

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## AND GOD CREATED GREAT WHALES.

## GENESIS i. 21.

It is curious and a little pitiful to note how Design and Evolution are pitted against each other—as if the one were contrary to the other—in much of the controversial literature of the day, and how this illogical conflict on a false issue culminates just where it should find no place, at the annual meetings of the British Association. For, surely, it is not only obvious that evolution may be simply a method in which the creative design is worked out, but also that, if it be, it implies a design far more subtle, profound, and far-reaching than that involved in the older hypothesis of successive acts of creation. If the whole infinitely varied round of Nature has been *produced* from a single point, if, so to speak, the whole universe has grown from a single seed, He who created that seed—assuming for a moment that it had a Creator—and stored up in it the potencies which it has unfolded and is to unfold through incalculable æons, must have possessed a wisdom which we can hardly distinguish from Omniscience, and a power which we can hardly distinguish from Omnipotence; and all the marks of design which we trace in the unfolded flower must speak to us of a forethought more, and not less, wonderful and divine than if that flower had been built up petal by petal and touched in tint by tint.

(2) Whether or not Evolution be the most fitting and adequate word to describe, for the present, the genesis of the universe, there can be no doubt that a vast process of development has taken place; for all the sciences—*e.g.* astronomy, geology, embryology—point to it with one consent, and all the results of observation and experience as they are read off by the most competent interpreters. And yet, on consideration, even the most advanced and sceptical

philosopher must admit that Evolution is not and cannot be the *final* word of science, though it be the last it has yet uttered. For it does not cover and explain all the facts of which science takes cognizance, nor even the ultimate and fundamental facts; as, for example, the origin of matter and force (if these be two, and not one), the origin of life, the origin of consciousness. Great and marvellous as is the advance which science has made during the last fifty years, those who most triumphantly proclaim its advance and are most competent to appreciate it will be the last to deny that it has still greater victories to achieve in the future, and that it is very far from having reached its goal. It will yet discover some higher law, speak some larger nobler word,—a word, perchance, which will cover and illuminate the fundamental problems which for the present it is compelled to leave unsolved, or even untouched. To pronounce Evolution the final word, to ban all who do not implicitly accept it as an adequate solution of the mystery of the universe, is therefore to sin, as against science herself, so also against that law of progress which has as surely governed all human discoveries as it has marked all the successions of nature. While, on the other hand, to deny development, to doubt that through the whole realm of nature there has been a slow, laborious, and gradual ascent from simple to more complex, from inferior to higher, forms, is to be wilfully blind and deaf to the teaching of all the facts within our reach.

(3) It has been the constant misfortune of science to number among her votaries men who have so little of her spirit as to fulminate anathemas against all who do not accept her last as her final word, and adjust the whole circle of their beliefs to what may be only an unverifiable hypothesis and is sure to prove an inadequate solution of the great problem. These bigots of science are as truly the worst enemies of science as the bigots of the church are

the worst enemies of true religion. And he is the truly scientific man who rebukes and withstands these hasty and ignorant bigots in the name of science herself; and who, as he glances at the long muster roll of her triumphs, finds in it ample space for more, and more glorious, inscriptions than those which have already been so fairly written and so splendidly illuminated upon it. But even the bigots of science,—no, nor even the hypocrites of science who, knowing more and better than her bigots, nevertheless stoop to support their narrow intolerant dogmas and to swell the volume of their anathemas—are not so untrue to their high calling and vocation as are those who, professing to believe in God as the Maker of all things and the Saviour of all men, nevertheless fear lest any accurate interpretation of his works should convict Him of having contradicted Himself, convict Him of being double-minded and double-voiced, so that, unless they “lie for Him,” the “truth” cannot be known or cannot prevail. The perversion is so monstrous and unnatural that no severer condemnation of it is possible than the bare statement of it. Yet who can deny that there have been many “good men” who have thought to do God service by both misreading the Bible and refusing to read the book of science; *i.e.*, by closing their eyes against the plain facts both of Scripture and of the natural universe?

(4) There is perhaps no one subject, there is surely no one document, which the bigots whether of science or of religion have treated with more intolerable unfaithfulness and insincerity than the ancient tradition of the origin of all things which Moses has inserted in, with which he has commenced, the Book of Genesis. Yet, viewed fairly, looked at with the open eyes that desire the truth, with due consideration of its date, purpose, method, it may be doubted whether there is any one document over which true science and true religion could meet with heartier consent. Both have, and both should claim, an interest

in it. The first chapter of the Bible is also the opening page of the book of science, and records her first veritable triumph; nor, if only this first page be rightly read, has she even yet done much more than confirm and expand it.

(5) How, then, may we reach or recover the right point of view? In many ways, no doubt, if only we bring an honest and open mind to the task; but none seems more valuable than that suggested by the brief phrase which stands as title to this brief essay. For in the words, "And God created great whales," we may find a key to the whole story of creation as narrated in the Book of Genesis. We approach this key as we observe that "great whales"—literally, "sea monsters," and doubtless alligators and crocodiles rather than whales would be in the author's mind—are the only creatures of whom specific mention is made in this Chapter, and consider the motive for mentioning them. It speaks indeed of domestic cattle and of wild beasts, but not of the lion or the ox; it speaks of the fowl of the air and of the creeping things of the earth, but no one species of these genera is singled out for special note. It is only when we come to the fish of the sea, which the waters bring forth abundantly, that the creation of any single species is recorded, and a word is used which would call up in the minds of the first readers of this document an image of the monsters they had seen disporting themselves in the Nile. Now why is that? No naturalist, no man of science, intent on purely scientific objects, would have written thus, or have made this solitary exception. No, and therefore in this exception we have a hint that the whole document was written not from a purely scientific or naturalistic but from a religious point of view. For the crocodile—regarded as a noble animal type, a fine symbol of Nature's work—was *worshipped* in Egypt. The Israelites had grown familiar with that worship in the house of their bondage, and were only too prone to revert to it, as

their after history proves. By a single stroke of his pen, then, either Moses or the original author of the document, teaches them that the crocodile was not a god but a creature of God, and condemns the whole system of idolatry, of animal or nature worship, by which the world was then oppressed. Following up the phrase to its last resort, we find in it an attempt to free the minds of men from a more cruel bondage than that of Egypt, bondage to the mere brute forces of nature, and to raise them to their true place as lords of the natural world and not its slaves.

(6) Nor is this the only hint contained in this Chapter of the religious intention by which it was inspired and shaped. It is full of such hints. Much easy satire has been expended, for example, on the Mosaic view of the function of sun, moon, and stars. According to Moses, we are told, the vast solar and sidereal systems have no other use than to give light to men, or to serve them "for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years." But, it is asked, can any rational mind believe that that vast array of bodies celestial was designed solely for the benefit of our tiny planet, or of the creatures who inhabit it?

Those who criticize Moses should at least, however, take the pains to place themselves at his point of view. And as it is very obvious that no reasonable and thoughtful man, writing from the purely scientific or astronomical point of view, could possibly imagine that sun, moon, and stars were created solely for earthly uses, and as moreover we have quite as good ground for attributing the "godlike faculty" to this great statesman and lawgiver as to any of his critics, would it not be reasonable, as well as charitable, to inquire both whether Moses does affirm them to have no other use, and whether in emphasizing this special use he may not have had other than a scientific motive? In Chaldea, the ancestral home of the sons of Abraham, the great lights of heaven were worshipped as themselves divine, and this

lustrous celestial veil was drawn over the face of the Almighty and hid Him from his seeking children. May not Moses then have written from a religious, instead of a scientific, point of view? May he not have made this emphatic and repeated assertion of the creation of sun, moon, and stars, and of their ministry to man, in order to withdraw the intercepting veil, in order to teach us that we should worship none other god than the Father of the lights, and to persuade us that even the glorious orbs of heaven, to which men once paid Divine honours, are our servants and ministers, not our lords?

If we but think ourselves back into the time and place of Moses, remember that he was the redeemer and mediator of Israel, that it was his special mission to reveal God and his will to them, and to lift them out of the ignorance and bondage in which all races were then sunk; and then, with all this well in mind, turn to his story of the creation, we shall find in it a hundred proofs that it *was* written from the religious, and not from the scientific, point of view; and that, in writing or in copying and adapting it to his purpose, he was impelled by the very motive which animated him throughout his career; viz. the desire to raise Israel, from its bondage to sense and nature, into the freedom and dignity proper to man and into the service and worship of the only true God.

(7) In insisting on this higher and religious motive, however, I do not for a moment admit that, even from a scientific point of view, much can be reasonably alleged against it, provided always that we read it with the same fairness which we are expected and bound to bring to the perusal of any scientific or sceptical treatise. It is a very ancient document that lies before us; probably long anterior, in substance at least, to the time of Moses, though he may have recast it into its present shape. It is far and away the oldest document in the world. And we might fairly

claim for it, therefore, that it should be read with the large allowance which is readily extended to almost every ancient document outside the covers of the Bible. It was primarily intended, moreover, for the instruction of men to whom both science and letters were unknown. Hence it must of necessity be concise, simple, memorable, free from technical formulæ, couched in such plain terms as plain men use. The very utmost we could demand of it is that it should contain no demonstrable and fatal error; that it should be pliant to or leave room for the discoveries of widening science and experience; and that, to the end of time, it should fulfil some high moral or religious function. How happily it meets, how generously it outruns, these conditions has been demonstrated again and again, and is now very widely admitted, admitted the more frankly and heartily in proportion as its critics possess the erudition which enables them to compare it with the other ancient documents that cover, or profess to cover, the same ground. Those who possess even the slightest acquaintance with the cosmogonies and mythologies of ancient India, Egypt, Chaldea, Greece even, cannot but confess that the story of the creation told by Moses is simplicity and sobriety itself when compared with *them*; that it is not bound up, as they are, with monstrous and impossible misreadings both of the natural universe and of the genesis of man; and that its terms are so simple, so general, so flexible as to leave verge for any conclusions which science may reach.

The "days" of creation have, indeed, been gravely denounced or lightly ridiculed from the time when men began to let their reason play freely on Scriptures which were long held to be sacred from criticism. But many very competent critics now see in this "week of days" only a mnemonic device which made it easier to commit the story to memory and to hand it down in an unbroken tradition;

while they admit that the general order of creation, or of evolution, given by Moses tallies, at least in its main outlines, with the last hypotheses of science. And of this we may be very sure, that if the document recorded in the first Chapter of Genesis had been discovered among the papyri of Egypt or the inscriptions of Babylon, or even if its substance had been traced in the discourses of a Greek philosopher or the verses of a Latin poet, the whole scientific and literary world, even that small portion of it which girds at the Bible, would have received it with an instant chorus of admiration and astonishment; while if the "origins of things" which we find in the sacred books of Asia, Africa or Europe, had been found between the covers of the Bible, even the staunchest believer must have repudiated them, and, with them, the whole system with which they were indissolubly intertwined.

(8) From the purely scientific point of view the Mosaic account of the creation is no doubt very defective, though it cannot fairly be said to be inaccurate. But, as we have seen, it does not profess to have been written from that point of view; and we need claim for it nothing more than that it is the best conception of the genesis of the universe which the world's "gray fathers" were able to form or to receive. In such terms as they could apprehend, the ancestral race of man was taught that the world and all that it contains came from God, that it was fashioned by his wisdom, in a gradual orderly way, for a definite and gracious end. It is philosophic rather than scientific; *i.e.*, it rather expresses man's first and best thoughts concerning first causes and their first effects than lays out in order a scientific report of the origin of all things. And why should we demand science of Moses? No one expects to find in the Ten Commandments a systematic code of laws, an elaborate and complete scheme of jurisprudence. Why, then, should we expect to find modern science in the first

Chapter of Genesis any more than we expect to find modern jurisprudence in the Decalogue? All just legislation indeed implies the fundamental moralities of the "Ten Words"; and so all science, truly so called, implies the fundamental simplicities of the opening document of Genesis. But to look for a scientific treatise in Genesis is about as wise as to look for an elaborate jurisprudence in Exodus.

Nevertheless, when science has grown ripe, it may be that its last, simplest, and grandest generalizations will correspond, in a quite surprising way, with the ancient and simple generalities of the Book of Genesis. And we may, perhaps, find one hint of this correspondence in the recent discoveries of the spectroscope. It has been demonstrated that the very salts and metals which we find in the earth exist in the solar and sidereal light; so that possibly light may have in itself the constituent and originative germs of all terrestrial things, and, in the most exact scientific sense, the universe may be but a product, an incarnation and epiphany, of light. But should that be so, will not this generalization of science correspond very happily with the words of Moses, who tells us that, in his first creative fiat, God said "Let there be light," creating first that from which, *ex hypothesi*, all else was to proceed?

Time was too, we may add in passing, when the existence of light prior to the creation of sun, moon, and stars, was a theme for ridicule; but now that, in their study of the nebulae, astronomers have discerned the existence of "a self-luminous substance, of an inconceivable tenuity, diffused over spaces so vast as to baffle every effort to define them," men of science now proclaim as a fact that which they once ridiculed as absurd.

(9) But it is when we look at the Mosaic narrative as a whole that we see most clearly what room it leaves for the advancing discoveries of science, and how evidently it

was cast into a portable and rememberable form. We are told at the outset that the earth was "without form and void." It needed, therefore, first to be put into form, and then fitted or furnished. These two processes constituted the work of the six "days." For these six days are divisible into two groups—a first three, and a second three. In the first three God gives form to the formless earth; in the second three He fills the void earth with an innumerable multitude of living things. That which is without form is without use; that which is void is not being used. God will not suffer the world to be either useless or unused. Only when it is drawn into shape and peopled with innumerable forms of life can He take delight in it. Hence God says of each day's work, "It is good"; but only when the end crowns the work, and the world is both formed and occupied, does He pronounce it "very good."

What are the steps or stages of this work? First, light springs up in darkness; second, the aerial heavens are divided from the waters; third, the earth emerges from the deep and brings forth grass and herb; fourth, the great lights are made to rule the day and to rule the night; fifth, the fish of the sea and the fowl of the air are called into being; sixth, the beasts of the earth are formed, and man, the crown and lord of them all. This is the work of the six days; and these days, as I have said, may be divided into two groups; a first three in which God *forms* the formless earth, and a second three in which He *fills* the empty earth.

Look, then, at the first group, the formative group. In these, we are told, God separates the light from the darkness; then He separates the aerial heaven from the heaving waters; and then He separates the earth from the sea and causes it to bring forth and bud. Thus, by successive acts of separation, the world is drawn into form, drawn within bounds that define it; the chaos is dissolved into its

separate elements,<sup>1</sup> fire (light), air, water, earth. And these four are evoked in the most philosophic order; *i.e.*, from the finest and most subtle to the grossest and coarsest. There is first the light, which is the finest; then there is the air, the next in fineness; then there is the water, which is grosser, but still finer than the earth; then there is the earth itself, the grossest of them all. Nay, more, these elemental acts of creation culminate in vegetation, which embraces all four of them. Its substance is of the earth earthy; its tissues are filled with water; its lungs breathe in and breathe out air; and the light, or heavenly fire, permeates its whole being, giving it both its beauty and its fruitfulness.

And now let us take the second group of days, and mark how exactly it corresponds to the other; how the fourth day answers to the first, the fifth to the second, the sixth to the third. On the first day we have the genesis of light out of darkness; and on the fourth day the sun, the lord of light, is made, as are also those pure and sacred princes of darkness, the moon and the stars. On the second day the aerial firmament divides the upper from the inferior waters; and on the fifth the birds of the air and the fish of the sea are created and made. On the third day the solid earth is formed; and on the sixth day the earth brings forth beast and cattle and creeping thing, each after its kind. Nay, as the work of the first three days, during which the elements were created, culminated in vegetation which combines all the elements in itself, so the work of the second three days, during which the living creatures were called into being, culminated in man, who combines in himself all the special faculties and virtues of the animate world.

Obviously there is method here, there is design. And

<sup>1</sup> Of course I use this word throughout in its popular, not in its scientific sense.

the design of the method is not only to help the memory and ensure an accurate tradition, but also to convey the thought that God put forth his creative powers according to a wise and divine order; first, creating the elements, from the finer and more subtle down to the grosser; and then furnishing the elements with animated forms of life, from the simpler and ruder to the more complex and perfect.

Men of science have laid so much stress on "the days" of this ancient narrative that they have overlooked the wisdom and simplicity with which it conveys true and large impressions of the origin of all things. If, in a large simple way, speaking to the simple and unlettered on the genesis of the world, we were to speak thus: First, God gave shape to the shapeless earth, then He filled the empty earth; first He created the elements, beginning with the most subtle and creative, and coming down to the most gross and material; then He filled the elements with their appropriate tenants, beginning now at the lowest end of the scale and working upward from the most simple and rudimentary structures to the most subtle, complex, perfect: if that were our story of the creation, as it is that of Moses, would any scientific man who believes in God the Maker have much fault to find with it? Would he not admit that, viewed as a large and simple outline, it was true enough for all practical purposes, and that it would be far more likely to convey a fine moral impression to the popular mind than a more detailed statement such as the science of to-day might put forth, only to be corrected, if not contradicted, by the science of a hundred, a thousand, or four or six thousand, years hence?<sup>1</sup>

(10) The prime excellence of this Biblical document is not,

<sup>1</sup> In this ninth section I have been much indebted to some imperfect notes I took of a most admirable and comprehensive sermon preached by the late T. T. Lynch, some twenty or five-and-twenty years since.

however, its simplicity, nor its elasticity—giving scope to any discoveries that science may make—nor even its general accuracy when read historically and in a reasonable spirit; but its religious inspiration and motive. It sees, and teaches us to see, *God* in all things. It puts Him behind and before all things. And, moreover, it places all things under *our* feet, so redeeming us from that fear of the vast and irresistible forces of nature which led unemancipated man to worship and appease them, and teaching us to worship Him only who is the Maker and Ruler of them all. They are our ministers and subordinates, not our lords; we have no Lord but Him. In short, the Chapter contains the very charter of science, as well as the fundamental truth of religion. For so long as men *worshipped* nature they could not approach and study her in a scientific spirit, any more than they could worship Him who is a Spirit so long as He was veiled from them by the works of his hands.

Nor, in thus tracing all things to a spiritual origin, does Moses do more than science itself will warrant; for science has no simpler hypothesis to offer us, nor any half so reasonable; nay, by the lips of some of her most distinguished disciples, she frankly refuses to supply us with any hypothesis at all. Searching everywhere for the original cause of things, she is compelled to confess that she cannot find it in the things themselves; that, while the method or order of physical sequences is familiar to her, their cause is unknown. The origin of matter, the origin of force, the origin of life, the origin of thought are all, by her own confession, beyond her reach. Even though she call Evolution to her aid the problem is only pushed farther back. It is not solved. It is no whit nearer to a solution. It has to be handed over to reason and conscience after all.

And when we bend reason to the task of judging the solution of this standing problem which the Bible offers to

our faith, reason confirms, and rejoices to confirm, the Biblical theory of causation. For we ourselves, if we *have* bodies, *are* spirits; and therefore the conception of a Spiritual Cause of all that we behold cannot be alien to us. If it be, as it is, an elementary axiom of science, that the effect can contain nothing which was not in its cause, and can never be greater than its cause, then, as it is very certain that we find "spirit" in the great effect which we call the universe,—find it at least in ourselves and in one another,—we are plainly entitled to infer that there must be spirit in the Cause of this great effect. We hold, and are warranted in holding, that we must have derived our spirits from the original and creative Spirit; and that He must be inconceivably greater than we are, since we and all things proceed from Him. Moreover, as we know that our spirits, our wills, rule and control our physical frame, and even pass out beyond our personal limits to affect and transform the face of the earth, we argue, not without some show of logic surely, that the great original Spirit must be able to rule and affect at his will the great and universal frame which sprang into being at his command.

(11) Even when we go away from and beyond ourselves, and watch the play and movement of the physical world, seeking to interpret it honestly and according to our best skill, we still meet with phenomena which speak to us of a Spirit behind it and working up through it; in other words, we see nature herself straining up to God. For who can watch the face of nature, and study her history, without observing in every province of her domain the signs of an all-pervading intelligence, and struggles by which she seeks to free herself from the rigour of physical law, and to rise into a liberty which is the proper attribute of spirit? Matter itself is not purely materialistic, but is ever lifting itself up toward the spiritual, as it could hardly do were its Cause as material as itself. If in its lower provinces, for example, it

is everywhere and absolutely subject to the law of gravitation, yet even in that low stage in which we come on the phenomena of crystallization we observe a tendency to resent and shake off that subjection and to rise into forms and shape itself after an ideal impossible to it so long as it maintains an undivided obedience to this law; forms which by naming them "ideal" we shew to have in them the suggestion of a Mind at work behind the material atoms. Vegetable life marks another advance; for here so many forces operate, and the result is so complex, subtle, and wonderful, that we cannot but feel that at this point we enter on a much higher and freer mode of existence, and are brought into more immediate contact with a shaping and invisible Cause. Science may dissect the plant, name its parts, determine their functions; but it cannot create the tiniest moss that grows upon a rock, or tell us by what mystic forces it was created or from whence those forces issued. In animal life we make yet another advance, a nearer approach to the intelligence, will, freedom, which are the proper attributes, not of matter, but of spirit. We reach the full diapason in man, finding in him a creature subject to natural laws and instincts indeed, but capable of controlling and modifying them in a thousand different ways; able to subdue the earth, to bend all other creatures to his will, to study and formulate the laws by which the universe is governed, to rule his physical instincts and lusts in the service of reason and conscience, to deny himself and his natural selfishness that he may minister to others; and, in a word, a creature capable of rising out of the necessities of mere physical law by obeying what St. James calls "the law of liberty," because it can only be freely obeyed.

Here, then,—whether by evolution or any other process matters not a jot,—we not only find spirit in man and confess it to be his supreme endowment, we also see that nature itself is so ordered and conditioned that it is for

ever mounting to higher forms and freer modes of existence ; and that, in its advance toward this spiritual heritage of freedom, it is for ever suggesting an Intelligence, a Will, at work behind it, which is seeking to raise and redeem it into the liberty for which it yearns. If the effect cannot be greater than its cause, must not the Creator of the universe and the Maker of man be a Spirit? Has not Moses reason with him when he writes *God, God, God* across the heavens and over the whole earth? If science be a reasonable interpretation of the facts of nature, must not science herself confess, as she watches this wondrous ascent from bondage to freedom, from blank and blind subjection to intelligent and voluntary obedience, that a free intelligent Spirit is at work through the whole round of nature, and that its only adequate cause must be sought in God?

(12) But if we concede so much as this, can we refuse to concede far more? Whether or not Evolution be the last word and the master word of science, *we* are not bound to determine. Some of her eminent disciples affirm that the evolutionary theory has been logically demonstrated ; while others, equally eminent, contend that as yet it is no more than a probable hypothesis. It is a question which they must be left to determine for themselves ; though, however they may determine it, we shall continue to hold that the final word is far from having been pronounced, and expect to witness triumphs of scientific discovery in the future at least equal to its victories in the past. But that, however it may be named, there has been a long process of development in nature, a gradual ascent from lower to higher forms of life, and that this ascent culminates in man, no one denies or can reasonably deny. Why, then, should this process, which has occupied not only the centuries of human history, but also the long æons of the geological record, stop abruptly at the point which it has now reached? Is it not far more rational to believe that the process is still going on, the ascent still

culminating, the ladder still rising, however slowly and imperceptibly, and that in future ages and æons both man and nature will continue to develop into a perfection we cannot as yet conceive? But if that process is to go on, who does not perceive that, as hitherto the whole realm of nature has been pressing on and upward to produce the spirit of man, as in that spirit we have the highest consummation it has yet touched, so in that spirit we must look for the starting point of the new development? Here, in spirit, is the topmost point nature has reached; if it is to rise higher still, must it not start from this point? Must not that which is spiritual in nature unfold new energies, pervade and dominate that which is material more fully, and perchance transform it at last into its own quality and substance? May not that great word of the apostle, "first that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual," be truer after all than any hypothesis which science has formulated or any generalization which philosophy has framed?

(13) The method by which this development or advance has been effected is, we are told, that of differentiation and individualization; which means, I suppose, that when by some happy conjunction of outward conditions with inward organization a certain member of any species grows to be different from and to excel its fellows, this happy variation, this favoured individual of the species, becomes the source from which a new species springs, the type to which it conforms. The line of advance runs through these selected and favoured organisms. For years, perhaps for ages, a lower type of life has waited for the happy moment in which its most perfect and richly endowed form should appear; and then, when it appears, this perfected form constitutes a new point of departure, and the process of development starts on its upward way once more.

If, then, when nature has risen into man, that process is still to go on, and to go on by this same method of differentia-

tion, for what should we look? We should look, not for any abrupt rise in the whole level of human life, but for the selection of favoured individual forms, *i.e.* for elect men, who shall be raised by some happy conspiracy of outward conditions and inward organization, above the common level, into higher and ever higher forms of life, until at last the one Supreme Man is born in whom the whole laborious ascent is consummated, and from whom there may spring men of a higher species, of a type answering to his own.

This is what science herself teaches us to expect as we follow "the struggle of existence from dim nebulous beginnings" to ordered worlds, and from the lower forms of animate life up to the dawn of consciousness and the rich personal life of man. And what science has taught us to expect is precisely that which the Bible declares the great creative and redeeming Spirit to have done. For what, after all, is the story which the Bible has to tell but this; that when the common plane of humanity had been reached, by a process of natural selection, Abraham and his seed were differentiated from their fellows, elected to special favour, raised to a higher type, set apart to be a peculiar people of happier spiritual conditions than the other races of mankind; that from this selected and highly favoured stem, illustrated all along by the noblest types of human life, there broke at last the peerless and consummate flower of humanity, a Man so perfect as to present a new and higher type of manhood; and that from Him, the perfect Son of Man, there has sprung and is ever springing a new and higher order of men, spiritual rather than natural men, born from above as well as from below, one with Him already, but ever—on both sides of the gate of death—pressing on to a closer likeness, a fuller participation of his Divine life; so that the very Apostle who declared the divine order to be "first that which is natural and afterward that which is spiritual" also affirms the first

man to have been of the earth earthy, while the second man is the Lord from heaven ?

In fine, Science and the Bible are at one, and will be seen to be at one whenever scientific men learn to treat the Bible fairly, and religious men learn to deal fairly with the discoveries of Science. They both proclaim a spiritual Cause of the world, and a spiritual End for it. They both affirm that nature is from Spirit, by Spirit, for Spirit. They both teach that as all things come from God, so also things tend to God and will reach their true goal and perfection as they return to and rest in Him, the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End.

ALMONI PELONI.

---

## THE SOURCES OF ST. PAUL'S TEACHING.

### III. THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

THE history of the Book of Wisdom is involved in considerable obscurity, and very little can be laid down with any degree of certainty as to its authorship and date beyond the fact that it comes from the pen of an Alexandrian Jew shortly before the Christian era. Various names have been suggested, including those of Apollos and Philo. But the balance of evidence seems to be decisive in favour of an earlier date than that which either of these two names would give, and the coincidences with the Epistle to the Hebrews (which is also assigned to Apollos) have been decidedly exaggerated. It will be sufficient for my present purpose to quote Dr. Westcott's conclusion in his article on the Book in question in the "Dictionary of the Bible" : "It seems most reasonable . . . to believe that it was