd Allen, Esq., M.P., Reform Club; G. M. Kiell, Esq., 8, Kensington Park Gardens; Nehemiah Learoyd, Esq., 17, Finchley Road.

Second-class Associate:—Rev. C. F. S. Money, Lewisham.

The Rev. H. Moule then read the following paper:


A FEW words on the nature of the authority which I attach to Scripture in the matter before us may be necessary, and will not, I trust, be out of place. By one who for more than fifty years has believed the Canonical books of the Old and New Testament to have been infallibly inspired by the one Eternal God, the statements contained in those books respecting the nature of that God, of His works, or of His dealings with man, can never be regarded as the mere opinions or theories of their several human authors. They are to him the revelations of God. To such a faith the first two chapters of Genesis, for instance, set forth not the Cosmogony of Moses, but the record given by Jehovah of His own creation and of one particular arrangement of that portion of Creation included in this earth. And, if thus given of God, such a record cannot be either trivial or without purpose. It cannot be mere legend, nor myth, nor conjecture. It must be truth—and truth which, in some way and at some period of his history, must to man be important and profitable. That Scripture was not intended to teach science or history is, in
the ordinary sense of those words, true enough. If, however, in the first eleven chapters of Genesis (to say nothing here of other portions), if, in the very commencement of this wondrous revelation, to which, moreover, as that revelation proceeds, continual reference is made, the subjects are mainly physical and historical, surely so much of science and history as this was intended for man's instruction. If, again, the Author of the works of creation and providence, and the Author of the records of those works contained in the Holy Scriptures be the same All-wise and unerring God, no real variance can exist between the two. Between misconception and mere theory on one side, and truth on the other, or between misinterpretation and mistake on the side of Scripture and fact on the side of science, or between misconception there and misinterpretation here, there can scarcely fail to be opposition. But between the works and dealings of God, and His own record of them, there can be none. And let me be allowed to observe that the liability to misinterpret Scripture and the liability to misconceive the laws of nature appear to me nearly equal. For just as there are certain powers of mind, and these the gift of God, without which a man, whatever may be his talents of another kind, cannot fairly grasp any one portion of the system of nature, so there is a gift of that same God, the possession of which is necessary in order rightly to understand on any subject the true bearing and reach of Scripture. As reasonably may a man expect, by hammering one or two rocks, or by the possession of a few pebbles, to take in the whole science of geology, as to find in a few detached texts the true teaching on any subject of the word of God. On those subjects of which I am speaking there is in both records an analogy which must be carefully studied. They who would not misconceive the one, nor misinterpret the other, must possess a capability of comparing things that differ; and they must be careful to do this.

One word more on this subject. Both in natural science and in Scripture there is a class of facts and truths, which, from the first appearance of these records, has been patent to the most unlearned. Such are those which in science relate to the life of the body, and which in Scripture relate to spiritual and eternal life. While in both there is another class, teaching or illustrating the nature of God and of His works, which, though obscure at first, becomes clear and evident in the lapse of time. To this latter order I consider those to belong of which I now proceed to speak. In doing so I turn for the present from direct history to a passage in the 104th Psalm. And in justice to my argument I may be allowed to observe
that on the Psalms generally the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has set His stamp of infallible inspiration. While, to the reality and truth of the statements in this particular Psalm, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has given direct testimony, in that he cites from it words setting forth the nature of angels. I take it up, therefore, as the production of a man not only of high mental power, but endowed with supernatural intelligence, and possessed of supernatural information. In it he expresses in a solemn act of adoration his deep sense of the majesty and glory of Jehovah as exhibited in His works of creation and providence. Words uttered by such a man under such circumstances, and written down under the teaching of the Spirit, cannot fairly be regarded as a mere poetical effusion. However figurative some of the expressions, and however beautiful the poetry of the whole, we cannot justly suppose the descriptions to be either imaginary or mistaken. He speaks of realities—of things that he knew to be true. He glorifies God for what that God had actually done.

Now, having stated in the fifth verse the creation of the earth, he, in the four following verses, speaks of two great works wrought on this earth so created, or rather of two providential arrangements of its surface. First, at some undefined period after its creation, Jehovah covered the earth with the deep as with a garment, and that to such an extent that the waters stood above the mountains. Then, at a period also undefined, but subsequent to the former, the Psalmist, in language partly figurative and partly literal, states that at the word of Jehovah the earth, previously so covered with water, was uncovered, and the dry land appeared. Through the elevation of the mountains and the depression of the valleys the surplus waters were drawn off to the place which Jehovah had founded for them. There a bound was set on them, “that they might not pass over, neither turn again to cover the earth.”

Now, it cannot be gainsaid that the statement here is, that at some period of its history the whole earth was covered with water, and that these waters were partly disposed of in reservoirs within the earth. A reference to other Psalms, and to one or two other Scriptures, further develops those facts or arrangements, and serves to identify, to a certain extent, the period of their occurrence. In Psalms cxxxvi. and xxiv. we find the earth spoken of as stretched out above the waters; as founded upon the seas and established on the floods. In Psalm xxxiii. 7, Jehovah is said to “gather the waters of the sea together as a heap, and to lay up the depth in storehouses.” In Prov. viii. 22-29 are the following re-
markable statements. Wisdom, speaking, says—"I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. . . . When He prepared the heavens, I was there; when He set a compass upon the face of the depth; when He established the clouds above; when He strengthened the fountains of the deep; when He gave to the sea its decree that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth," &c.

In these words of Wisdom there is—First, a distinct reference to the arrangement of the firmament or heavens, by which the first great separation of the waters was effected, viz., into the waters above and the waters below the firmament. There is, secondly, in them, and in the context, the gathering of the waters into one place, and the appearing of the dry land. And, thirdly, in this one place of the waters there appears to be a further distinction between the depths, on the face of which a compass was set, and "the fountains of the deep." These fountains clearly correspond with "the storehouses of the depth" (Psalm xxxiii. 7), and with the place founded for the deep (Psalm civ. 8), a place on which bounds are set, that those waters "turn not again to cover the earth."

In the Book of Job, Jehovah Himself speaks; and surely we are not to look for legend or conjecture or mistake here. In immediate connection again with the foundation of the earth, and yet as a work separate and distinct from it, He says (Job xxxviii. 8-11), "Or who shut up the sea with doors when it brake forth as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness the swaddling-band for it, and brake up my decreed place, and set bars and doors, and said, 'Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed.'" Now this clearly refers to a period when the deep covered the earth, and when darkness covered the face of the deep. It as clearly intimates that this was not the original or normal state of the earth. Here, as in Psalm civ., it is evident that if the Lord "covered the earth with the deep as with a garment," there must have been the earth to be covered. If "the sea brake forth as if it had issued out of the womb," there previously existed those inner recesses from which it so brake forth. Into those recesses it is here stated, as in Psalm civ., to have been driven back; and on "the decreed place," broken up for it, "bars and doors" are stated to have been set, so that without the special interference of Him who set those bounds, the sea should
ever be kept within them and never through the forcing of these bars turn again to cover the earth. Now, to say the least, there is between the statements in all these passages a very remarkable agreement. We might say, so far as the several human authors are concerned, there is in them an undesigned coincidence. And there can be no just ground for the supposition that any one of these writers, thus agreeing together in their treatment of the same subject, expresses in his particular statement anything that is not fact and truth.

