

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.

VOL. LVII.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1925

675TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM D, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MARCH 23RD, 1925,
AT 4.30 P.M.

WILLIAM DALE, ESQ., F.G.S., F.S.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Proceedings commenced by a statement from the CHAIRMAN, that Mr. W. Jennings Bryan, having failed to send in his paper, the Council had been obliged to substitute for it, at the last moment, the paper which the Rev. Dr. M. G. Kyle had sent in for the 20th prox.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced that Major H. Charlewood Turner, a former Secretary of the Society, had been elected a Member, and also that the Langhorne Orchard Prize on "Can Revelation and Evolution be Harmonized?" had been adjudged to Professor George McCready Price, M.A., of Union College, Nebraska, U.S.A., a Member of the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Lieut.-Colonel F. A. Molony, in the absence of the Rev. Dr. Kyle, to read the paper on "The Antiquity of Man According to the Genesis Account."

*THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN ACCORDING TO THE
GENESIS ACCOUNT.*

By the Rev. President M. G. KYLE, D.D., LL.D., Xenia
Theological Seminary, U.S.A.

ANY adequate and satisfactory discussion of the antiquity of man according to the Genesis account, or any other source of materials, must not only present chronological data, but, and more especially, the stage of advancement in civilization; not merely the antiquity of man in time, but the man of antiquity in his time. Dates do not tell us very much; a mere calendar is not very illuminating. It is only when we are able to locate ourselves at some point indicated by a date and see, as in a *camera obscura*, life at that date streaming by us that we are much instructed.

It is well to state in this case the presuppositions—necessary, indeed, to every discussion which does not propose to discuss everything by beginning at the very beginning—the presuppositions, I say, which underly what is about to be said; let us get our feet upon a solid and clearly understood foundation

before we attempt to build a superstructure representing the antiquity of man.

The first presupposition of this discussion is the progressive creation set forth in the first chapter of Genesis, the progress that begins with the announcement of the creation of the materials of the whole heavens and earth and then proceeds in an orderly way to the arrangement of those materials for a suitable habitat for man. The mighty power of God goes forth over the waters imparting motion, followed immediately by the fiat, "Let there be light," a mode of motion; and then rotation at once sets up the succession of day and night. The waters above the earth lift to form the clouds and the open firmament of heaven appears. Upheavals of the earth thrust up the dry land, and the waters running down are gathered into the seas. The earth brings forth the herb bearing seed, and the permanence of species is proclaimed in the words, "After its kind." Then the waters of the sea brought forth the lowest forms of animated life, and the heavens cleared away so that the heavenly bodies came to be for signs and for seasons. The earth also brought forth the lowest forms of life upon land; all animate life was given procreative power, and each limited by the divine fiat, "After its kind." Last of all, the creation of man was in the image of God; "In the image of God created He him, male and female created He them." The continuance of the race in a pure human character was not imperilled by leaving to mere chance to bring a man "sport" and a woman "sport" together in the same age and the same land to set agoing a race of human beings; God *made* them male and female as he had *made* all the animals, that there might be no half species, so-called missing links. Thus was creation finished; not a theistic evolution, which will not evolve except when God comes in and gives it another turn, but a progressive creation that was never intended to run alone.

Another presupposition upon which we must take our stand securely is the trustworthiness of ancient documents. Creation had no historian; nobody was there to observe and relate; only God can tell us about it. Science may find out much concerning results; it is great in examining materials. But science is organized knowledge, organized always upon the principle of the continuity of nature. But the continuity of nature belongs only to that portion of eternity marked off as time, which began with creation and will end at the winding

up of the affairs of this world. It can tell us nothing about creation, for creation brought the laws of nature into being; they could not preside over their own birth. Concerning man's starting off in the world, then, only God can tell us.

But if the ancient documents which purport to tell us of the antiquity of man, back to his beginning, are not trustworthy, if these documents have been thrown together promiscuously and are mutilated and interpolated and incorrectly transmitted and are generally untrustworthy, then we know nothing reliable on the subject of creation. This trustworthiness of ancient documents is of transcendent importance. Criticism and archæology have proceeded along parallel but dissimilar lines; criticism starts from the assumption of the untrustworthiness of ancient documents, which therefore must be re-written and reconstructed—are composed, in fact, of scraps, filled with mistakes, and so are untrustworthy. Archæology, in both the Biblical and the classical fields, has started without assumption and has proceeded uniformly toward trustworthiness of ancient documents. The whole underlying Homeric stories, the account of the ruined palace and splendour of King Minos and the story of Menes, the first king in Egypt, all formerly regarded as legendary or mythical, have now taken their place in sober history. Herodotus and Strabo and Josephus, so often charged with inaccuracies, have again and again been found to be correct. In the Biblical field not a single statement of fact has been finally discredited. Thus men come more and more to believe in the trustworthiness of ancient documents, until with many it has become almost an axiom.

With man, made in the image of God, as the crowning act of a progressive creation, and with the record of this sent down to us by trustworthy documents candidly presupposed, we are now ready to consider the antiquity of man according to the Genesis account, and also still more exactly and completely the man of antiquity according to that account.

The Genesis account presents to us the real primitive man. Much is written on the subject of anthropology concerning primitive man, as found here and there in different parts and different ages of the world. The only real primitive man in the absolute sense of the word primitive was the first man, the progenitor of the human race; though some cling to the supposition that there were many different centres of population whence the race spread over the world, and so the race had many

progenitors. Yet all the traceable lines of migration and of philological relationships as well as the physiological characteristics of the race point to a common original in a single progenitor sometime, somewhere, so that the most and the best investigators on different lines of scientific evidence consent to the statement of Scripture that presents to us, "All men of one blood to dwell on all the face of the earth." The plain intent of the Genesis account assumes this as a fact, and tells us of the first man, the one progenitor of the race.

I. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS OF LIFE OF PRIMITIVE MAN.

The physical conditions of life to which primitive man was subject as presented in the Bible are most interesting, and especially so when compared with the presuppositions of anthropologists on the subject. He is represented in Genesis as having capabilities; he was to subdue the earth and replenish it and rule over it, and was set in the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it. But as yet he had not put these capabilities into exercise; he was able to do all things that men ever do, but he had not yet begun to do any of them. He had done nothing to subdue the earth or to keep the garden in order; he had done nothing for himself, had neither made clothes, built himself a house, nor done anything toward producing food. He was, as yet, only a food gatherer.

Then, as he had done nothing, manifestly nothing had been done in the world. As he was an unskilled man as yet, so the world was an untouched world. There were no roads, no buildings, no implements. There was nothing that man has produced. It is true he was put in a garden, but it was not an Italian garden, nor a Japanese garden, nor any other kind of a made garden of flowers and vegetables with beds and paths and all things in order. It was one of God's gardens, a field of poppies, a lily marsh, a hillside of rhododendrons, a tangle of glorious fir trees and poplars. Thus, nothing that man has ever learned was as yet acquired, and nothing that civilization has given to the world was yet begun. This unskilled man in an untouched world was naked and in the woods.

We seem to be given also in the Genesis account an illuminating note of philological beginnings. It used to be thought

that all, or nearly all, words of human speech could be traced back to verbal roots ; though how anybody ever conversed in verbs, much less in the roots of verbs, it would puzzle even a philologist to explain. It is observed that some languages have only one real verb, to do ; or were like the ancient Egyptian, which used “ to do ” and “ to stand ” and “ to be ” with a great many verbal nouns. Children also always begin to talk not with verbs at all, but with the names of things. And now philologists have taken the ground that language began not with verbs, but with nouns. How perfectly natural, then, that when this new creature, man, began to try to talk, he should first name the objects round about him, and what objects would first attract his attention more than the moving objects, the beautiful creatures of the wood and the field around him. Now, this is exactly the first exercise of human speech of which we have any hint. “ Whatsoever Adam called any creature that was the name thereof.” Of course ! There was nobody else to give it any other name. But the very simplicity of this account causes many to overlook the importance of it. Here is also recognized the arbitrariness of language ; words always mean only what they are understood to mean by those who use them. And, except in the case of a few onomatopoeic words, they have no natural meaning. “ Whatsoever Adam called ” a thing that was the name of it, is the simple announcement, in terms that even children can understand, of the fundamental principle in the growth of language.

The moral condition of this primitive man is not less interesting than the natural conditions of his life. As he had not begun to do anything, so neither had he begun to sin. Just as his natural capabilities had not yet been put to exercise, so his moral character was not yet developed by exercise. Like one to be born long afterwards, this primitive man was to grow “ in wisdom and in stature and in favour with God and man.” Thus his perfection was the perfectness of completeness and not that of attainment or achievement.

The trying out of the moral nature of man that he should grow in wisdom and in stature and in favour, is of transcendent interest in the Genesis account of the antiquity of man that we may understand the state of advancement of this primitive man of antiquity. The human soul was free, for only such a creature would be in the “ Image of God.” But freedom involves freedom of choice, and a choice between good and

evil opens for us the way toward temptation. How temptation had access and why, we do not know ; but our ignorance on the subject is no greater for that time than for the present.

The account of the temptation of primitive man has been much jeered at by shallow thoughtlessness. If we look narrowly at primitive man, we shall have no difficulty concerning the significance of his temptation. The so-called "childishness" of the temptation story in Genesis is exactly in keeping with the childhood of the race. It is an account of the temptation of primitive man. Now what kind of a temptation could come to such a man as we have seen ? Temptation must come within the horizon of our desires. I might be tempted with a handsome limousine, but I could not be tempted with a white elephant, for I have no desire whatever to possess a white elephant. What kind of temptation could come within the narrow horizon of primitive man ? None of the complex and intricate temptations of our present-day civilization could appeal to him. Eve could not be tempted to envy her neighbour's new bonnet, or fine clothes, or social pre-eminence, Adam could not be tempted to overreach his neighbour or to speculate in margins, or to be a grafter, political or otherwise. Neither could temptation come down the road to him in a limousine with powder on her nose ! The artificial, complex temptations of to-day do not come within the horizon of primitive man at all, but only such temptations as appealed to his active desires. The desire of achievement had no competitor ; the desire for possession was fully gratified, for he possessed all the world. Only the desire to enjoy the good things was within his horizon as a field of temptation, and here the only immediate desire to which appeal could be made was concerning something to eat.

Thus, the Genesis account of the trying out of the moral nature of primitive man is exactly in accord with the conditions of his life ; just such an account as must be given of the first temptation of man primitive, if we had no Bible at all. Any other kind of account would be an absurdity. If the story in Genesis presented some of the complex, artificial temptations of an advanced state of civilization it would be pounced upon at once as absolutely anachronistic and impossible.

Complete consideration of all the details connected with the temptation and the fall would lead us far afield beyond the scope of this paper ; there is need only to see the effect of these things upon the man of antiquity and upon the progress which he might

make as we attempt to get some definite idea of the antiquity of man.

Limited as was the horizon of experience of the man of antiquity to whom temptation came, the temptation as described runs through the whole gamut of the desires of the soul, and the account, though it reads like a bed-time story for children, yet sounds the profoundest depths of psychology and ethics, even within the narrow scope of the appetites. The temptation appealed first to the desire to enjoy things (Gen. iii, 1); then to the desire to obtain things (Gen. iii, 4); and then to the desire to do things (Gen. iii, 5). Yielding was progressive also and in the same order and as the temptation went on, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her and he did eat." Here we have in regular order "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." John says that these are "all that is in the world"; for the desire to enjoy things has to do with what goes on within, the desire to obtain things with what comes in from without, and the desire to do things with what goes out from within. Manifestly these three cover all possible influences that can touch the soul, and our Lord was tempted in "all points," not *all ways*, but at "all points" as we are, and actually met precisely the same temptations to enjoy things, and to obtain things, and to do things that might make the world stare. He heard the temptations within, but did not open the door. Thus, the man of antiquity met at the outset of life what everyone at any time meets at the opening of a career. The whole gamut of desires was tried out through every approach to the soul; under the temptation *he* fell.

The death that was threatened him is learned from what happened in that "day." Desire was perverted and must be subjected to conscience. Immediate fellowship with God was interrupted and mediation made necessary. And the submissive sense of responsibility was repudiated. He was shut out from the tree of life that had made him *posse non mori*, "able not to die," and sent out into a world cursed for sin with only the bud of a promise of a far-off redemption.

The course of the progress in civilization of this man of antiquity is most briefly yet clearly set forth in exact scientific order, but in popular language, in the fourth chapter of Genesis. First, there

took place the domestication of animals ; they became " keepers of sheep." And then arose agriculture ; they became " tillers of the ground." Public religion began at a *place* of worship, and then civil government is mentioned as people multiplied. Emigration began, as always, from disagreement or discontent, and urban life began as there came to be different *centres* of population. True nomadic life followed the growth of population and the necessity of wandering from place to place to feed the flocks, a place to go from as well as a place to come to. And, last of all in the order of development, the arts and crafts of the world were given by those progenitors, Jubal and Tubal Cain.

Only upon the background of this man of antiquity, with all his sins and blunders, is it possible to sketch the rate of progress in the development of civilization which is to be dated from the time this unskilled man was placed in an untouched world down to the place where history receives him and gives us definite account of him, so that there we may be able to find him and give some approximate estimate of the real antiquity of man.

II. THE DATE TO WHICH THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN REACHES.

The determination of dates in antiquity is still very uncertain and indefinite. Chronologers are fond of a great appearance of positive information in their lists of dates, and oft times give an appearance of exactness that does not really exist. In Egyptian chronology there is a great deal of assurance given us that is pure assurance on the part of the chronologer, however indignantly they repudiate this idea ; the fact is that between the dates given by the principal chronologers there is a difference of the small matter of *about two millenniums* ! A trifle like that may not trouble the chronologers, each of which is confident the mistake is altogether in the dates of the other, but it is, to say the least, rather disconcerting to the ordinary reader. Of course, the time when Lepsius tentatively, for mere convenience in reference, estimated Egyptian chronology three reigns to a century is *past*, though it is but a few years since his list of dates was still given in quotations.

Similar uncertainties, or at least indefiniteness, exists in the Assyro-Babylonian chronology, as when, in the excavations at Nippur, a pavement, the date of which was known, was taken as a base line, measurements made down to another pavement,

whose date was unknown, and the rule of three made to do the rest! As though cities were destroyed at regular intervals and always left a determinable amount of debris!

As the distinguished Professor Morris Jastow, Jr., urged a few years ago at a meeting of the American Oriental Society, there is still a vast deal of uncertainty in early Babylonian dates, especially in the Sumerian period, and archæologists ought to keep before the reading public this indefiniteness a good deal more than they are wont to do. Back of the time of the Eponym calendar (912-647 B.C.) this uncertainty reigns, and dates are being changed from year to year like money over a gaming table. Even the Eponym calendar is not entirely above suspicion, as such scholars as Halevey do not permit us to forget.

Now this uncertainty concerning dates B.C. does not impugn the trustworthiness of ancient documents; it shows simply that when we get back to the age when they had neither clocks nor calendars, and so did not reckon primarily by the flight of time, but by events, we have come to the place where our method of counting every moment of time whether anything happened or not, and that by astronomical time with mathematical exactness does not apply at all. Except for a few events like eclipses, whose *interval of recurrence* may be calculated, though the particular occurrence may not be known, there is no reliable way of applying our chronology to the ancient world.

By the various incidental means of comparison of events, dates may be made out with some fair degree of reliability back as far as the time of Abraham, at which point the most candid chronologers are now disposed to stop. Beyond that time we know nothing of exact dates, and may only be guided vaguely by various considerations which the historical imagination is able to use and which will now be passed in review.

The genealogical lists of Genesis which were formerly much relied upon as a basis for chronology and are still sometimes thrust forward as reliable criteria, are yet now well known to be a mere quicksand which may swallow up the luckless venturer in inextricable depths. Genealogies were intended to give the line of descent, but were never intended to be used as a basis of chronology. The best evidence of this is that the Biblical writers never so used genealogies. Additional evidence is supplied by the examination of a few of the genealogies given. The genealogy of Moses (Num. xxvi, 59) presents three generations from Levi to cover a period of 430 years! During which time the Israelites

had increased by so many generations that they had become to the Egyptians an ominous menace. Evidently all the steps in the genealogy of Moses are not given. The same thing appears in the fact that Kohath, the grandfather of Moses, if we are to suppose that all the steps in the descent are given, had 8,600 male descendants, more than 17,000 descendants altogether during the life-time of Moses! The genealogy of our Lord in Matthew, fourteen and fourteen and fourteen generations from Abraham to David, to the exile, and to the birth of Christ, requires about 70 years, 30 years, and 45 years, respectively, to a generation! The manifest incompleteness of the steps in the genealogy is further corroborated and explained when we examine the genealogy given in Chronicles, where some persons are actually mentioned whose names are omitted from the genealogy in Matthew. The moral element which so often enters into Old Testament chronology appears when we discover that these persons, dropped out by Matthew, were descendants of the detested Athaliah.

Genealogies were only intended to give the line of descent; they touched the mountain tops, the valleys were passed over. This is exactly in accord with the usage of the Hebrew in the employment of terms of descent. "To beget," "to bear," "father," "son," "mother," "daughter" do not ever require us to understand immediate descent. Whether or not it be immediate or remote must always be determined by independent evidence, and may not be determinable at all. They "begat children and children's children" (Deut. iv, 25). The wives of Jacob are described as bearing to him both children and grandchildren (Gen. xlvii, 16-18). Sarah is described as "bearing" the people of Isaiah's time (Isa. li, 2). "To beget" a son meant nothing more than the going off of a line of descent in which that son sometime appeared, it might be at the second, or at the forty-second removal. Thus the genealogical table in Genesis (chap. v) which reads that so-and-so lived so many years and begat so-and-so means nothing more than that one great leader of the antediluvian world lived so many years at which time went off the line of descent in which appeared, at some undetermined remove, the next great leader. Any attempt to add together these figures and get chronology is utterly futile. These facts briefly presented here were elaborately worked out by Professor William Henry Green in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April, 1890). The way in which they are ignored by those who would

make out that the chronology of the Old Testament is utterly untrustworthy would be much more creditable to ignorance than to intention.

The fact is that the Bible leaves the date of the antiquity of man an open question. We are at liberty, at the same time that we hold strictly to the trustworthiness of the Biblical record, to accept any *established* date, but not mere speculative guesses. A geologist recently said, "When we are guessing, it is as easy to guess a million years as to guess a century."

III. HINTS IN THE GENESIS RECORD CONCERNING THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

We come now to the consideration of certain facts and hints in the Genesis record which the historical imagination is able to use with telling effect in gaining some more or less vague idea of the antiquity of man. Here also we shall see the value of the information which we have first set before us concerning the man of antiquity.

The Bible gives us some internal indication of the lapse of great stretches of time. We have seen that the list of antediluvian worthies is quite capable of stretching out to almost illimitable periods of time; that, in fact, this list only touches the mountain tops of biography; how wide may be the intervening valleys we can no more tell than can we estimate the valley that lies between two mountain ranges which rise up before us one behind the other.

The Egyptians have a kind of fabulous history, a reign of the gods, which corresponds to this reign of the antediluvian worthies. However, the names in Egyptian give us no clue whatever. On the other hand, the Babylonians have a list of heroes who reigned 36,000 years. Here the list is most illuminating. Professor Clay has shown that this Babylonian list of fabulous heroes is practically the same, name for name, as the list of Old Testament worthies. The Babylonians give prodigious scope to imagination in the length of the reign of these worthies. While little or no dependence may be placed upon the number of years, it is evident they represent the tradition of a great flight of time in the early history of the world.

Then the character of the ark built in Noah's time calls for a long and tedious development of civilization. From the first

rude floating craft, a round or hollow log, it is a far cry to the craftsmanship and engineering ability displayed in the erection of such a craft as the ark. In the postdiluvian period, development lagged far behind this ; even in the great days of Phœnician and Roman seamanship no such craft was produced ; nor did those master builders, the Venetians and Genoese, nor after them, the Portuguese nor Dutch, give anything to the world approaching the ark. Indeed, modern shipbuilding never exceeded the work of Noah until the marvellous genius, 50 years in advance of his own time, who produced the " Great Eastern," gave to the world that anticipation of the present-day floating palaces that cross the ocean. It is now known in ship architecture that the proportions of the ark are exactly the proportions required for the greatest steadiness combined with largest carrying capacity. In very fact not only the proportions, but the dimensions, of the ark were almost exactly those of the great battleship " Oregon," queen of the seas of a generation ago, Such an achievement in naval architecture as the ark calls for a long period of the growth of civilization in the antediluvian age, and such an extent of great populations as could not have come about in one or two millenniums.

Then the progress of populating the world and the rise of civilization, now being so exactly confirmed as recorded in the Bible in the 10th chapter of Genesis, calls for a lapse of time that is appalling before we come down even to the first pilgrim father Abraham on what is to us the horizon of history. A few minutes spent in tracing the streams of migration and growth of empire, delineated in that table of nations, will convince the most sceptical of this. The descendants of Ham are represented as the first to spread out, the time of which movement must itself have been a long while after the Deluge. When would they begin to spread out ? Certainly not until populations began to crowd upon each other. For how long a period in an empty world would not people cling together and only, when necessity or the demands of comfort or some disruption in society came about, would migrations begin ? Indeed, disagreements or necessities are almost invariably the sources of migration. Centrifugal tendencies in population are literally a throwing off. The centripetal force in human society, gregariousness, is most natural until superseded by something that drives people apart, as strife and conflict, or the growth of numbers beyond the available food supply, or the unsuitability

of the dwelling place. Such a growth of populations starting from a very few people after the Deluge supposes long stretches of quietness at the old home until some self-interest caused a part of them to wander about. Then the descendants of Ham moved southward, manifestly following the course of least resistance ; in other words, seeking a warmer climate. We are told they occupied Canaan—that is, Canaan was a son of Ham—and anthropological discoverers in Palestine certify that the aborigines of that land were not Semites like those who succeeded them. In time—and how long a time must it have been before in this new land conditions could again arise for spreading out further?—but in time, again, some necessities of existence became a new centrifugal force that expended itself still further in the easiest direction, southward, and Cush became a son of Canaan. And so southern Arabia and north-eastern Africa were populated. Here, in this vast region, again through untold generations, population grew and spread out. It was hot enough now ; the centrifugal force would expand itself laterally, and history, as we find it recorded, followed exactly these lines. How many generations would it require for the population to creep along the Arabian coast around to what we now call the Persian Gulf, to the mouth of the Euphrates, there to establish a new centre where should arise a great civilization on the far horizon of which at last arose Nimrod, the son of Cush, and became the father of the first historic civilization—that is to say, the first in history, whether or not it was the first in existence ?

The dynastic Egyptians are variously placed in antiquity, reaching back either to 4,000 or to 6,000 years B.C. But these dynastic Egyptians, whenever they appeared, came down the river from the land of Punt. They were of the same sons of Cush who had gone around the Arabian coast and early populated the Babylonian plain. They are identified not only by the historical record in Genesis, set beside the dynastic history of the Egyptians, but we have the pictures both of the people of the land of Punt and the early Sumerians of that Nimrod people. They are the same, with unmistakable distinguishing peculiarities.

Now all this tracing of the movements of populations has shoved the horizon of civilization farther and farther back, and still it is always and only the horizon of *civilization*, a civilization with arts and crafts far removed from anything primitive,

removed by uncounted generations from the time when an unskilled man was placed in an untouched world ; for it is not only the progress of the postdiluvians who inherited the antediluvian civilization which we have to deal with, but the progress of the antediluvian world up to that point from the most primitive beginning. Under the inspiration of a great revelation, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit now given, "Who leads us into all truth," the world has progressed very rapidly ; yet, even so, 2,000 years have been required for the growth of the present-day civilization. How much less rapid was probably the world's progress before the fullness of time for this progress came ?

One other consideration demands our attention. All modern tracing of lines of migration as well as modern indications of philological research point toward there being originally but a single starting point for the race. The supposition has at times gained considerable credence, as already noted, that the account in Genesis is only the account of a sample creation and dispersion, and not meant to be the story of the only one. But scientific research, both ethnological and philological, points to the truth of the words of Scripture that God has "made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth." Thus all the antiquities now known in Egypt and Babylonia, all the prodigious remains of the Maya country and the marvels of Chican-Itza, even the strange antiquities of the Mediterranean basin and the islands of the Pacific, point to the stupendous antiquity of man even since the days of Noah. In presence of the original antiquity of man before the Flood, imagination flags.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said that it was necessary for speakers to confine themselves to the subject of the paper, and not to be tempted to the side issues of evolution and its kindred aspects.

The object of the writer was to prove the great antiquity of man, and the Biblical record did not deny this fact but confirmed it. The author, in a clear and convincing way, set forth the proofs that it was not possible to give a date in so many years at which man

appeared on the earth. He (the Chairman), as a geologist, had long been persuaded that man appeared as long ago as Pleistocene times, a period so remote that it could only be estimated in the same way that we estimate geologic time.

In that part of the paper which referred to Adam naming the animals in the Garden of Eden, he was reminded that the famous thirteenth century "Bestiary" preserved at Westminster Abbey, in relating this event, said that "whatsoever Adam called it, that was the name and *the nature* thereof."

Lieut.-Colonel MOLONY said: I am very glad that we need not defend the date for the creation of Adam given in the margin of some of our Bibles, and called Archbishop Usher's chronology, I believe. The subject of the antiquity of man is exciting great interest at Cambridge, and those who have studied it are convinced that the time of man's first appearance must be much more than 6,000 years ago.

I only propose to criticize one very minor point in the paper—about Noah's ark. As a boy I noticed that all the toy arks in the shops must inevitably capsizes if put in the water. So I was very pleased to note that if an ark were made according to the dimensions given in Scripture it would not capsizes. For its breadth was to be 50 cubits against a height of 30. The author reminds us that the dimensions of the ark are those of a pre-dreadnought battleship. But then he says they are the proportions required for "the greatest steadiness combined with largest carrying capacity." This is not quite correct, because the battleship has to be forced through the water, whereas the ark was only to float about. Its carrying capacity would have been greater if made nearer circular. But probably its width was limited by the largest beams Noah could procure, it being clearly desirable that one beam, or at most two scarfed together, should stretch right across. In any case the dimensions given for the ark in Scripture are perfectly credible.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: No one could listen to the paper without being impressed by its reasoned vindication of the Genesis account of primitive man, of the test imposed on him, of the origins of language, etc., in contrast with the anachronistic notions of the

Modernists. The arguments of the main thesis seem less convincing. Surely the distinction must be emphasized between those genealogies which only profess to give outstanding names necessary to prove their genuineness, and those which give chronological details, as in Gen. xi.

Dr. Kyle's explanation on p. 134 seems to leave things where they were, for the ages of the fathers hold equally good, whether the birth is of "a son," as the Bible states, or of some "great teacher," as he suggests, and the totals remain unchanged.

There are, of course, some elements of uncertainty: *e.g.*, in Gen. v, 32, and xi, 26, where the sons of Noah and Terah are respectively said to have been born in the same year, which we know was not the case: *e.g.*, Abraham was sixty years the junior of his eldest brother. This is only in the case of the direct line of Christ; then the Messianic ancestor, as Shem or Abraham, gets the first-born's place. But these seem the exception, and hold out a very slender margin of relief to those in need of it. Certainly, as the lecturer points out, the opponents of Biblical chronology deal out their millenniums with no niggard hand; they juggle with myriads of years as the evolutionist with his millions.

As to Dr. Kyle's reference to Prof. Clay at bottom of p. 135,* I understood this latter, in his recent paper before the Institute, instead of claiming identity between Babylonish heroes and Old Testament worthies, to question any such identity, and to treat the idea as a *reductio ad absurdum*. As for the ark (p. 135), certainly there are many "means" between it and a dug-out, but its extraordinary character is sufficiently accounted for by the fact that God was the Architect, and He who gave the specifications no doubt gave the ability to carry them out, otherwise we must suppose one Noah to receive dimensions and whole generations of Noahs to evolve the skill to build the ark, which is absurd.

As for the vast periods Dr. Kyle predicates for the spread of ancient peoples along the lines he enumerates, may not the natural process have been much quicker in an empty than in a full world? Were Europe unoccupied to-day, it would not take long for large

* "Early Civilization of Amurru," p. 99. "The names found in the Hebrew lists are quite independent of those found in the Babylonian lists."

tracts to be overrun. Nomad races especially are like sheep, outrunning one another for often imaginary advantages; and there was in those days a determining factor, which exists no longer in the same sense to-day. "The Lord scattered them."

Even admitting that we owe the civilization of to-day to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is hardly correct to say that it is the product of a 2,000 years' evolution. That is to forget the long centuries of stagnation in the Christian era. Indeed, the advance, out of all proportion, of the last few decades would rather argue that when the hour strikes for a great development it happens in a surprisingly brief space of time.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: Mr. Chairman, not having seen the paper until to-day, I have only one or two remarks to make upon its contents, but they touch upon important points in the lecture.

First, I must protest against the lecturer's description of Adam, on p. 128, as "an unskilled man" who had been put into the Garden of Eden to do certain things, but "had done nothing". Had the lecturer been present, I should have liked to ask him his authority for making such a statement. Surely, if, as the Scriptures state, God made Adam *in His own image and after His likeness* (Gen. i, 26); and if Adam, with the rest of creation, was declared by God to be *very good*, there seems to be no escaping the conclusion that he must have been just the opposite of an *unskilled man*!

Then, on p. 136, he tells us that "the character of the ark calls for a long and tedious development of civilization . . . as could not have come about in one or two millenniums."

But here again he seems to forget that the ark was not apparently built by the wisdom or skill of man, but by direct instructions from God (Gen. vi. 14-16), who can well dispense with the natural time required for man to acquire the art of shipbuilding. Just as when our Lord would feed 5,000 men (John vi, 11) He produced the necessary loaves, without waiting for the wheat to grow, or the grain to be ground into flour, or the oven to bake it. It is unfortunate that the Divine side of these things is too often overlooked.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS thought Mr. Collett hardly recognized that the Divine direction for the ark only concerned measurements,

and therefore the lecturer appeared to be correct in suggesting that a development of civilization was necessary for its building.

He pointed out that according to the true text of Acts xvii, 26, the word "blood" is omitted, which makes the headship of Adam the more clearly affirmed. So far, however, from man having evolved from savagedom, he had always regarded the barbarian as the truant child of civilization, and instanced the Australian aborigines, who were held by investigators to be an ancient branch of the human race.

He recalled how so acute and well-informed a man as the late Mr. Gladstone, in his correspondence with Lord Acton, felt compelled to surrender the apostle Paul's accuracy and consequent inspiration in saying that death entered the world through man's sin (Rom. v, 12), in view of the earlier fossil remains of animals, whereas the apostle's deduction, that "so death passed upon all men," proved that he was only referring to the death of man. Adam must have been cognizant of the death of animals, or he could not have understood the penalty of death which God attached to His prohibition. Mr. Roberts believed this was physical death, and in this disagreed with the lecturer.

He agreed with the lecturer's explanation of the meaning of the terms "beget," etc., and pointed out how this reconciled the two pedigrees of our Lord given in the Gospels. Just as we should trace our King's natural descent from George III through Edward, Duke of Kent, but his legal one through George IV and William IV, so he believed Matthew gave us the legal pedigree of heirship to David's throne, while Luke the actual one, both culminating in Joseph, to whom our Lord was legal heir, having been born during Joseph's lawful wedlock with Mary.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: Whilst much of the paper gives food for thought and seems quite consonant with the views of most of us here, there are some points which do not seem to fit in with what I regard as the orthodox views regarding the mental capacity and vast abilities of our unfallen progenitor, Adam.

We can hardly imagine, I think, the magnificent capacity of the mind and body of Adam—unspoilt by sin and unweakened by the diseases which sin brings. The nascent glory of that masterpiece to that creation of the Almighty is quite beyond our imagination.

Presuming that the language of Eden was something akin to Hebrew and Welsh, it might not be a bad plan to persuade some philologist to draw up a minimum Hebrew vocabulary and see how that and its roots might by combinations have been used by Adam and his descendants.

Hebraists tell us that the possible combinations of Hebrew roots are indeed wonderful. The word that occurs to me at the moment is that of "comfort," which is said to be "to sigh with." Just the sort of word that might have come from one who before the Fall knew not any sorrow, to whom sighs were unknown, but came to need comfort and to coin a word for it.

I see no necessity to suppose any childishness about Adam. He was a perfect man in mind and body, but ignorant of evil as far as it differed from good (Rom. xvi, 19). *Mens sana in corpore sano*. He would have been intellectually equal to solving any problems that came before him. I believe that mentally in all departments he was perfect—just perfect, and more we cannot say.

Nowadays we mortals are possibly strong on one or two points, but weak in twenty or thirty others. