

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

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

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XLIV.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 1, Adelphi Terrace House, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1912.

530TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

MONDAY, APRIL 1st, 1912, AT 4.30 P.M.

E. J. SEWELL, ESQ., TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced that Miss Morier had been elected as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. TUCKWELL to read his paper.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND MODERN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP.

By the REV. JOHN TUCKWELL, M.R.A.S.

MODERN Biblical scholarship is a development. By a brief glance at its origin we shall the better understand its relation to modern archæological discoveries.

During the first three hundred years of the history of the Christian Church the progress of the truth with which she was entrusted was phenomenal. But the next thousand years, and especially that part of it which followed immediately the breaking up of the Roman Empire, was a time of almost universal arrest of human progress. The ignorance and degradation of the populations of Europe rendered them powerless to civilize the barbarians who brought them under their martial sway. "These were times," says Hallam in his *Middle Ages*, "of great misery to the people, and the worst, perhaps, that Europe has ever known. Even under Charlemagne we have abundant proofs of the calamities which the people suffered. The light that shone around him was that of a consuming fire."

The first gleam of a new dawn was due to an awakening of interest in classical learning. Manuscripts began to be collected and libraries to be formed, while the opportune invention of paper rendered books cheaper, and quickened and extended the

book trade. It was only incidental to this general movement, at first, that attention began to be directed to the contents of Holy Scripture. Then in the fifteenth century came the invention of printing.

It has often been affirmed as an apology for certain modern views of Scripture that, at the Reformation, men discovered that the Church's claim to infallibility was invalid, but feeling the need of some infallible basis on which to ground their faith, invented the theory of an infallible Book. Was this so? Was it not rather the rediscovery of the Book which gave militant effect to the intellectual and moral shock which mankind was beginning to experience at the Church's condition and claims? It was the use of a manuscript copy of the Scriptures that shed the light upon the mind of John Wycliffe—"the morning star of the Reformation." It was the publication of the Greek text of the New Testament and his scholarly Latin translation and their circulation in the universities and among the learned and noble that caused it to be said that "Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched." It was the perusal of the New Testament which first set free and then set on fire the great prophetic soul of Martin Luther. It was with the Book in their hands, as the final Court of Appeal, that the Reformers fought and won their battles, and whatever value they attached to it as the standard of Christian Truth they attached to it from the very beginning. Nothing, therefore, could be more remote from the true history of the conflict than the supposition that the degree of inspiration the Reformers attached to it, whether they were right or wrong, was an after-thought.

What happened was this. After the Reformation, when freedom of thought and speech could no longer be suppressed, the contestants over the subject of supernatural religion came from all sides into the arena. Lecky, in his *History of Rationalism*, writing of "the moral chaos that followed the death of Louis XIV.," says of Voltaire and Rousseau that "the object of these writers was not to erect a new system of positive religion, but rather to remove those systems which then existed and to prove the adequacy of natural religion to the moral wants of mankind. The first of these tasks was undertaken especially by Voltaire. The second was more congenial to the mind of Rousseau." The Christian apologist had to face this new condition of things, and in Germany, as Canon Cheyne admits in his *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, a party arose under the influence of eighteenth-century Deism which adopted that

method of treating scripture which Eichhorn, one of its earliest advocates, called the "Higher Criticism." The term in a narrower sense is sometimes used in contradistinction to the term "lower" or "textual criticism." It would be a mistake to suppose, however, that even in its wider sense it represents a form of scholarship or spheres of investigation entirely new. The older scholarship included in its enquiries such subjects as the authorship, the languages, the human element, the diversities of style, the uses of metaphors, parables, similes, and various other figurative forms of speech found in Scripture. It welcomed all the light it could obtain from comparative philology, from such science as was available and from all known history. It is not here that any difference exists. Much more light has come in modern times both to and from some of these sources, and this light has compelled the opponents of supernatural religion to change their polemical tactics. Such a work as Volney's *Ruins of Empires*, thought to be brilliant and triumphant in its own time, would be as out of date now as the bows and arrows of the ancient Babylonians. It is in those particulars, in which the German theologians have made compromises with the older Deism, that the divergence has arisen, and it is to mark that divergence that the term "higher criticism" is generally employed. Among these particulars may be included the attitude of mind in which the study of Scripture is approached; the too exclusively philological and literary basis of enquiry into the origin and composition of its various books; the excessive application of subjective tests in judgment of the value and trustworthiness of the records; the adherence to obsolete ideas concerning the beginnings of human and of Israelitish history; the substitution of hypothetical evolutionary processes for inspiration and revelation in dealing with the contents and order of the historical records; the too hasty rejection of the historicity and truthfulness of those records and the general discredit cast upon the supernatural element in the whole volume and the consequent weakening of its Divine authority. It will not be possible in this brief paper to deal adequately with all these particulars, I shall confine myself for the most part to those of them upon which the modern discoveries of Archæology have a special message to convey.

Upon the general question of the relation of this method of dealing with Scripture to the older Deism, I shall not, I hope, be accused of making a partisan appeal to prejudice if in justification of Canon Cheyne's admission and my own contention I refer to the "Twentieth Century" Edition of *The Age of Reason*.

The editor of that edition points out that in Tom Paine's denunciation of the Jewish wars; his denial of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; his rejection of the Davidic authorship attributed to so large a number of the Psalms; his assertion of the composite character of the book of Isaiah; his views of the Virgin Birth predicted in the Old Testament and recorded as a fact in the New; and the discredit he casts upon the authorship of Gospels and Epistles, he anticipated the views held by many German and English divines of the present day. The same thing is also shown by the late Dr. Parker in his remarkable little book entitled *None Like It*. He says, "It must be clearly understood that the name of Tom Paine was not introduced by me, but by Mr. H——; and it must be further understood that I quote it to prove one point only, namely, that Paine anticipated in substance the main contentions in literary criticism of the Higher Critics, and it can be further proved that Paine himself, so far as this point is concerned, was only an echo of a much older Deism. All this should be remembered when considering the supposed originality of recent writers" (p. 216). Now a statement would not be untrue because Paine made it, and I offer these quotations in confirmation of the view expressed concerning the historic relationship between the present and the past.

My purpose in this paper is to present in as concise a form as possible some of the best-known results of modern archæological research, and to claim for them a fuller recognition and a larger place in the Biblical scholarship of the day, however it may have arisen. The justice of this claim is forcibly represented by Professor Eerdmanns who, himself, formerly accepted the conclusions of the Higher Critical school and still occupies the professorial chair at Leyden in succession to the celebrated higher critical scholar Kuenen. He says: "The time in which the now dominating school of criticism arose was prior to the many discoveries made in Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt and Syria . . . The theory of evolution was then prevailing in science and philosophy, and its influence was doubtless felt in critical and historical studies on Old Testament subjects . . . The many contradictions which even the ordinary careful reader of the Bible was often able to discover gave the ardent scholar the means for constructing a new building out of the scattered pieces of Hebrew literature. In erecting this building, scholars did not always see the great difficulties of their position and the traps that were to be avoided."