All this, however, becomes clearer and more certain, on a comparison of the passages already quoted with the brief history contained in the first ten verses of the first chapter of Genesis. To speak more particularly, in the second of these verses is set forth the occurrence, and in the ninth and tenth verses the removal, of this, which I will now venture to style the (or, if you please, a) pre-Adamite deluge. In order, however, to establish the fact that the second verse describes, not a chaotic and imperfect creation, but a wasting and devastating deluge spread over the earth, previously created by Him whose works are perfect, I must be allowed to give a brief exposition of the first and second verses. In giving it, moreover, I shall be glad thus practically to enter my protest against the assertion that the clergy, as a body, teach their people that the heavens and the earth were created only six thousand or seven thousand years ago. And I would show cause for a contrary assertion, namely, that if they are engaged, as men ought to be, either in the daily contemplation of the depths of the wisdom and knowledge of the Creator, or in adoration, as they stand in His presence, of the glory of all His attributes, they cannot be either unwilling or afraid, according to their ability, to dive into the lowest depths of true science or to accompany it in its loftiest flights. In my proposed exposition I shall not refer to the Fathers, though for a portion of the view I am about to give I might gather from them considerable support. Neither will I derive my interpretation from heathen legends; nor will I attempt to force Scripture to bend to scientific theories. I will first give the meaning, which, with a little close attention and a comparison of them with other Scriptures, these verses may be seen to have, and then confirm that view with a very little Hebrew criticism. I take it for granted that in the first verse, under the term "the heavens and the earth," we are to include all created things, and all created beings. And so far the proposition is the same as that of St. John,—"All things were made by Him, and without
Him was not anything made that was made;" and it agrees with St. Paul's statement,—"By Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers, all things were created by Him." So that in this proposition is included another; namely, that the God who created the heavens and the earth is the only Uncreated One. All other things and beings had a beginning; He had no beginning; He is "from everlasting." When, therefore, we turn our minds to the words "in the beginning," we must connect these not only with the creation but with the Creator; and as soon as we do this, we find it impossible to conceive that until six or seven thousand years ago there were in all the universe no created beings. We see, then, that the words "in the beginning," have, if I may so express it, a nearer connection with eternity than with our time, and that the creation of heaven and earth may date back farther than the wildest speculator on the age of the earth has ever imagined.

From this clear statement of the inspired writer that the earth as well as the heavens was created "in the beginning," I call your attention first to the statement at the close of the chapter, that "God saw every thing that He had made, and behold it was very good." His work is perfect. But could we say or think that the earth, if at its creation it was in a chaotic state, was "very good," or perfect? Could we consider it perfect when "without form and void, and when darkness was upon the face of the deep"? Clearly from the subsequent history it was not so. When created, however, it must have been perfect. The state or condition described by the words "without form and void," was a state or condition prior, indeed, to that to which the remainder of the history shows it to have been restored, but subsequent to its creation. The period between creation and that condition of desolation and destruction and darkness is by the sacred writer undefined. So also is the duration of that condition. One act alone marks its close—the brooding of the Spirit of God upon the face of the waters. I say its close, for in immediate succession to this the command was given, and light was created. Here, then, was a deluge, of the universality of which I conclude there can be in the mind of a believer in the Scriptures no doubt whatever. I must presently speak of its removal. But first my few promised words of Hebrew criticism. Had Moses intended to say that when the heavens and the earth were created the earth was without form and void, he would have omitted the substantive verb (and was, יבָּרָם). An
instance of this idiom immediately occurs—"And darkness upon the face of the deep." Had he wished to express the immediate or close connection of such a state with creation, he would have used what may be called the successional or connecting form of the verb 'an; such as is employed throughout the chapter. For instance: "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." No sooner, that is, had the Spirit brooded on the face of the waters, than God said, Let there be light; and no sooner had this command been given than it was obeyed—"He spake; and it was done." Dr. Pusey in a note to his preface on the Book of Daniel very truly observes, "Moses was directed to choose just that idiom which expresses a past time, anterior to what follows, but in no connection of time whatever with what precedes." To this I will only add a single passage, which, when fairly considered, however, is of itself conclusive on the point in question. The Lord Himself speaks thus by Isaiah (xlv. 18), "Thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God Himself that formed the earth and made it, He established it, He created it not in vain, He formed it to be inhabited." The word rendered "in vain" is the "to-hoo" of Genesis i. 2, which fairly expresses desolation. And the plain statement here, so exactly corresponding with all I have previously stated, is this—that the earth did not so proceed in that state of desolation from its Creator's hands. Previous to such a state of things it had fulfilled His purpose. It had been inhabited. For how long a period, I repeat, we are not told. But at length, whether for the sin of its then inhabitants, or for whatever cause, desolation and destruction came upon it. "The earth was (or became) without form and void;" the deep covered it; and darkness was upon the face of these covering waters; until at length, at the close of an unknown period, the earth was restored in the way described (Gen. i.) to light and life, and order and beauty.

And if, in the place of the fable of an original chaos or of theories not less fabulous, this fact of restoration be received, we through it perceive something of what was the previous state of things. At all events, a little reflection will lead us to a very important point in my argument—the sources of the waters which during that deluge so covered the earth. In the work of restoration a firmament is formed to sustain that portion; here styled "the waters that are above the firmament." This, to my mind, especially if taken in connection with the passages from Job, the Proverbs, and the Psalms, points to the previous existence of such a firmament. A portion of those waters had previously been sustained, as sub-
sequently in the atmosphere. And when the period of desolation arrived, the retentive power of that atmosphere being at God's command withdrawn, all of that portion would, in rain and by waterspouts, descend to the earth. Then, as to the waters which after the removal of those above the heavens, still so covered the earth that they stood above the hills, if we only admit that at God's word they were so gathered into one place that the dry land appeared, we can scarcely fail to see that the only place for their so gathering together was not only in seas and oceans, but in recesses of the earth, in deep places beneath mountains and valleys, and it might be beneath the seas themselves. In the elevation of the mountains and the depression of valleys those treasure-houses for the deep were formed. From the position they severally occupy they are two; yet inasmuch as they form one body or mass of waters, they are one. Now, if into such recesses those waters must of necessity at God's bidding have returned, it must have been from them, or from similar recesses within the earth, that when the period of desolation commenced they issued forth. They are clearly the "fountains of the deep" (Prov. viii. 28), which God at the creation strengthened; on which, that is, both previous to the period of desolation and subsequently, He has set bolts and bars of restraint that they turn not again to cover the earth; but on the withdrawal of which "the waters issued forth as out of the womb."

**PART II.**

Before passing on to the second point in my proposition, allow me to summarize what I have thus said on the first. It must be quite evident, I should think, to every one, that in Genesis ii. the sacred writer speaks not of a partial or local deluge, but of one which was universal,—**covering the whole earth.** The same is evident in the words of Psalm civ. 6: "Thou coverest it (the earth) with the deep as with a garment, the waters stood above the mountains." Again, it must be clear that after the removal into the atmosphere of that portion styled "the waters above the firmament," the remaining portion was still sufficient to cover the whole earth. The dry land did not appear until the waters under the heavens were gathered together into one place. And further, we have seen reason to conclude that this one place is partly beneath the surface of the sea, and partly beneath the dry land. Into the recesses and hollows beneath the latter, especially, the
surplus waters were withdrawn—hollows formed by the elevation of mountains and the depression of valleys. And these, whether the same as existed previous to that period, when "the earth was without form and void," or whether then re-arranged, were clearly the sources from which those waters, that then covered the earth, were made at God's command to flow. And who will venture to deny the possibility of the formation of such reservoirs within the globe when first created by God? Or who will assert that a natural law or order is, to infinite skill and power, impossible, according to which, by the earth's revolution on its axis at a certain velocity or at a certain angle, such a mass of waters should be retained in those reservoirs, and by a diminution of that velocity or a change of angle be set loose. For myself, however, I care not to know how or by what means these effects were produced. My one object hitherto has been to establish the fact that the Scriptures quoted declare, that in the several given but undefined periods, the waters of the earth had been so restrained; that they had been so sent forth over the face of the whole earth (Gen. i. 2, 9); and that they had been withdrawn and again restrained (Gen. i. 9–13).

Now in this same Book the inspired writer, in his description of the extent of the Noachian flood, and the depth of its waters, employs language as nearly as possible the same as that in which he and the other inspired writers describe the Pre-Adamite flood. God Himself is stated by him to have spoken to Noah thus: "I will destroy them (men) with the earth." "Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth." ... "For yet seven days and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights." Then, in his narrative of the event so threatened, he employs, with respect to the extent of the Deluge and the depth of its waters, language so distinct and positive as this: "And the flood was forty days upon the earth. And the waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth. And the waters prevailed and were increased greatly upon the earth." And the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered." (Gen. vii. 17–20). Again the withdrawal of the waters is related in such full and particular expressions as these:— "And the waters returned from off the earth continually; and after the end of the hundred and fifty days the waters were abated and the Ark rested in the seventh month on the seventeenth day of the month on the mountains of Ararat. And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month. In the tenth month, on the seventeenth day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen" (Gen. viii. 3–5). Surely
the inundation expressed in these several terms is co-extensive
with that described by the Psalmist in Psalm civ.: “Thou
coveredst it (the earth) with the deep as with a garment;
the waters stood above the hills.” Surely the expressions I
have just now repeated are equivalent to those in Gen. i. 9,—
“Let the waters under the heaven be gathered into one place,
and let the dry land appear.” They are literal and exact,
beyond question, in the one case; and they cannot, with any
consistency, be regarded as figurative or exaggerated in the
other. But further, we learn from the Book of Job
(xxxviii. 8) that the pre-Adamite inundation was occasioned
by the breaking forth of the waters of the earth from
restraint; and to this same restraint they were driven back.
And in the description of the rising and of the abating of the
Noachian Flood, exactly the same ideas are presented to the
mind. The sources from which the waters rise and descend,
and to which they return, are evidently the same. Thus as
to the rising of the waters,—“In the same day were all the
fountains of the great deep broken up and the windows of
heaven opened.” The latter of these, which might be
called the floodgates or the cataracts of heaven, are clearly
the waterspouts, caused by a vast and sudden depression of
the atmosphere, the small drops or globules of vapour flowing
together into a torrent. While “the fountains of the great
deep” are evidently the same as those spoken of by Wisdom
(Prov. viii. 27), which Jehovah strengthened, “when He
established the clouds above, when He set a compass on the
face of the depth and when He prepared the heavens.” They
are the reservoirs in which “He shut up the sea with doors
whon” (on that former occasion) “it brake forth as if it had
issued out of the womb” (Job xxxviii. 8). With this last
passage, expressing, as it does, restoration from a state of
confusion into an original and normal state of order, how
exactly does the language agree in which Moses describes the
cessation of the Flood! (Gen. viii. 2)—“The fountains of the
great deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the
rain from heaven was stayed.”

The whole narrative in the Book of Genesis, in either case,
though brief, yet, when combined with the information
afforded by the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs,
plainly shows that the sources of the two deluges were the
same, viz., the waters sustained in the form of vapour in the
atmosphere and those in the depths of the sea and in the
recesses of the earth; the depth of the covering waters in
both deluges was the same—the highest mountains were
covered; no dry land appeared; and the extent was the
same,—the waters covered the whole earth. And with this, so far as relates to that, with which we are now concerned—the universality of the Noachian Deluge—agree the words of Jehovah by the prophet Isaiah (liv. 6), "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me; for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." The reference here is to Gen. ix. 15: "And I will remember My covenant, which is between Me and you and every living creature of all flesh, and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh." But still more fully and exactly do the words of St. Peter (2 Pet. iii. 5-7) agree with what has been shown, both as to the extent of the Noachian Deluge and in part as to its sources: "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water." Here, as it appears to me, is an evident reference to the formation of the firmament into and above which a portion of the waters was taken up (Gen. i. 6, 7). Then there is a still clearer reference to the gathering together of the waters into one place, so that the dry land appeared (Gen. i. 9, 10). Then it is added, "Whereby," that is, by which water (both that out of which, and that in which, the earth stood), "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." If here the two expressions, "the world" and "the heavens and the earth," be taken together and compared with Gen. vi., vii., viii., they add the strongest testimony to the universality of the Noachian Deluge and of its desolating and destructive power. Both then and on the occasion described in Gen. i. 2, "the earth," because of the waters, "was without form and void." To use the language of a prophet, foretelling the threatened destruction of Tyre (Ezekiel xxvi. 19), when Jehovah brought up the deep upon it and great waters covered it, the earth was made desolate.

The terms again in which the destruction caused by the Noachian Deluge is expressed confirm the view thus taken of those which set forth its extent: "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the
earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark." This follows the statement that "all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered" (Gen. vii. 19, 20). And it is only consistent both with this language and with the fact described, that we should interpret these statements of entire destruction literally. Such interpretation, moreover, is fully confirmed by the two following passages from St. Peter's second Epistle, "And spared not the old world; but spared Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." Again, "The world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The destruction in all these passages is co-extensive with the Deluge. In neither class of passages, whether taken separately or taken together, is there the slightest ground for the limitation of the universality of the expressions employed.

PART III.

It will doubtless have been observed that my argument has been limited to the extent of the two deluges, to the sources or reservoirs of their waters, and to the destruction of life occasioned by the latter. No allusion has been made to the Scripture statements respecting the extent to which animal life is stated by Moses to have been preserved from that destruction. I have considered that these two questions of universality demand a separate investigation. Difficulties which, when confusedly thrown together, appear impossibilities, will generally be overcome if disentangled and taken in detail. If the Scriptures be correct and true in the record of the Deluge, they cannot contain impossibilities in the narrative of the Ark. That which I have shown to be the correct view of the Scripture statements respecting creation, and respecting these two deluges, is a sufficient reply to all objections against the Scripture narrative drawn from the vast periods of time required both for the formation of the various strata in the crust of the earth, and for various and successive disruptions and upheavings. In the period, illimitable by us, between the act of creation and the occasion of the earth becoming without form and void, and again in the undefined duration of that state of convulsion, there surely is ample space for the production of all those phenomena. And more than this. In the record of two deluges, occurring at the nearer approach to us of a succession of countless ages, we may see, as it seems to me, the probability of a vast series of such convulsions.
occurring in an appointed order. We may thus see the probability (which, to the believer in the inspiration of Scripture, becomes a certainty) that the vast upheavings of the Alps, the Andes, and the Himalayas, for instance, occurred not confusedly nor by chance, nor by undirected force, but according to law and order, instituted by the Eternal, the Omniscient, the Almighty God. And is it to wander too far into the region of conjecture to suppose that in the chemical action, in the flowing, and in the vast power of the subterranean waters, so revealed to us in Scripture, may be seen the true explanation of many a natural phenomenon? Is it not in them that we are to find the true laboratory in which our limestone rocks and our deeply mysterious chalk cliffs were formed? Can we not see in them the sources of fresh springs and salt springs; and, when they come into close contact with the masses of fire within the earth, can we not see the sources of hot springs and the origin of salt rocks? Once more, may we not, in time, be able to trace to them the cause of that gradual upheaving of the earth's surface, often as mysterious as sudden disruption?

But I must check myself, and turn to the question before me, the extent to which in the Ark life was preserved. I would not on any account close my eyes to the geological truth that in far-distant periods the distribution of animal life was similar to that now existing. Nor would I evade the question: "Does Moses, in his statement that every kind of beast and bird and fowl and creeping thing was taken into the Ark by Noah, include the creatures indigenous to New Zealand and Australia and America? You take the expressions literally, which set forth the universality of the Deluge; do you put no limit on these?" And in reply to this I would first observe that, from the dimensions of the Ark and from the exact detail of the narrative, the number and variety of creatures must have been very great. Then, having myself assuredly gathered from the Scriptures that man was created not a savage, but a civilized being, and seeing unmistakable indications of a high state of civilization and of a very large population in the old world, I can see no difficulty in such a gathering having been effected during a period of 120 years, and by one, who must have possessed vast influence of a certain kind, and no little wealth.

The observation, however, often loosely made, is strictly true, that a limitation must not unfrequently be placed on these universal expressions of Scripture, such as "all men," "every man," "the world," &c. Such limitation, however, is to be set not by the science, the reasoning, the fancy, nor the fears of unin-
spired men, but by the inspired authors themselves; and it is to be gathered from a fair consideration of the passage in question, or from a fair comparison of Scripture with Scripture. Here is an instance: St. John says of Christ, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." No expression could be more universal. Yet in the very same chapter he says: "The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not;" thus excluding many from the possession of that light. And afterwards the Lord Jesus Himself says, "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in Me should not abide in darkness;" thus limiting the gift to believers.

In the same manner the language of Moses, taken by itself, is thus full and universal: "Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of everything that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two unto Noah into the Ark, the male and female, as God had commanded Noah" (Gen. vii. 8, 9). And of this apparent universality some have attempted to prove the possibility, and some the impossibility. On a little consideration, however, a limitation is evidently placed on it by the inspired writer himself. For, first, the distinction between clean and unclean beasts seems to point to those animals of the earth, amongst which he knew such a distinction to have been instituted by God. And in neither class, in the full directions subsequently given to Moses, do we find either the kangaroo or the ant-eater,—creatures which have presented to many minds such mountains of difficulty.

The clue to the difficulty, however, appears to me to be here. We must take together the numbers of each kind of bird or beast to be preserved, and the directions for the provision of food for these creatures during a whole year. The numbers were fourteen of each clean, and two of each unclean kind. The provision is thus stated:—"And take thou unto thee of all food that is eaten; and thou shalt gather it unto thee, and it shall be for food for thee and for them." Now in the first place, animal food does not appear to have been permitted to man previous to the Flood; and in the next place there is here evidently no provision for carnivorous creatures. The fourteen clean beasts and the two unclean, would not have satisfied the carnivorous animals during a whole year. Besides, these were not intended for food for them, but to keep seed alive on the earth. If, then, food was required and food was provided for all, and for carnivorous animals none was provided, a limitation to this extent is at once set on the universality of the expression: such animals
were not included in the Ark. And if a limitation thus far be evident, then if we take into account the distinction between the clean and the unclean, there is no difficulty in the exclusion of creatures inhabiting the remote parts of the earth. There is nothing unscriptural in limiting the beasts and birds and creeping things admitted into the Ark to those inhabiting that portion of the earth in which Noah dwelt before the Flood, and to which the Ark would for that reason return. We may limit them still further to such among these, as not only for sacrifice or for food or as beasts of burden, but in the variety of God's providential arrangements are serviceable to man. Such a limitation is consistent both with the narrative and with the general usage of Scripture. The limitation of the Deluge to only a portion of the earth is consistent with neither.

But if, then, a vast number of animals had no representatives in the Ark, by which their several species might be continued on the earth, in what way are we to account for their subsequent existence? I reply that almost every kind of fish, through the mingling of the salt and fresh waters, must have died. Every kind of tree also and plant, "whose seed was in itself upon the earth," must have been destroyed. In these cases, then, there must have been, after the subsidence of the waters, reproduction, or restoration of life, with perhaps some modifications. According to the Scriptures, there was creation after the pre-Adamite deluge. What is there in Scripture to contradict the idea of something similar to a certain extent after the Noachian Deluge? I can see nothing; while the several considerations above adduced tend greatly to support it.

To that support, although my paper has already been too long, I must venture to add another, inasmuch as it in my opinion greatly confirms not only this last, but most of the details which I have given of the brief Scripture history of the Creation and of the pre-Adamite and Noachian Deluges. It is that which is to be drawn from the clearly-connected typical teaching, afforded by those several details in that connection with each other, in which I have shown that they stand. Such teaching, set forth by inspired Apostles, and held with varying clearness and correctness in every age of the Church, differs from that of mere figure, or fable, or miracle, in that it rests on reality and fact, whether of person, or event, or course of events, or of divinely-appointed rite and ceremony. It is to be discovered also in such facts and realities, not by hasty guesses nor by efforts of the imagination, but either through direct Scripture revelation, or by a careful comparison of any
type or course of typical teaching with the analogy of Christian doctrine. Whenever the teaching is correct and true, it fits in with an exactness which cannot be accidental. And when faith and intelligence are thus satisfied, the fullest confirmation is afforded both to the truth and reality of the type and to the truth and reality of that which is typified. There is in it all that force of undesigned coincidence which forbids the idea of chance, or of unreality, or of untruth.

Thus, then, runs the parallel. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth: a perfect work. He created man upright in His own image: a perfect work also. After a time the earth fell into a state of desolation and darkness and death. From his state of uprightness man fell into a state termed a "death of trespasses and sins." Darkness filled every soul. "Darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people," "Death reigned over all."

The state of desolation and darkness was closed by the Spirit of God moving upon or brooding over the face of the waters. And none can enter into the kingdom of God,—none, that is, can pass from death unto life, except he be born again of water and of the Spirit.

The imparting of the life-giving energy of the Spirit of God was immediately followed by the command, "Let there be light." And that was no sooner given than "light was." St. Paul, pointing to this very fact, says,—"God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give us the light of the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

In that restoration of the earth God did not entirely dispel the darkness. With the light of day the darkness of night continued to alternate. So in the regenerate and enlightened soul the heart is renewed, but corruption remains; and the darkness of doubt will ever mingle with the light of faith.

I might easily follow the particulars of these types through the whole history of the restoration of the earth, and in that of the creation of man as it is contained in the first two chapters of Genesis. But I must pass on to one or two of the instances of this teaching in the narrative of the Noachian Deluge. This in the Scriptures is clearly regarded as a type of the coming destruction of the earth by fire. Now, into the Ark, prepared by the believing patriarch, he and his family were received, and, together with the clean and unclean animals, gathered there by them, were saved.

The Holy Spirit taught St. Peter (Acts x.) that the gathering together of all manner of clean and unclean animals (limited however to such, be it observed, as he might kill and
eat) typified the union of both Jews and Gentiles within the Church of Christ. Can there, then, be anything strained in the idea that in the Ark and its inmates are typified Christ and His Church, or the company of believing people gathered from Jew and Gentile alike?

According to the view which I have stated above, no lion nor any ravenous beast was admitted into the Ark. Such animals are elsewhere used as figures of the enemies of God. Accordingly we find it written that “no murderer hath eternal life;” “the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”

In the universal destruction of all living creatures not admitted into the Ark may clearly be seen the death, both spiritual and literal, which through the entrance of sin into the world has passed upon all men. “In Adam all die.” And in that reproduction or renewal of vegetable and animal life, including the carnivora, what a picture-prophecy (for such a type is) may be seen of the resurrection both of the just and also of the unjust!

Now these are only a very few specimens from a certain stratum of Divine truth. But few as they are, they of themselves utter a voice far clearer than may be gathered from specimens from a literal rock as to probable facts and probable periods. Connect them however with similar specimens from the same stratum, and extend here your analogical reasoning, as you do with respect to geological formations; add to it moreover (as in geology you cannot) the few clear facts of history, and you get, as I just now stated, both as to the fact or facts which typify, and the truths and events typified, instead of mere probability and theory, positive, certain truth.

The Chairman.—I am sure we shall all be glad to return our thanks to Mr. Moule for his very remarkable paper, which I hope will lead to a good discussion. We must all feel indebted to him for the great care with which he has collected together passages of Scripture of the greatest possible importance on this subject. I now invite discussion.

Rev. J. H. Truscott.—I have heard Mr. Moule’s paper with considerable interest, and though I cannot say that I agree with it in the main, yet, for that very reason I wish to offer a few remarks upon it by way of opening the discussion. It appears to me that while there is much that is valuable in the line of thought through which he has passed our minds yet still there is much which leaves room for divergence of opinion, both from a scientific and a religious point of view. Speaking of the paper generally, I would say that its science is founded upon theology, which I think is always more or less a mistake; while its theology, so far as it bears upon science, is founded upon private interpretations of Scripture— at least, so it seems to me. With reference to the first part of the paper, as to the universality of some
primeval and pre-Adamic deluge, there would be no difficulty in allowing twenty of such deluges in those geological epochs within that portion of illimitable time which Mr. Moule has called attention to. The cataclysms and vast changes upon the earth in those geological epochs are probably beyond dispute, and therefore that that which is depicted in the 2nd verse of the first chapter of Genesis should have been pointedly referred to by the Divine penman, Moses, as that which preceded the six days of creation, is not to be wondered at. But I cannot help thinking that the passages from the Book of Job and the Psalms are rather hardly pressed. Viewed as a matter of scholastic and theological interpretation, there is too much hard pressing of poetry and metaphor into scientific and dogmatic statement in Mr. Moule's paper. I do not know whether you felt this generally, but it seemed to me that a rather rigid pressure was put on the poetic inspiration of Job and David in these Divine records, and that they were being pressed scientifically beyond their proper scope. But I will pass now to another point. I, for one, have long been impressed with the conviction, apart from the scientific merits of the question, that the Scriptures do not require us to believe in the universality of the Noachian deluge. I cannot see any weight in the arguments which have been brought forward upon that point. Those arguments have been brought before us over and over again, but I must confess that the calmest and most reverential investigation of the Word of God—and I speak as a clergyman—leads me to an opposite view. I cannot but remember that passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, in which St. Paul uses language in every respect as full and unreserved and unlimited as Moses, when he says, "The Gospel was preached to every creature under the whole Heaven." Just in the same way we are told that the mountains under the whole of the heavens were covered with water. We must take it that the language of the Scriptures is often only partial and limited in its application, and there is not the slightest irreverence in taking it so. I will not refer to that other text which declares that all the world went up to be taxed, because that one from the Epistle to the Colossians is unanswerable, both showing that from the New Testament point of view there was the same line of thought prevailing as in the Old Testament. If science tells me that the Deluge was not universal, still I maintain that the Word of God is as inspired and as true and as accurate as ever to my mind. When we speak of things universal, but limit them to special circumstances, our words have no longer that wide signification which originally belonged to them. Even Stillingfleet, 200 years ago, and in an age long before theology was invaded by the theories which we have now, said distinctly in his Origines Sacrae, that he believed that the Deluge was not universal, and his argument was this:—(to the Chairman) I see you have Stillingfleet there, and I am quite willing to be brought to book for what I say, though it is many years since I read him; his argument was this—that it is in the nature of God's attributes and God's moral government, not only never to work a miracle without necessity, but never, as a God of love and benevolence, to destroy life without necessity. Therefore Stillingfleet says that as in all probability the human
population of the globe was not co-extensive with the surface of the globe at that period, and as the Deluge was instituted simply for the purpose of destroying mankind, it follows that those portions of the entire creation which were outlying the area occupied by men would not be destroyed, on the principle of Divine beneficence, if it could be avoided; and that the idea of a perpetual succession of miracles so enormous as those which must be demanded by a universal deluge (and geology has proved them still greater than they were thought to be in the days of Stillingfleet), made the universality of the Deluge a thing which was thoroughly improbable. Now, if Stillingfleet held that view, and if science and geology in our own day confirm it, and if such good Christian men and able authorities as Dr. Pye Smith and others hold it, there can be no objection to our holding it. Then there is another topic upon which Mr. Moule has touched with regard to the animals within the Ark. I think myself that according to the Mosaic theory the polar bears would be unclean animals. It has been very properly pointed out that it would have required a vast number of years to gather animals from every part of the world into the Ark, but much less time would be necessary to collect animals from a small geographical area; and, in my view, all that the story goes to show is, that the animals preserved in the Ark were only those which belonged to the district over which the Deluge extended. The whole of the argument is lost and obliterated if we do not suppose that all the animals within the area of the Deluge were preserved by twos or by sevens, clean and unclean, for the purpose of preserving them; and that order was clearly given by God to avoid the necessity of a second creation. Mr. Moule's paper, however, seems to imply that that was not so, and that there was a gigantic re-creation of the animals which were submerged and destroyed, and that the only reason for some of them being put in the Ark was that they might be preserved for sacrifice and food during the continuance of the Flood—

Rev. H. Moule.—No, no.

The Chairman.—Mr. Moule said nothing of that sort.

Mr. Titcomb.—Then that is my mistake. It would be unfair to press the argument about such a series of stupendous miracles, and the polar bears being kept in the Ark, if Mr. Moule opposes the notion that they were brought in; but I think the whole bearing of the narrative is that the animals were taken into the Ark to preserve them, because otherwise they would have been destroyed. It seems to imply that as all mankind were destroyed so all beasts were destroyed, and that as man was taken into the Ark as a type of his race for preservation and reproduction, so twos and sevens of the animals were taken in as types of their races for the same purpose, and to avoid the necessity for re-creation. The theory of new creations is one upon which Scripture is utterly silent, and we might almost appear to be irreverent to the word of God by believing in it.

Mr. Reddie.—There are one or two obscurities in this paper which I should like to have explained. The first is Mr. Moule's theory of a previous creation before the creation of light. I cannot understand how the world could be
anything else than "without form and void," when without light, and without
the created beings which the author assumes are included in the words, "in
the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." He says that that
includes all created beings, and even including men, as I understand him;
but he afterwards speaks of the creation of light subsequent to the destruction
of that world. But how can he realize a living world existing in total
darkness? What created beings could live in it? Some explanation on
that point seems required to enable us even to understand the theory he
holds. With regard to the meaning of the words thohu and bohu, we have
had that question discussed on two occasions before. In the 10th number of
our Journal of Transactions we find Mr. Warington objecting to the rendering
put forward in Dr. Baylee's paper "On the Nature of Human Language."
Mr. Warington, alluding to a passage in Isaiah, says:

"In Isaiah the usage of the word thohu differs considerably, and looking
through the latter half of the prophecy of Isaiah, which some think is by a
different hand, I find six places in which thohu is used as meaning simply
nothing,—nothingness, without the slightest trace of ruin. It also means
empty, worthless."

On a more recent occasion, when Mr. Warington read his own very interest­ing
paper "On the Biblical Cosmogony," he quoted, oddly enough, that
very rendering given by Dr. Pusey in the preface to his work on the
prophet Daniel; but it seems now as if we shall require to have not only an
interpretation of Scripture, but an interpretation of Scripture interpreters!
for Mr. Warington makes the words of Dr. Pusey to signify exactly the
opposite to what Mr. Moule gives us as his reading of them. I rather think
Mr. Warington's interpretation of the words is the sound one. But it is
difficult to criticise the verbal accuracy of a paper when we have not that
paper in print before us, owing, in this instance, to the fact that Mr. Moule
was rather pressed for time, so that we could not have it printed this evening.
Then, with regard to the supposed agreement with Mr. Moule's theory, of
the allusions to the covering of the earth with the waters in the Psalms, in
the Book of Job, and elsewhere, I think it is very likely that the language
agrees perfectly with the description of a universal flood, because I think
they do most probably allude to the flood of Noah, and not to any imagined
previous deluge. I think that most people would be startled to find that
more floods than one are spoken of in the Scriptures. Another weak point in
the paper is that many of Mr. Moule's arguments rest on mere verbal expres­sions; as, for instance, where he considers that the words, "the heavens and
the earth," do not include the water. If you consider that the words,
"God created the heavens and the earth," in the first verse of Genesis, did
not include the waters in a separate condition, as they now are in, but that
the earth and waters were then in a state of mixture and confusion before
ever being separated, or the earth as covered with the water, the whole is
clear, and this new theory of a former flood disappears. Observe, too, there
is no creation of the waters recorded at all, if "the earth" merely means the
dry land, and not land and water in a state of chaos. I contend that the most obvious meaning is the most probable and accurate one. The "heavens" refers to the sky and all beyond, and "the earth" to the earth and waters together; and darkness then "was on the face of the deep." In confirmation of this, the context tells us of no creation of water afterwards, but only of "the waters" (assumed to exist) being gathered together in one place, so that the dry land, formerly covered or moist, then should appear. The world also was created, as a whole, in its elements and principles, but not in form—though of course it must have had some shape—for there could be no form in darkness. If you get rid of light, you get rid of "form" at once. I approach a discussion of an exegetical kind with some reluctance, both because I do not like much exegesis in our papers, and because I would fain speak with great deference in the presence of the clergy and of the author of the paper before us. But I am obliged to say that the very terms in which the Flood is first spoken of, "And behold I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth," seem to me to indicate that that was the first time this had been done, and that it was not a second flood. The second would have been as nothing to the first that took place, and still less to the series of floods which Mr. Moule seems to think occurred. I shall not, however, take up with that theory until I find that geology has given us substantial ground for holding it. With regard to the universality of the Noachian flood, there are, no doubt, great difficulties about it; and I must even say that I would much rather adopt the theory of a partial flood than the theory of Mr. Moule. I do not understand how any one can bring himself to believe that since the flood of Noah there has been a creation of wild beasts and other creatures; and indeed it is rather contrary to the whole theory and tone of Mr. Moule's paper to suppose that wild beasts could have been created as such. I prefer to hold what appears to be the more Scriptural view, that a state of savagery or wildness was introduced among the animals as a consequence of the fall. That much more accords with the theory of the creation and the fall of man, and the renewing of the earth and the restoring of man through Christ. We have St. Paul's allusion to "the whole creation groaning and travailing together in pain," evidently as a consequence of the fall. But we must take up that question hereafter, when we have a paper in reference to it, for it will not do to touch it merely incidentally. But there are great difficulties in dealing with a theory so perfectly novel as the one now before us; for this is the first time I ever heard of the waters covering the face of the earth being translated into meaning that there had been a previous deluge in a world of total darkness. The paper must be further considered carefully after we have the whole of the arguments before us in print, which I regret was not possible to-night.

Rev. C. A. Row.—I will not trespass long upon the meeting; but inasmuch as this paper is eminently theological, I cannot help expressing an opinion upon it. I think that as a mode of interpreting the holy Scriptures, it will hardly be supported by one theologian out of a hundred. The principles of interpretation which it puts forward are, I think, exceedingly dangerous
principles, and they seem to assume one particular mode of inspiration. The paper not being printed, and therefore not having read it beforehand, however, the fault may be mine; but as far as I have been able to follow it, I think its principles of interpretation are exceedingly dangerous. It mixes up one portion of the Scriptures with another, taking one passage from the Psalms, another from the Pentateuch, another from the New Testament, and so on. Mr. Reddie has referred to a passage in the New Testament which shows how difficult it is to attempt to analyze and make a careful exegesis. There are many eminent theologians who hold that the term “whole creation” in that passage applies only to the human race. Then take St. Peter, and his reference to the “whole world.” If we take the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, there is no doubt that the term “world” very frequently is applied in a decidedly limited sense. Mr. Titcomb quoted one remarkable instance; and St. Paul told the Romans that their faith was heard throughout the whole world. But does any one tell me that in the year 58 the faith of the Christian Church was heard throughout the whole world? I think that to set up such an interpretation, so largely based upon theory, unless there is the strongest necessity on Scriptural grounds for it, is a very dangerous proceeding; and, according to my view, it is far more likely to produce disbelief in the inspiration of the Scriptures than anything else. I therefore decidedly object to such a course. Then another serious question for us to consider is, the great and serious multiplication of miracles which it involves. Any one who knows the difficulties of the subject will admit that we should be very careful in ascribing miracles where the Scriptures do not positively say that they have been performed. There cannot be a doubt, as I said once before, that the New Testament does show a great economy of miracles; and I cannot see what grounds I have, in order to support a theory of my own, for calling in an indefinite number of miracles, and palms them off on either the New or the Old Testament. I read a large number of rationalistic and infidel works, and there is nothing more dangerous, with regard to the spread of such literature and such opinions, than the needless calling in of miracles in places where the Scriptures do not expressly mention them. I would not even hint at miracles unless the Scriptures made it absolutely necessary; and I would not assume them where the Scriptures say nothing whatever upon the subject.

The CHAIRMAN.—In summing up this discussion, I can only say that I differ altogether from the first part of the paper, but I agree entirely with the universality of the waters covering the earth. Every scientific fact points to that great truth: that which is described in Scripture is also marked on God’s works in the earth. I cannot see any foundation from what we read in the records furnished by our geological strata for those frequent deluges or creations which was the favourite theory of a few years back, but which the progress of science is now eliminating from science in the opinions of the men who themselves brought it forward as once the most probable theory of the earth’s history; but, setting that aside, I cannot help feeling that I thoroughly sympathize with Mr. Moule in his assertion.
of the universality of the Noachian deluge. The more we consider true science, and the more fairly we interpret Scripture, the more we must be brought to the conclusion that the Noachian deluge was universal. In the first place, all theologians are agreed on one point, that the Deluge was as universal as the human race. No fair interpretation which you can give to the New Testament, and no fair interpretation which you can place upon the Old Testament, will lead you to any other doctrine than the universality of the destruction of the human race with the exception of Noah and his family. Now if you admit that the passages which you take from the Holy Scriptures prove the universality of the destruction of the human race, with the exception of those eight who survived in the Ark,—if you take the Holy Scriptures as bearing the interpretation of universality of that,—I claim the same universality of interpretation as to what is said to be the destruction of all flesh upon the earth. If you give a universal interpretation to the one, I think you are bound to give the same interpretation to the other; and if you talk of universality of the destruction of the human race, I believe you must at the same time admit the universality of the Deluge over the whole earth. In this way you get rid of all difficulty of exegesis and of interpretation by comparing other passages of Scripture where similar universal terms are used, but where the facts are so narrowed or where they are used in such a connection you cannot give a universal interpretation to them. But I would point out a great theological difficulty into which such an interpretation as that of Mr. Titcomb would lead us. If I am to say that the terms describing the destruction of all flesh are not universal, I must apply the same interpretation to the destruction of the human race. In that case we should have no answer to such a paper as the last one which was read in the Institute, and which received very little countenance from our members. I do not see how you are to answer those men who maintain the plurality of the human race, or how are you to maintain the universality of the destruction of the human race, if you are to use such an interpretation as this? You may then admit hundreds of other races besides the Adamic race; and when the authors of the New Testament speak of the universality of the destruction of the human race, you may place just such an interpretation upon that as leads you to interpret a partial deluge of the earth. Now let us go to the real facts—

Mr. Reddie.—Will you be good enough to explain why you maintain this ground? The human race were created in only one place or centre, whereas the animals, I suppose, were “brought forth” all over the world. I only ask for argument’s sake, but why do you object to a deluge that would be universal as regards the human race, but which might not spread to Australia or to other countries where there were then no human beings? Why do you object to this—on your theory of the creation, I mean?

The Chairman.—I think that that is sufficiently clear in that portion of Stilllingfleet where he maintains that it is not necessary to believe in a universal deluge. He meets that position by limiting the language of Scripture when it speaks of the destruction of all flesh on the earth. He says:
"I cannot see any urgent necessity from Scripture to assert that the Flood did spread itself over all the surface of the earth. That all mankind (those in the Ark excepted) were destroyed by it, is most certain according to the Scriptures. When the occasion of the Flood is thus expressed:—'And God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth.'"

But that is not Stillingfleet's view; he merely puts it as an assumption. He says that it is "not necessary" to maintain a universal deluge; but upon this theory of a partial deluge he says, it would be sufficient for Scripture if you destroy, not Palestine only, but the whole continent of Asia. That is his point, and he puts a limited interpretation upon the words, remarking:—

"For it is said that all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle and of beast and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man."

And then he proceeds to show that that might have applied only to that part of the earth which men inhabited. But when you give a universal interpretation to every man, why do you limit it in the case of the other animals? I now go to what I consider to be the patent facts of science, and what are they? It is admitted that there is no mountain so high upon the earth that it does not contain evidence of having once been under water. That much is admitted. I will not say what are the different theories which have been attempted to be set up to account for this. I only deal with the facts, not with interpretations. We are told that we must not multiply miracles. Well, but what is a miracle? We put our own interpretation upon the word miracle, but when we get to the Bible that has a very different interpretation. A miracle is a work of God, and as much a part of God's law as any other work of creation. Man's very existence or vitality and God's keeping all things in the order in which they are kept are as much miracles as anything else——

Mr. Reddie.—No, no.

The Chairman.—A different kind of miracle, I grant you (hear, hear), but still a miracle. I say that science also comes in with its miracles, and requires as much from our faith as anything contained in the Bible. Look at the electric telegraph: is not that a great miracle? You suppose that all Europe was once at the bottom of a very deep sea, and then, by some means or other, was raised again to the top and was depressed again, and so on; and if you multiply these things and believe the miracles of science, are you to have any difficulty in believing that one miracle which the Bible shows in the universality of the Noachian deluge? We have had a reference made to Dr. Pye Smith and his views. But why did he object to a universal deluge? Because he thought there was not water enough to cover the whole earth. But when he put forward that theory we had not plumbed the depth of our oceans. He did not know that they were far deeper than the height of our
highest mountains. The Bible does not tell you that the Deluge was a miracle in a limited sense, but that it was God's work of destruction, like the curse that came upon the earth for man's sake. Was that great curse universal, or only partial, which came on account of man's disobedience? Did Australia or America escape? If you admit the universality of that first curse, what difficulty can you have in admitting the universality of that judgment or second curse? But let us come to what science shows us. I do not go into the scientific hypotheses, explaining the changes that have taken place—the great upheavals and depressions; but we can tell something of the terrific forces chained up in the depths of the earth. Look at the islands of the Azores. When you see those islands raised above the sea, and when you plumb the depths of the ocean, you may well ask what force and what power raised them up. What force and what power was that which even Darwin himself admits lifted up the Andes and 2,000 miles of land, not by a gradual process extending over 3,000 years, but in the course of one earthquake, and lifted them up eight feet? We find there are forces in nature quite capable of doing that which science tells us of, in showing that the Andes and the Himalayas were once under water and are now above it. But science has failed to give us any satisfactory reason for their present position, unless you admit such a miracle and work of God as is implied in a universal deluge. Let us go to another fact. There is the science of ethnology, which teaches us that if you take the past history and tradition of mankind, they show that the human race everywhere have had impressed on them the tradition of a flood, universal so far as mankind were concerned. Tylor, in his History of Civilization, attempts to account in one way for the universality of that tradition by the fact of the people finding shells on the tops of their mountains. But examine their histories and traditions, and see how precisely they agree with the inspired record. See how Mexico gives you the tradition of a bird bearing a branch across the waters. All these things are impressed in a marvellous way upon the different peoples, and they corroborate each other in a marvellous way. I maintain that all true science—the science of history, the science of the natural history of mankind, the science of human tradition so far as it can be interpreted, and the science of geology in its true sense as the words spoken to us by the rocks of the earth—these things all bear testimony to a universal deluge—

Mr. Reddie.—But it will not do merely to say that the rocks have been covered with water, because they bear testimony that they were formed in water as strata. It will not do, therefore, to say merely that they have once been "covered" with water; and I feel so much the value of your remarks, that I should like you to be quite clear upon the grounds of your argument.

The Chairman.—But that is in my favour. No one will deny that the cretaceous strata and the nummulitic rocks of Egypt were under water. It is for you to account, if you can, for their being brought up without such force as would be sufficient to produce a deluge——

Mr. Titcomb.—I cannot but call attention to what our Chairman has said concerning the universal traditions of the Deluge. I have collected 200 or
300 of them, and know them thoroughly well, and I can confirm all he has said. They exist with such minuteness of variation and with such circumstantiality of agreement, that they are really wonderful. But, cui bono the argument? It has no bearing on the question at all. These things can be accounted for from the facts of the case—that the eight souls who were saved as the originators of the new race went north, south, east, and west, and circulated the tradition of those records; and those records are the traditions of the family of eight, and are not to be accounted for in any other way.

Mr. Reddie.—They certainly could not have been the traditions of the drowned inhabitants of the world. (Laughter.)

The Chairman.—The first part of my argument was that the terms of Genesis implied the universality of the destruction of the human race, and now I say that they also maintain the universality of the destruction of all living things in the same passage. When you interpret the destruction of all living things partially, then I say that others have a right to interpret the destruction of the human race partially—

Mr. Titcomb.—That is not the point. You say that everybody in all parts of the earth had an evidence of the universality of the Flood from local facts instead of from tradition.

The Chairman.—You misunderstand me altogether. Tylor said that in his History of Civilization, and I was combating his views. Tylor attempted to account for the universality of the tradition, not from the universality of the destruction of the human race; but not admitting that at all, he thought the human race got that tradition from the universality of the local evidences of the Deluge, showing that all parts of the earth had been under water. I combated that by adducing what you have confirmed, that the traditions of the human race were so peculiar, and agreed, in the midst of certain diversities, so thoroughly in the main with what is stated in the Bible, as to prove that they all came from one central source. That was my point—

Mr. Titcomb.—But that does not confirm your argument.

The Chairman.—Yes, in a certain sense it does. I now claim that, having shown the universality of the destruction of the human race, Tylor’s argument entirely falls to the ground; and I now further claim the testimony of the rocks as to the universality of the Deluge—

Rev. E. Henslow.—It seems to me that if the rocks prove the universality of the Deluge, you confuse the element of time, because the rocks are of different epochs.

The Chairman.—I say that the progress of modern science is going to sweep these epochs away. I do not believe in them. Even Professor Huxley is beginning to find that the rocks give a very different testimony to what was supposed when men held the theory of a succession of creations. One of the very last things I heard from Professor Huxley at the Geological Society was in opposition to that theory; and he said that in the lowest rocks, and in the Silurian system, you might find as great a variety and as high a development as at the present time, for any evidence you have to the contrary. But now I want to show how dangerous it is to quote from memory. Stillingfleet
takes hold of a certain objection urged against a universal flood, and goes on to say:—

"The only ground of questioning the possibility of such a flood as that which is related in Scripture hath been from hence: that some have supposed it impossible that all the water which is contained in the air, supposing it to fall down, should raise the surface of water upon the earth a foot and a half in height; so that either new waters must be created to overflow the earth, or else there must be supposed a rarefaction of the water contained in the sea and all rivers, so that it must take up at least fifteen times the space that now it doth; but then, they say, if the water had been thus rarefied, it could neither have destroyed man nor beast, neither could Noah's ark have been borne up by it any more than by liquid air. To this, therefore, I answer: first, I cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture to assert that the flood did spread itself over all the earth; that all mankind (those in the ark excepted) were destroyed by it is most certain according to the Scriptures, when the occasion of the flood is thus expressed: 'And God saw that the wickedness of man,' &c."

Then he takes the destruction of animals, and says you have no necessity to admit more than that; and then he goes on:—

"Secondly, suppose the flood to have been over the whole globe of the earth, yet there might have been water enough to have overwhelmed it to the height mentioned in Scripture."

And he goes on to show what are the arguments which prove that that was possible. But a little further on he says:—

"I come now, therefore, to the evidence of the truth and certainty—"


"Of this universal deluge, of which we have most clear and concurring testimonies of most ancient nations of the world."—

Mr. Titcomb.—Universal as regards man.

The Chairman.—No; as regards the destruction of all the animals. He says: "I am not afraid of admitting a universal deluge, though I can make you a present of a partial deluge if you like"; and he then goes on to show the evidence upon which he rests his case. Now that shows the difficulty which often arises in partial quotations. But Mr. Henslow has reminded me that I am not following the text-books of geology as regards this matter. I know I am not; but everybody knows that geology has completely outstripped its text-books. Any man who denied that would be laughed at as a man far behind his age. The text-books do not now come up to the theories maintained by the great authorities in the Geological Society, who do not see any necessity for admitting these successive creations. I think that when we begin to understand these things more we shall find that old Dr. Cockburn was not so far wrong as a scientific man when he maintained that all the phenomena presented to us by the strata might be perfectly accounted for by a universal deluge. I do not agree with Mr. Moule that he has proved the
existence of a pre-Adamite flood; indeed I do not think that that is at all necessary. You might call that multiplying miracles. But if we consider this subject, we find traces in the Holy Scriptures of a great curse falling on the earth. We find that when man fell, that creation which had been declared by God to be very good—the animals and trees which He had created perfect—received a curse for man. The earth was cursed for man's sake. Who can tell what cataclysms or terrific events were connected with that curse when man was turned out of Paradise? But we have Scripture telling us of another curse. The earth was polluted by man far more than when Adam and Eve sinned and were cast out of Paradise. There is some mysterious union between man and the inferior creatures; and that curse was so great from man's vileness that God in His wisdom allowed it to extend over the whole of creation, except those beings whom He saved in the Ark. But one thing has been lost sight of in these controversies with regard to not having a universal destruction of all living things. If we are to take a partial deluge, and only to submerge Asia, according to the principle which Stillingfleet mentions, where was the necessity for having such a number of animals in the Ark? Where was the necessity for having an ark of such dimensions? All the provision that would have been required was, that there should have been enough to sustain Noah and his family until the Ark was carried to those portions which were not submerged, and which would have been well supplied with animals and foliage. There was no necessity for the saving of such a number of animals. We are told that we must not multiply miracles, and that Scripture is provident of them. Now I deny that. It is true in some portions of the history you go over long epochs and periods without a miracle; but you come then to a break, and then there is a prodigality of miracles. It must have been a miracle in a universal deluge, or even in a deluge which extended only to Asia, which sustained the Ark on the water in the midst of such a terrific conflict. Submerge Asia now, if you could do it, and would not that produce a universal deluge? We know what a sweeping deluge took place as the result of one little earthquake; what, then, would be the effect of submerging a whole continent? It is said that the Scriptures are so very provident of miracles, but just take the instance of the children of Israel in their passage from Egypt to the land of promise. Was there not a prodigality of miracles in the deliverance of those people? Would not one sign have been enough? Why did He multiply them if He is to be provident of miracles? But no; He determined to give the people such evidence of His power that they should not resist the belief or knowledge of that power of the One True God. Why did He lead His people through the Red Sea? He could have carried them into the desert without that. Where was the necessity for such a miracle, if the Scriptures are provident of miracles? Why were the children of Israel condemned to wander forty years in the desert? Why were they not taken into a country where they could have grown their own corn? Why were they fed with manna—angels' food? Why did the fall of manna take place on every day except the Sabbath for forty years, and why
was there a continual miracle in the cessation of the fall of manna on the seventh day? Come down to the time of our blessed Lord. How very few were the miracles throughout the prophetic period! Our blessed Lord Himself refers to that—to the one leper who was cleansed, and the one widow sustained. But was our blessed Lord cautious or sparing in the working of miracles? Were not His miracles of a character calculated to strike awe and reverence over all the world? But where was the necessity for such a miracle as cursing the barren fig-tree, and causing it to wither away? If your view is correct, no miracle should be wrought except for some high and extraordinary purpose! But the taking away of one or two miracles will not satisfy the sceptical spirit of the age. The men who object to one or two miracles deny the existence of miracles at all. They feel that if they admit one they might admit thousands. Take the Biblical account of the collection of the animals into the Ark. Was there no miracle in bringing all the clean and unclean animals together into the Ark? Do you suppose Noah went to bring them together—to tame all the wild animals and bring them in? We do not know enough of science to say that the animals which were taken into the Ark were not capable of producing all the varieties that we see now upon the earth, and to a certain limited extent I would go with Darwin's theory. We know man's power of multiplying apparent species—I do not say real species—and producing varieties of dogs, horses, pigeons, and other animals; but we do not know enough of the limitation of the law. We find that there is a law limiting variation in the propagation of animals, but we do not know how far it extends. For anything science shows to the contrary, we may account for all the various animals now distributed over the face of the earth from those species which were preserved in the Ark. Then we are told we multiply miracles for the dispersion of these animals; but the same power of God which brought those which were to be saved from all parts of the earth could distribute them again over the whole earth. And remember that we know very little of the power and rapidity with which the animal creation might increase and multiply when there is nothing to disturb their multiplication; but we do know that one little weed introduced here from America only a few years ago, has increased to such an extent as to become a pest, filling up all our canals; and that has been done within our own memory. We cannot say how rapidly the animals would increase and multiply after the earth had been delivered from the deluge.

Rev. H. Moule.—I have not much to say in reply to the observations which have been made, but I will first refer to Mr. Reddie's remarks as to the creation of light. I distinctly stated that the Scriptures appear to speak of the events after the period spoken of in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis as a restoration of light and life, and order and beauty. Life had existed before; and, if so, light. Dr. Pusey has stated that the original words of the chapter admit the interpretation of an indefinite period from the beginning of creation to the period of confusion, thus giving a carte blanche on which scientific men might write anything they please. With regard to Mr. Titcomb's remarks, I do not think they have
touched the subject of my paper. Mr. Row's comments have been somewhat severe as to the danger of such views as mine; but all I can say is, that I have attempted simply to follow out the meaning of the Scriptures. The danger which Mr. Row spoke of, and Mr. Titcomb quite agreed with him, consists in attempting to interpret universal expressions too literally. Now I quite admit that such universal expressions as those gentlemen referred to are limited; and I have admitted that over and over again. But what I contend is, that those expressions are not always limited, and that the passages which I brought forward from Job, the Proverbs, and the Psalms, contain, just as the first chapter of Genesis contains, reasons, which I am sure cannot be set aside, for the literal meaning of the universal expressions which they contain. I am sure that all danger arising from that source may be completely put aside. But another danger which Mr. Row seemed to fear was what he called the multiplication of miracles. I can scarcely add anything to what our chairman has said on this subject; but if you admit the universality of the Deluge—call it miracle or call it what you will,—the necessity for the reproduction of vegetable life is as manifest as anything can be. No plant or tree could have existed for several months under water. There must have been new life given to them, and to a vast number at all events of the fishy tribe; and what is there in going a step beyond that to admit that animal life might have been produced afresh? I put this paper before you simply as what I have endeavoured to gather from Scripture; and I must say that I have been for twenty years fully persuaded of this interpretation of the first and second chapters of Genesis. With regard to the passage from the 104th Psalm, I am sure it is impossible to interpret that with reference to the Deluge, because it refers to the time when God formed the heavens and the earth. But I shall be very glad if my paper, when printed by the Institute, should be left open for further discussion. I expected that great fault would be found with it, but I am as persuaded of the universality of the Deluge as I am of any truth with which I am acquainted; and I am sure that that will be admitted when all the confusion which geologists have been making will be brought into order by the scientific declarations of the Scripture.

The meeting was then adjourned.
NOTE (See pp. 121 and 231, et seq.).

THE ANIMALS TAKEN INTO NOAH'S ARK.

In discussing the foregoing paper, and also that of Mr. Davison, "On the Noachian Deluge" (page 121 et seq., ante), there is an argument which might have been used, with reference to the animals taken into the Ark by Noah, which seems so obviously sound, now that it has occurred to me, that I cannot but feel astonished that, so far as I know, it has never been previously advanced. I venture to place it on record here, as it appears to clear away much difficulty that has naturally been felt, both as regards the sufficiency of the accommodation afforded by the Ark for so many animals, and also as regards the capture and housing of the wild animals, and the quantities of food that would be required for all.

It is simply this, that most probably, because most naturally, Noah would take with him, as far as possible, the young of all animals, and especially the cubs of wild beasts, instead of collecting the grown-up creatures. This supposition certainly clears away very many difficulties of the kind I have referred to; and, upon reflection, it seems that it almost needs must have been so; for it is well-nigh impossible to understand how either the grown-up wild animals, or many of the birds, could have been taken by Noah into the Ark in any other way.

In advancing this argument, however, I do not wish to recede from that urged by me, in discussing Mr. Davison's paper (p. 152, ante), as to the probable much smaller number of species (if species and not genera were taken) then than now; which argument, it will be observed (p. 259), is also used by Mr. Mitchell in discussing Mr. Moule's paper. But in using this argument, I beg leave emphatically once more to disclaim any adherence to Darwinism (see p. 161, ante). I do believe in variations in plants and animals (the existence of such variations it did not require Mr. Darwin to prove)—and I am not sure that there may not be a variation of their so-called species (but that Mr. Darwin himself does not claim yet to have proved); but, even if there were, it does not in the least follow, that there could be a further and unlimited variation, or any new development or transmutation of genera.—

J. R., Ed.