At the time to which Professor Eerdmanns refers Dr. Young

and Champollion were just beginning to unravel the intricacies of the Egyptian hieroglyphics; Niebuhr, Tychsen, and Grotefend were making their first imperfect efforts to decipher the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia; while Rich, Botta, and Layard had hardly begun to reveal beneath the mounds of Babylonia and Assyria those rich stores of historical knowledge which were destined to revolutionize our conceptions of the civilizations of the past. These stores are so vast and their testimony so incontrovertible that we are justified in saying that Archæology has shown that—

I.

The practice of literature existed at a much earlier period than modern Biblical scholarship at first supposed. The supposition was, that except perhaps within the colleges of the Egyptian priesthood and in a few incoherent scratchings upon rocks, human knowledge was generally communicated from generation to generation by unwritten tradition, folklore and the songs of wandering bards.

Canon Driver says: "The date at which an event or institution is first mentioned in writing must not be confused with that at which it occurred or originated: *in the early stages of a nation's history the memory of the past is preserved habitually by oral tradition; and the Jews, long after they were possessed of a literature, were still apt to depend much upon tradition*" (p. 118). The first part of this statement needs qualification, and the second is the rock upon which the "Higher Criticism" splits. Even the elegance, power, and precise descriptions of the Iliad and Odyssey were attributed to a blind bard who could not write. As late as 1884 the Revisers of the Old Testament changed the perfectly accurate translation of Judges v, 14, in the *Song of Deborah and Barak*, "out of Zebulon they that handle the pen of the writer," into "they that handle the marshal's staff." Thus a number of the accredited authors of Scripture have been substituted by a countless array of unknown writers of later date whose discovery, had it been true, would have been a more astonishing display of the acuteness of the human intellect than the discovery of the Röntgen rays, or of radium, or even of the infinitesimal electrons that are supposed to operate in the invisible electric current. The products of the pens of these hypothetical authors and redactors are represented by such symbols as J, J¹, J², E, E¹, E², JE, P, D, D¹, D², D³, etc., R, R^D, R^{JE}, JED, etc., etc.

This amazing analysis, to quote Professor Eerdmanns again, "leads to highly improbable results. Words; half verses,

quarters, eighth and sixteenth parts of verses, belonging to different sources, are combined in the most various ways. . . . By the acuteness of scholars, contradictions and parallels are discovered in chapters and verses of the most harmless and harmonious appearance." The hypnotic influence which this analysis has had over certain scholars is extraordinary, and even Professor Orr can say concerning the Yaweh-Elohim theory, "This result also, whatever explanation may be offered, has stood the test of time, and will not, we believe, be overturned." If that be so, his case against the Higher Criticism is gone, and even our Lord took up a fallacious position when He said of the supposed Mosaic writings: "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" for in all the letters used in the analysis of those writings the letter "M" never once appears for a single verse or word. All that Professor Orr will allow is some quality which he describes as "Mosaicity." But it is not a question of "time" but of evidence, and evidence has become available now, which was not available when the foundations of this analysis were laid by Jean Astruc with his theory of Elohist and Jehovistic and nine minor documents. For instance, we now know that the art of writing goes back to very remote antiquity in the history of man, for even the cuneiform characters of Babylonia were the offspring of an earlier pictographic form of writing in use before the adoption of clay as a writing material by the early inhabitants of the plain of Shinar. Further,

(i) By what seems like a perversity designed to provoke every sense of the fitness of things in the order of Biblical truth, the story of the Creation in Gen. i, so fundamental to the monotheism of the whole Bible, is affirmed to be among the latest products of Hebrew literature! It is said to belong "approximately to the period of the Babylonian captivity" and to be "later than Ezekiel" (Driver). We are to suppose that the Hebrew religion and nation existed for a thousand years before it possessed any adequate cosmology! Or again, it is said to have been derived from a Babylonian original, and an eminent Assyriologist has even attempted, by translating some of the Hebrew into Babylonian, to reconstruct that supposed original! But the two languages are sufficiently near of kin to make such an effort absolutely devoid of evidential value. Were the original Greek of the New Testament to be lost, an accomplished German and English scholar in five thousand years' time, finding the first page of one of the Gospels in English, would have no difficulty in turning the English into German and proving most conclusively

to his contemporaries that the English derived the story from their very intellectual German neighbours. Or again, it is even said that the Genesis record is sifted out of the Babylonian legend.

But if we are right, as seems almost certain, in identifying Marduk with Nimrod, then that legend must be later than the fact recorded of him in Gen. x, that "the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, Erech, Akkad and Calneh." Further, the deified Nimrod, Marduk, only takes the supreme place in the Babylonian pantheon in succession to Enlil of Nippur (Calneh) as the natural corollary to the rise of Babylon to the imperial sovereignty over the other cities of Babylonia under "The First Dynasty of Babylon." The legend, therefore, cannot be earlier than about 1900 B.C. Yet, further, Mr. Maunder, in his *Astronomy of the Bible*, tells us that the astronomical allusions in it to the Signs of the Zodiac forbid that it should have appeared in its latest form earlier than about 700 B.C. This does not mean that the legend was first constructed then, for there is a part of what may be a version of an earlier date contained in a bi-lingual tablet, and which appears to have been used as an incantation formula. But it is anachronistic, unmethodical, and incoherent. One of these languages is Sumerian, and contains the words "Adam" and "Eden"; the other is a Semitic translation. But the priority of the Hebrew story to these and all other versions is plainly implied by a comparison of their contents. It would be superfluous to recapitulate the well-known version of the seven, or more correctly six, tablets. But it is necessary to notice that the four first are occupied with the account of the destruction by Marduk of the old goddess Tiamat, the goddess of the stormy deep, whose body he splits into two parts, "like a flat-fish," one part being used to support the upper waters, while watchmen are placed to see that they do not break forth again.

Now when a legend is formed on the basis of a fact or truth, it is manifest that the fact or truth must be known before the legend can be compiled. The fact underlying the contents of these four tablets is the creation of the "firmament" to "divide the waters from the waters," which is related with such beautiful simplicity, dignity, and brevity in the Hebrew story. The conclusion, therefore, is irresistible that the Hebrew story, whoever wrote it and wherever it came from, must have been known to the old Babylonian poets, who elaborated it into their grotesque legend. Of the fifth tablet we have only some twenty or thirty complete lines assigning to Marduk the work of fixing

the Signs of the Zodiac, causing the moon to shine by night and establishing a lunar year of twelve months. It is this tablet, with its allusion to the Zodiac, which suggests to Mr. Maunder the date of 700 B.C. Of the sixth tablet we have only about a dozen complete lines, which appear to refer to the creation of man by Marduk out of his own blood, and perhaps to the creation of woman also. The number, variety, and importance of the works recorded upon the tablets represented by these two fragments were out of all proportion to the single creative task described on the other four. It would not be at all surprising, therefore, were we to find that their contents were an adaptation of some older version tacked on to the other four to complete the story.

In contrast with all this, the Hebrew story is so pure, so lofty, so impressive, and thrown into such language, as to teach the unity, sovereignty, goodness and omnipotence of God to every age and in every tongue, and to minds of every degree of culture and knowledge. It seems an outrage upon our reason and our moral sensibilities to ask us to regard it as derived from a composition so impossible, so grotesque, and so degrading to the Deity as the Babylonian legend. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." We are driven to the conclusion, therefore, that the Genesis account cannot be of such recent date as modern Biblical scholarship has supposed. It may be but a fragment (if you will), but it is literature of great antiquity, conveying to man, from some superhuman source, a knowledge of events which transpired before his own existence, intended to win his obedience, worship, and love, to the One Author of his being, the Creator of the Universe.

(ii) Let us pass now to the second and more detailed version of man's creation, and the account of the creation of woman, and the institution of marriage, in Genesis ii. It is very significant that there should be these two versions, and that there should have been two or more versions of the creation legend among the Babylonians. But if the Biblical record be true, it may suffice to say that this ampler version, like the more general, must have got there by some means other than derivation from the Babylonian legends or than mere happy guesswork. Men and women of past ages were as little likely to have been able to give an account of their own creation as an adult person to-day to give an account of his own birth.

Let us add to this the story of "The Fall"; whether we regard it as symbolical or literal, or partly both, is immaterial to

our present purpose. The well-known Babylonian seal, which cannot be of later date than 2500–2000 B.C., representing a man and a woman and a tree bearing fruit and a serpent behind the woman, presents a combination of details which irresistibly points to the conclusion that the engraver was familiar with some such story as that in Genesis iii.

The contents of both these chapters are assigned by the critics to the "J" document. But no adequate attempt is made to account for their origin or for their preservation during so many thousands of years. It is not enough to say that "J" committed to writing a previous oral tradition, whether amongst Hebrews or Babylonians. If they contain truth, however veiled, oral tradition cannot account for man's knowledge of that truth or of the events concerning his own existence, which transpired before the dawn of his own consciousness. Moreover, oral tradition is scarcely likely to have preserved in any form a faithful account of what our translators have not inaptly described as "man's shameful fall." The only reasonable way out of these difficulties is to admit the supernatural and to regard the original records, in whatever language composed, as literature of far greater antiquity than modern Biblical scholarship has been disposed to admit.

(iii) Let us now look for a moment at the story of Cain and Abel. Like the two previous stories, the New Testament puts its imprimatur upon its historicity (Heb. iii, 4), and modern Biblical criticism assigns it to the "J" document. It is true we do not find its exact parallel in any of the legends of antiquity, but what appear to be different forms of one original story are found among different nations, looking much like a legendary superstructure upon the Cain and Abel basis. It is that of—

Dumuzi and Innana among the Sumerians.

Tammuz and Ishtar among the Semites.

Osiris and Isis among the Egyptians.

Adonis and Aphrodite, or Venus, among the Greeks and
Latins.

The subject of the story dies a violent death; in one instance he is a shepherd, and it is his brother who strikes the blow; or it is supposed to have been transformed into a meteorological myth and the summer is destroyed by the winter and reappears to bring joy to earth again. In the sixth tablet of the Gilgamesh series it is the youthful husband of the goddess Ishtar who has come to a premature end, and growing out of it

is the story of Ishtar's Descent into Hades for the recovery of her youthful spouse, which the Babylonians commemorated by an annual festival. This festival was among the "abominations" denounced by the prophet Ezekiel (ch. viii, 14). The first part of it was kept by bitter wailing and lamentation over the tragic death of Tammuz, then on the last day his return to the land of the living, anointed with oil and clad in a new garment, was celebrated by unbounded expressions of joy when all moral restraints were loosened and unbridled licentiousness prevailed. Ishtar was also the pre-Israelite Astarte of the Canaanites, whose worship was celebrated by the sacrifice of infants, as excavations by Professor Macalister at Gezer have disclosed, and by the obscene rites of the grove, or Asherah, denounced so often in the Old Testament.

Once more then it must be said that known truth must precede the possibility of any legendary embodiment of it, and if the story of Cain and Abel be the basis of these legends then we have in it another proof of the great antiquity of the practice of literature which modern Biblical scholarship has been so slow to recognize.

(iv) But what I venture to think is the most conclusive proof afforded by all these old Biblical records of their priority over all other records in whatever language preserved, is that furnished by the parallel accounts of the Hebrews and Babylonians of the story of the Deluge. It is no longer possible to deny it as an historical fact, nor to treat it as an astronomical or meteorological myth. Mr. Maunder, in the volume already referred to, has also given us good reason for believing that it must have been known to the astronomers who pictured for themselves upon the midnight sky the figures of the constellations, 2700 B.C. or earlier. These figures are not suggested by the natural arrangement of the stars, as Volney and many other advocates of solar-myth theories have supposed, but are arbitrarily assigned to the stellar universe. But whoever did this extraordinary work so long ago, the Babylonians accepted it. There are the ship, the water-snake, the raven, the mountains, the altar, the sacrifice and the man. I have by my side a cutting from *The Daily Telegraph* of December 4th, 1872, containing the report of Mr. George Smith reading before the Society of Biblical Archæology the first translation of the Deluge Tablet ever given to the world. Sir Henry Rawlinson was in the Chair, and Mr. W. E. Gladstone, who was present, uttered these memorable words, "I do not know whether it is supposed that the enquiries of archæological or other sciences are

to have the effect of unsettling many minds in this our generation, but I must say for myself that on every point at which I am enabled to examine them, they have a totally different effect (cheers)." May I humbly say that it is with exactly the same experience that this paper is written. Modern critics analyze the story into "J" and "E" documents, which some unknown redacteur combined into a single whole about the eighth century B.C. As separate documents they are supposed to have existed a century or two earlier. The following analysis of the Hebrew story is taken from Canon Driver's *Introduction*. From the parallel column in which I have placed the Assyro-Babylonian story, it will be seen that the supposed "J" and "E" elements of the one appear to a remarkable degree in the same order of succession as in the other.

<i>Hebrew Story.</i>				<i>Cuneiform Story.</i>			
—				—			
J	Chapter	VI.	1-8				
E	"	"	9-13	Col. I.	14-19	...	The gods.
	"	"	14-22	"	20 to II 9	...	Build a Ship.
J	"	VII.	1-5				
E	"	"	6				
J	"	"	7-10	Col. II.	22-31		Collecting Cargo.
E	"	"	11				
J	"	"	12				
E	"	"	13-16a	"	32-34a		Entering Ship.
J	"	"	16b-17	"	34b-36		Beginning of Storm.
E	"	"	18-21	"	34-47	The Storm.
J	"	"	22-23	Col. III.	1-17		Destruction of Life.
E	"	"	24	"	18-19		Duration of Storm.
E	"	VIII.	1-2a	"	20-22a		Abating of Storm.
J	"	"	2b-3a	"	22b	...	End of Storm.
E	"	"	3b-5	"	23-34		Mountain of Nizir.
J	"	"	6-12	"	35-41		Dove, &c., sent out.
E	"	"	13a				
J	"	"	13b				
E	"	"	14-19	"	42a	...	Leaving Ship.
J	"	"	20-22	"	42b-47	...	The Offerings.
E	"	IX.	1-17	Col. IV.	1-35	...	The Oath.

How are we to account for the "J" and "E" elements of the

Hebrew story appearing in so close an approximation to the same order in the Babylonian? If, according to the commonly held critical theory, the Genesis story was derived from the Babylonian, then two theories more are necessary to complete the explanation. First, that two Hebrew writers split up the Babylonian story, each leaving out parts essential to its completeness, which the other selected, and one using the name "Yaweh" and the other the name "Elohim" to designate the Deity. Second, that a redacteur of a later period found these two bi-sections and spliced them together again in almost the same as their original Babylonian form. Can we be reasonably expected to prefer such an anomalous congeries of theories as this to the simple and obvious one that in the Hebrew and Babylonian records we have two versions of one original event, the former, simple, credible, and true, and the latter, distorted, perverted, and heathenized, coloured by the customs and prejudices, and debased by the false religious conceptions, of the channel through which it flowed?

But, further, there is in the Pierpont Morgan Library of New York a fragment of a tablet containing this story dated in the reign of Ammi-zaduga of "The First Dynasty of Babylon," some eighteen hundred years before Christ. Dr. Pinches also, in a paper read before this Institute last year upon a fragment discovered at Nippur and now in the Philadelphia Museum, U.S.A., possibly the oldest fragment in existence, called our attention to the fact that although its contents consist mainly of the so-called "E" (P) element, yet it contains a reference to the birds which are supposed to belong to "J."

With all this evidence before us, what reason can there be except the persistent adhesion to an arbitrary literary hypothesis for supposing that the Hebrews, with a Babylonian parentage and with the starry heavens whispering it to them night by night, had no consistent and coherent story of the Deluge until two thousand years later? Surely, if modern Biblical scholarship is to maintain its claim to the possession of a scientific spirit, it must condescend, either to rebut this evidence or frankly to say, with Professor Eerdmanns, concerning its late dates and composite hypotheses, "I believed so myself for many years, but I no longer hold that opinion."

II.

Another part of the message which Archæology has to convey to modern Biblical scholarship is that the early history of man, as it has come down to us, can no longer be treated as mythical.

It is not probable that the discoveries of the archæologist carry us back into antediluvian times, though it is not improbable that the break which the geologist finds between palæolithic and neolithic man may enable us to locate it in the history of the race. But Archæology has certainly dispelled the illusion that the traditional belie's of every nation concerning its origin and early history are untrue or even untrustworthy. It is forty years since this illusion received a severe shock by Dr. Schliemann's excavations at Hissarlik. That some indeterminate substratum of truth might underlie Homer's story of Troy was thought to be remotely possible, but for the most part that story was regarded as imaginary and legendary. The spade revealed what the wildest literalist never dreamed of, viz., that no less than nine successive strata of civilized settlements, of which Homer's Troy was the sixth, had been left upon the site. The earliest goes back to about 2500 B.C., almost to the time of Sargon of Akkad. Another surprise has lately come to us. Excavations in the Island of Crete have verified the old Greek tradition that Greece derived her civilization from that island. Mr. Arthur Evans at Knossos, Professor Halbherr at Phæstos, Mr. and Mrs. Hawes at Gournia, and others in other places have opened up historical remains which go back into neolithic times, and show us that the neolithic men were not all savage, cave-dwelling huntsmen. Even the truth about the famous Labyrinth and the man—and maiden—eating Minotaur has been brought to light, and the Scripture statement confirmed that Caphtor is Crete and the original home of the Philistines.

By the earlier achievements of Archæology the settlement of post-diluvian man in the plain of Shinar was established as an incontestable fact. That the Kengi-Urite (Sumero-Akkadian) culture which flourished there was indigenous no one believes, but that it was brought there from some mountainous region, according to Genesis xi, no one doubts. Excavations initiated by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, in 1903-4, conducted by Mr. Raphael Pumpelly, in the plains which lie around and beyond the Caspian Sea, and others conducted by Mr. Stein on behalf of the Indian Government as far away as Chinese Turkestan, have brought to light the remains of a long-forgotten civilization in the form of ruins of many ancient cities. The hope has thus been revived that we may yet find the original home of the Kengi-Urite race. At various times the populations of these regions have been driven out, and the excavators believe that their discoveries have thrown some light upon the causes of these excursions. Important

climatic changes appear to have taken place from time to time, so that regions which had been plentifully supplied with water became arid and barren and unable to sustain their inhabitants. The geological formation known as the "loess" is now no longer considered to be of glacial or fluviatile origin, but to consist of fine dust blown up by high winds and deposited against the sides of hills and mountains. We must therefore cease to adduce it in evidence of the Noachian Deluge.

Thus also the building of the Tower of Babel has been changed from a subject of ridicule into one of amazement. As one after another the ruins of the cities of Babylonia have been explored the remains of ziggurats have been revealed not less astonishing than the solitary instance recorded in Scripture, whose erection was associated with a degree of folly and sin which excited the Divine displeasure and judgment.

Even for the Confusion of Tongues evidence is not wholly wanting. Here, in a little tract of country, not more than three or four hundred miles long, inhabited by a people whose language was originally one, that language, in some mysterious way back in the earliest times of their settlement, became broken into two dialects, the southern and the northern, with the city of Babylon somewhere near the line of demarcation between them. The Hebrew record uses two words, שָׁפָה and דְּבָרִים, "lip" and "words," and tells us that it was the "lip" which was confounded, by which we may no doubt understand the pronunciation, and now, four thousand years afterwards, tablets are found which had to be written in parallel columns giving the equivalent words in the two dialects.

On the other hand, in the vicinity of this people was another race, the Semitic, whose language was spoken side by side with the Sumerian, and yet retained its unity through so many ages that an Assyriologist who can read a Semitic inscription of Sargon of Akkad, written some 2700 years B.C. can, without difficulty, read one of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, written more than 2,000 years later. No doubt the word "Babel" is a Semitic pun upon *Bab-ilu*, the translation of the Sumerian name of the city *Ka-dingirra*, "The Gate of God." Possibly the jibe of the Semites may indicate that they were not implicated in the impious scheme. But in any case the suggestion thrown out by Rev. C. J. Ball that the Semitic languages may have been developed from the Sumerian is worth considering, whatever may prove to be its ultimate value. The chief characteristic of the latter is the monosyllabic and bi-consonantal form of its

roots, while that of the former is its triconsonantal. But in not a few cases the Semitic roots have the appearance of being formed out of the Sumerian by lengthening, by prepositional additions or by reduplication, *e.g.* BAR "to split," "to divide," בָּרָא "to cut," "to carve," "to create," LAM "to shut up," קָלַם "to curb," "to restrain," etc.

At all events, with so much evidence at its command, Archæology may fitly urge that the early history of man which has come down to us from Hebrew sources should not be treated as mythical, and its compilation be thrust forward to a time when the shattered fragments of the nation gathered themselves up after seventy years of humiliating captivity under the yoke of a kindred people far behind them in religious knowledge and scarcely their superiors in any of the arts of civilized life.

But it can go further, and show that instead of legendizing the historic heroes of antiquity, we ought rather to reverse the tendency, and humanize the legendary heroes. In Egypt, Menes, the founder of the First Dynasty, is now regarded as an historical personage by Professor Flinders Petrie, and his tomb is believed to have been discovered at Abydos; so also with Minos II., the Cretan sea-king and descendant of Zeus, and even Father Zeus himself is in danger of losing his divinity. The cave of Dicte, where his mother, Rhea, is said by one tradition to have brought him forth, and Mount Juktas, where he is said to have been buried, have been identified by the excavators at Knossos. Just as in the case of Marduk or Ninrod, the chief deity of the later Babylonians, the cities which constituted the beginning of his imperialism have, with the excavations of the Philadelphia expedition at Nippur, all been made known.

What wonder then if Archæology should be able to give an emphatic denial to the theory that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were Canaanitish demi-gods? In 1869, Professor Nöldeke declared that "criticism had for ever disposed of the claim" that Genesis xiv was historical. But thanks to Dr. Pinches for his decipherment of the Chedorlaomer Tablets the historicity of that chapter has "for ever" been put beyond reasonable doubt. With our knowledge of "The First Dynasty of Babylon" and their successors, the Kassites, we are able to follow the history of the Hebrew patriarchs as it flowed on side by side with the Babylonian and Egyptian. Thus:—

- i. Abraham must have been born in the reign of Sumu-la-ilu.

- ii. He left Ur of the Chaldees in the reign of Sinmuballit.
- iii. He began his nomadic life about the time of the accession of Khammurabi; and the birth of Isaac and most of the remaining events of his life took place during the time of that monarch.
- iv. If Khammurabi reigned fifty-five years, as one of the tablets affirms, Sarah must have died about the same time as he.
- v. Abraham in any case must have died in the reign of Abeshu.
- vi. Isaac must have died just at the time when the great Hittite invasion occasioned the fall of that Dynasty.
- vii. Jacob went down into Egypt ten years later and therefore in the time of Gandash, the founder of the Kassite Dynasty, and in the time of the first Shepherd Dynasty of Egypt.

Egyptology bears witness to the fidelity of the record of life in Egypt in the time of Joseph, while Professor Hull and his colleagues have proved by going over most of the route the accuracy of the account of the journey of the Israelites from Egypt, and the Tel-el-Amarna tablets have testified to the anarchic state of the land of Canaan facilitating the Israelitish invasion, which followed not long after. Time would fail me to tell completely of the evidence which Archæology has furnished to modern Biblical scholarship, all bidding it rectify the premature theories which were formed a generation ago concerning the supposed mythical character of the historical records of the Old Testament.

III.

The message of Archæology in the next place calls for the correction of the results arrived at by a misapplication of evolutionary theories to the Biblical records. It is necessary to remember that the Old Testament, like the New, professes to be an historical record. It is difficult, therefore, to see how an evolutionary process can have any place in such a composition. If there be any such process in the case it must have occurred in the events and not in the record. If Lord Macaulay's pen had given us the result of an evolutionary process we might have had a brilliant romance, but we certainly should not have had a *History of England*. Hence for Biblical scholarship to follow the lead of an evolutionary theory in the study and interpretation

of an historical record is to follow a will-o'-the-wisp. To act scientifically, it should first acquaint itself with a sufficient number of facts independent of the record from which it might deduce the presence of such a theoretical process in Israelitish national life. But to take almost the only existing record of that life, which certainly is not compiled in conformity with any such process, and cut and hack, twist and transpose, deny and disfigure it to fit such a theory is, figuratively speaking, both as cruel and unscientific, as it would be to insist that a man should wear a garment of an artificial pattern, and to bend and break, distort and disfigure his limbs to make them fit it.

The Biblical record, as it stands, is the record of a national life supernaturally directed and controlled, with an ultimate purpose in view, by a Power interposing at every stage to check the evolutionary results of moral evil, and to preserve that national life from self-destruction, until the purpose of the controlling Power should be accomplished, in the advent of One into the world from without the *kosmos*—an incarnation of a Divine Person, and not the final result of an evolutionary process. With the history as it stands, the testimony of Archæology is in complete agreement, and gives not the least sanction to the results which have been made to follow from the application to it of an evolutionary theory. The question at issue is—did the events take place, and did the agents concerned in them feel, think, say, and act at the time, and in the manner asserted by the record? The answer of Archæology, so far as its testimony goes, is most emphatically "Yes." The only answer which the evolutionary hypothesis can give is "No, it is impossible." Hence it is believed to be—

- (a) Impossible that the national life and polity should have been founded upon any legislative basis approximating to that of the record, so that "The Law was *not* given by Moses" (John i, 17), no matter who says it. There may have been a "Mosaic nucleus" in it or "Mosaicity," but that is all.
- (b) Impossible that the alleged lapses of the people from the so-called Mosaic law recorded in the history and denounced by the prophets should ever have occurred. The record must therefore be regarded as anachronistic; interpolated, or later ideals were projected back into earlier times, while a higher religious faith was being evolved.
- (c) Impossible that such conceptions of the Deity and

such religious worship required to be rendered to Him as those assigned to the beginning of the nation's history, should have existed at that time. The national faith at first must have been heathenish and polytheistic until the conception of Jehovah as a tribal God had had time to develop into that of a universal Deity.

- (d) Impossible that the higher religious and spiritual experiences attributed to the historic characters in pre-prophetic times could have been true of them. Accordingly with a strange want of knowledge of the psychology of the religious life, the keen sense of sin, the humble submissiveness of will, as well as the lofty and sublime ecstasies, attributed in the Book of Psalms to David, are denied to that strong, passion-torn warrior. To satisfy the theory, therefore, they are given over to some unknown exilic or post-exilic writer whose personality was not conspicuous enough to win for him any known place in the nation's history, and whose very name is lost in oblivion.

These are a few of the conclusions which follow from the application of an evolutionary theory to the Biblical record. To state them is almost sufficient to refute them, but Archæology in its message to the modern Biblical scholar has something to say concerning them.

First, with regard to the Mosaic legislation. The scholarship in question answers itself concerning the military element in it by denouncing it as revoltingly cruel and therefore by no means anachronistic nor requiring any evolutionary theory to explain or to post-date it. Yet, it should ever be remembered that war is never a dainty business, and the little Hebrew peoples had to take it upon the terms imposed upon them by the older and greater and indeed by all the military nations around them. Amongst these nations, however, in later times, the reputation of the Kings of Israel is testified to by the servants of Benhadad, king of Syria, who say to him, "Behold now we have heard that the kings of the House of Israel are merciful kings" (1 Kings xx, 31). The justness of this contrast cannot be doubted by anyone who has read in the original the unabashed boastfulness of Sennacherib upon the Taylor Cylinder, in his description of the unmitigated and disgusting cruelty with which he treated the living, dying and dead upon the battlefield. There are no signs of an evolutionary process there. But when we are shocked at the militarism of the past it may be well to remember that under the coming

reign of "The Prince of Peace" the happy people may be not less shocked when they learn that we could ever have believed in the Christianity of a Hedley Vicars, a Havelock, or a Gordon.

With regard to the civil legislation of Moses, if one may distinguish it from the religious, when compared with the famous Laws of Khammurabi, codified five or six hundred years before the time of Moses, and separated by a thousand years from the supposed "J," "E" and "P" documents, there is no sufficient difference to call for any theory of evolution. The *lex talionis* is found in both. Khammurabi, it is true, put a man to death for sheep-stealing, and so did the English law of the eighteenth century, while the Mosaic law more wisely and more humanely required restitution and a fine—a principle which, if applied to-day, would soon put a stop to pocket-picking and burglary; and there are other cases of greater humanity. But both sanctioned polygamy, and both sanctioned divorce for causes other than unfaithfulness. The reason given by our Lord for the latter continuing up to His own time,—a reason for all defective legislation—shows no evolution on the subject for nearly two thousand years but a retrogression,—“For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept, but from the beginning it was not so.”

It is, however, in the religious legislation that the process is supposed to have most effectively operated. The limits of space prohibit a reference to more than the one outstanding case supposed to afford conclusive evidence of religious evolution. I refer to the composition of the Book of Deuteronomy. Though founded upon the contents of the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, it is considered to show a considerable advance upon them. To account for it the discovery of "The Book of the Law" by Hilkiah, the priest, in the days of King Josiah, is fixed upon, although there is nothing whatever in the narrative to show that the book found was the Book of Deuteronomy, nothing else and nothing more. It is surmised that there was a "Mosaic party" formed six hundred years after Moses was dead, and that to strengthen their influence the Book of Deuteronomy was forged. Kuenen says: "Deuteronomy was written not for the sake of writing, but to change the whole condition of the kingdom. The author and his party cannot have made the execution of their programme depend upon a lucky accident. If Hilkiah *found* the book in the Temple, it was put there by the adherents of the Mosaic tendency." Thus, a book devised to promote the pure and reverent worship of God was a forgery, concocted by godly

men concerned for truth and righteousness. Surely a strange alliance between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, to advance the cause of a truth-loving God.

In opposition to this incredible theory Archæology has brought to light the fact that as far back as two thousand seven hundred years before Christ the custom existed of burying written documents at the foundations or in the walls of important buildings. Nabonidus, King of Babylon, in his well-known inscription of the sixth century B.C., says of the Temple of Sippar, "That temple I excavated, and its ancient foundation I sought, fifteen cubits I dug up and the foundation-stone of Naram-Sin, the son of Sargon, which for 3,200 years no king before me had seen, etc." (This date is now known to be erroneous.) Excavations conducted by M. Naville in Egypt have brought to our knowledge the fact that in that country also, thousands of years ago, copies of portions of "The Book of the Dead" were buried within temple-walls. Surely it is more reasonable to conclude with M. Naville that the Book of the Law found by Hilkiah had been actually buried there, probably at the building of the Temple by Solomon, and that it was a genuine Book of the Law of Moses. There is thus no need to cast moral aspersion upon the Jewish high-priest, or upon the divine methods of insisting upon truth and righteousness in the world.

Before closing this subject one more discovery may be referred to. The supposed late date of Deuteronomy is based partly upon what is called the "Law of the Central Sanctuary" contained in the twelfth chapter. But the recent translations of the Aramaic papyri found in the island of Elephantiné in Egypt have revealed the fact that as far back as the middle of the seventh century B.C. when Psammetichus I. drove the governors of Assurbanipal out of Egypt, a costly temple was built there for the use of a Jewish colony. Here burnt-offerings and sacrifices, meal-offerings and frankincense were being presented continually. This temple was the only one of its kind known to have been standing during the seventy years of the Babylonish captivity. The importance of this discovery lies in the fact that while modern Biblical scholarship has been confidently affirming that the books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy and the whole "Priestly Code" (part of "P") were not the work of Moses and that the latter did not come into operation until after the exile, these bits of papyri show us the Levitical code in full operation 150 years earlier.

But it is replied that at all events the Book of Deuteronomy

could not have been known, because of the Law of the Central Sanctuary which would not have been thus violated. To which the question may be reasonably returned: Did the Jews in Egypt understand the Law as modern criticism has interpreted it? Would it not be more reasonable to understand it as applying only to the land of Canaan? Are we to suppose that a colony of Jews in a distant land were prohibited from practising their religious rites? Did Isaiah understand it so when he wrote, "In that day there shall be an altar to Yaweh in the midst of the land of Egypt" (xix, 19)? In the next place, even were the Law of the Central Sanctuary what criticism affirms, the fact that the Jews in Egypt did not observe it, would be no proof that it did not exist. The papyri show that they did not observe the laws forbidding participation in heathen idolatries, but their non-observance of these laws is no proof that they had no existence.

On all the questions touched upon in this paper, and on many more, it is necessary that the voice of Archæology should be heard. Too little attention has been given to it by modern Biblical scholarship. We gladly recognize all the good that that scholarship has done in quickening the spirit of enquiry and constraining the students of Scripture to make sure of the correctness of their interpretations. But if its influence is to be wholly good, it must be content to correct the follies of its youth and make the attainment of truth its only aim.

"We search the world and truth we cull—
 The good, the pure, the beautiful—
 From graven stone and written scroll,
 From all old flower-fields of the soul;
 And, weary seekers of the best,
 We come back laden from our quest,
 To find that all the sages said
 Is in The Book our mothers read."

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: I feel no doubt whatever that I am giving utterance to the general feeling of those present when I say that we have listened with great interest and pleasure to Mr. Tuckwell's paper. Most of us have listened to him and read his writings before, and knew what to expect, and it is pleasant to find this afternoon that our expectations have been fully realized.

Well now, as we all know, one of the great difficulties in treating a subject like archæology and modern Biblical scholarship in half an hour or three quarters of an hour is the great number of important things that must necessarily be left unsaid. Still, in spite of these obvious limitations, I feel a little surprised that Mr. Tuckwell should so uniformly identify "Biblical scholarship" with the methods and results of one particular party among Biblical scholars, namely, those who, assuming that the course of progress in religious thought and belief is in all nations and ages necessarily the same, consider themselves authorized in rejecting any historical statement, however well supported, which is not in accord with this assumption, and those, very commonly the same men, who believe themselves able, in dealing with documents written three thousand years ago, and in a language no longer used, one in which there is nothing else that can be used for test or comparison, to pick out clauses and passages in close connection with one another, and say that the one was written by a quite different person to the other, and many hundred years before or after the other.

I must say that it is to me very remarkable that the men who allege this are very often men who deny the possibility of miracles.

I think we must allow the existence of Biblical scholarship, and, thank God, ripe and sound scholarship too, which endeavours to base itself on really ascertained facts, including those of archæology, and is very cautious in admitting the results of so-called literary analysis.

My second caveat is that "Biblical" seems used throughout the paper as equivalent to the Old Testament alone. I admit, of course, that the bearing of archæology on New Testament scholarship could not have been included in Mr. Tuckwell's paper in the limits of time and space imposed upon it. But do not let us forget that what is true of this matter in regard to the Old Testament is true to an even greater extent in regard to the New, and that the school of Biblical critics referred to have been forced, by general consent, to abandon many of their most confidently asserted positions as to the New Testament mainly by the results of the discovery of old books, long lost sight of, and by the results of excavating and inscriptions which have brought out the historical character of narratives whose truth had been questioned because they did not fit a "critical" theory.

One last point and I have done. We must frankly admit that in questions of natural science truth has often been reached by the framing of theories as an attempt to give a connected account of a number of observed facts. Of course, the next step must be rigidly to test the theory to ascertain whether it really does explain and connect the observed facts, and in those sciences which admit of it experiment is the obvious method of doing this. But in applying this test to sciences or branches of knowledge dealing with the past, such, for instance, as geology or history, we cannot easily make experiments, and this particular test resolves itself into this: can we, by means of our theory, predict the existence of facts which subsequent research may show to have really occurred.

As we all know there have been striking instances of this in the history of natural science. The existence of the planet Neptune was discovered as a consequence of the working out of a theory that observed variations in the movements of the planet Uranus were due to the action of an unknown planet.

Again, quite in our own days, the famous Russian chemist Mendeléeff framed a theory known as the Periodic Law, with regard to the relation of the atomic weights of the elements. In accordance with this theory he asserted the existence of certain unknown elements, three of which were afterwards discovered. He also questioned the correctness of certain "accepted atomic weights" because they did not correspond with his theory, and here also his predictions were justified by the result of subsequent experiment.

Now, while we cannot object to the framing of theories with regard to the character and composition of the books of the Bible, we are fully entitled to demand that the most searching tests shall be applied to those theories before we accept them. And, in so doing, we are acting in a truly "scientific" spirit. Now, as Mr. Tuckwell has shown us, the discovery of new facts by archaeological research supplies the means of applying this very test. Did the Biblical "critics" with whom he is dealing truly predict, as a consequence of their theories, any facts which have subsequently been discovered? The only possible answer is that they did not.

Did they, on the other hand, assert, as a consequence of their theories, that many accepted facts were not, in fact, true? We know that they have done that in great number. Then, has subsequent archaeological research in any important instances verified

these corrections? I, for one, am not aware of a single such instance.

It seems to me, therefore, that the "critical theories" on the part of certain Biblical scholars with which Mr. Tuckwell has dealt this afternoon are discredited by the test of their comparison with the results of archæological discovery, and that as regards the Old Testament this is very convincingly set forth in Mr. Tuckwell's paper.

The Rev. CHANCELLOR LIAS said: As one of the oldest members of the Council, I am pleased to congratulate the Institute on the striking and picturesque paper which has been read to-day. I say picturesque because of the graphic language in which the author has put his points before us. It is now some years since the learned Professor Flint, the great authority on Theistic philosophy, remarked that the time had come when "the critics should be criticized." They have been criticized to-day. It is a pity that they should, as I fear they do, resent such criticism; and should be unwilling, or at least *seem* to be unwilling, to come out into the open to discuss the questions at issue. For they claim for their criticism that it is "scientific." Yet it cannot be rightly called "scientific" until it has been tested and has stood the test. Especially is the claim so frequently made for the Biblical criticism of the hour that it represents "the final and unalterable results of scientific criticism" essentially unscientific. For scientific theories are constantly liable to be corrected by fresh discoveries, *e.g.*, the recent discovery of radium has profoundly modified the hitherto accepted theories about heat and matter. If the Biblical critic, on scientific grounds, can claim finality for his conclusions, he not only sets the history of Biblical criticism at nought—since it has been constantly replacing one theory by another—but on his principles the supposed discovery of radium ought to be resolutely disallowed as contrary to the "final and unalterable" conclusions of modern physical science. That were to return to the old dogmatism which barred the progress of scientific discovery from the days of Aristotle to those of Bacon.

I have only one or two remarks to make in support of Mr. Tuckwell's paper. Professor Orr seems to think (see p. 224) that the theory that the use of the names Jahweh and Elohim are characteristic of different authors has been conclusively established. This

idea is very commonly held. But a little more familiarity with the history of Biblical criticism would entirely dispel it. Astruc, it is true, about the middle of the seventeenth century, propounded this theory. But Hupfeld, in a most able, learned, and ingenious essay, published in 1853, gave Astruc's theory its death blow. He showed beyond dispute that a great part of the "Elohistic" portions of the Pentateuch, as recognized in his day, displayed a far closer resemblance to the work of the "Jehovist" than to some of the portions of the "Elohistic" narrative itself. So he insisted that there must have been *two Elohists*, the writings of one of which displayed a much closer affinity to that of the Jehovist than to the writings of his brother Elohist. The latter Hupfeld supposed to have written a brief and elementary outline of Hebrew history with no great literary skill. This discovery was embodied in the critical scheme, and from that time the use of Elohim and Jehovah practically ceased to be distinctive of different authors. When Professor Driver acknowledged that "J E," that is to say, the narrative of the Jehovist and one of the Elohists as combined by a subsequent editor, could not with certainty be divided into its component parts (Introduction, p. 109), the theory in question may be said to have been decently interred. Another point made by Mr. Tuckwell in the same page may be allowed to receive additional illustration. The criticism which assigns Genesis i to an unknown post-exilic author carries its own refutation with it. Mosaism is unquestionably, however it came into existence, one of the foremost religions of the world. And Genesis i is an embodiment in the forefront of the narrative of one of the most important of its tenets. In the east and west alike great philosophers and the founders of great religions placed man's source of weakness in the material organization which formed a part of his composite personality. Plato, for instance, contended that man's great duty was to separate himself as far as possible from the body, which was the source of all his moral errors. Mosaism starts with the fundamental assumption that this theory was untrue. "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good!" (Gen. i, 31). So that it was not to the fact that he was encumbered with a body that man's transgression was due, but to another fact, namely, that being endowed from the first with freedom of the will, without which he would have been a mere machine, he deliberately chose to have

experience of evil as well as good (Gen. ii, 17; iii, 6). Matter was not, therefore, the source of contamination to the human race, but is eternally pure and unpolluted, as the handiwork of God. Man cannot shift on God the origin of the Fall, but to his own misuse of what God had given him. To suppose that this important doctrine was tacked on at the last moment to a religion which has subsisted for countless generations, by an unknown writer, in days of depression and even despondency, can hardly be regarded as either philosophical or probable.

Mr. MAUNDER said: I should like to join with Chancellor Lias in expressing the great pleasure with which I have listened to Mr. Tuckwell's address. It has always seemed to me that if we but read the books of Moses through, as we have them at the present time, they bear upon their face the evident marks of unity of purpose. Take for instance the book of Genesis, and look at it as you would at any other piece of literature. It does not matter what sources were used in the composition of the book, but its writer from the beginning to the end works upon one clear, definite plan; and that plan finds its completion in the closing chapters of Deuteronomy. There again in that book, if we simply read the book as it stands, as Professor Moulton has shown us in his *Modern Reader's Bible*, we find that book an essential unity; four noble orations, the one arising out of the other, lead up to the great Song of Moses; and orations, more eloquent, more masterly, do not exist in any literature whatsoever. Looking at the question from the point of view of literature alone, the books of Moses are evidently the work of a single master mind.

There is one trifling matter on which I differ from Mr. Tuckwell. I do not think that the well-known Babylonian seal to which he refers, "irresistibly points to the conclusion that the engraver was familiar with some such story as that in Genesis iii." It is *possible* that the engraver was trying to show some such incident, but the evidence is very slight. In all the many references to the seal which I have come across, not one points out that the seal was engraved on a cylinder, which necessarily has in itself no beginning nor end. The serpent on the cylinder is not more behind the one figure than the other. I have made a very rough little representation of the cylinder, which I will hand round, and it is sufficient to show that we might begin the seal on either side of the supposed snake. It is

not quite clear to me indeed that the snake is a snake, or anything more than a dividing line to show how the cylinder was to be placed when an impression was to be taken. Nor is it certain that either of the two figures is intended to be a woman. Moreover, they are both clothed, an important difference from the narrative in Genesis, and neither has taken the fruit from the tree, nor is giving it to the other; both are in exactly the same attitude. I therefore think it very doubtful whether we have the right to assume that there is any reference to the story of the Fall.

Mr. JOHN SCHWARTZ, Jun., described the paper as "able special pleading," and said the real conclusions of archæology were against the Lecturer, that evolution of morality and the spiritual was proved all along the lines, that the degradation theory of savages was exploded, and that the Jews, like others, had developed in the same way as other early peoples, and that the prophets alone could be said to be inspired.

After a few remarks from Professor LANGHORNE ORCHARD—

Rev. W. R. WHATELY said: There are two points raised by a previous speaker on which I should like to say a few words. He referred to the degeneration of savages as an exploded theory. I should rather describe it as (in some instances) a demonstrated fact. I believe that the Australian aborigines speak a language which must have been developed by ancestors in a higher state of civilization than the present race.

Secondly he spoke of the evolution of an ethical monotheistic religion in Israel as an instance of the general law of religions. The "general law!" Where is there another instance, apart from the Bible, of an ethical monotheistic religion? There is absolutely none. So far from being an instance of a general law, the appearance of such a religion in Israel is absolutely unique. Nor does the supposition of a gradual evolution from lower forms of religion render it any less unique.

Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL in reply said: Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I beg to thank you very cordially for the appreciation with which you have received my paper. The little criticism it has received will not need any lengthy reply. With regard to our Chairman's remarks, the use of the word "modern" in the title shows the limitation of the professed scholarship with which it deals. The existence of other Biblical scholarships I have clearly recognized on

p. 221. And with regard to the New Testament branch of the subject that will be dealt with in the forthcoming Gunning prize essay.

To the Rev. Chancellor Lias my thanks are due for a very suggestive and helpful supplement to the contents of my paper.

As to Mr. Maunder's remarks concerning the Babylonian seal, if the supposed serpent be only a dividing line then that disposes of his suggestion that because it is in the form of a cylinder the engraver intended his design to be "without beginning or end." Moreover, viewed in this position the two figures are back to back—a relationship which was certainly not an integral part of the design. It is quite true that the Babylonians of the same period made profuse use of dividing lines in their *inscriptions*, separating sentences and even words by them, but they invariably ruled them straight. I do not remember ever to have seen a wavy dividing line like this one. I do not know whether Mr. Maunder can give us another instance. Moreover, the formation at one end of the line differs from that at the other and might quite easily have been meant to represent the head of the serpent. Then as to the difference of sex in the two figures that is indicated by the head-dresses. One is adorned with horns, the emblems of authority, which may be taken to represent the authority given by the Genesis narrative to man over woman at "The Fall." The other figure has no doubt what was intended to be a female's head-dress. The deviation in other particulars from the Genesis narrative is quite in accordance with the analogy of the Creation and Deluge stories as Professor Orchard has pointed out. I am afraid, therefore, I must still retain my own opinion on this subject.

Mr. Schwartz's somewhat digressive criticism was sufficiently and very aptly answered by Rev. W. R. Whately, so that I need not occupy your time by any further remarks on the matters referred to by him.

In reply to Mr. Oke's enquiry I may say that by the kind permission of the Council I hope to have this paper published in pamphlet form. Again let me thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the patient and sympathetic hearing you have given me.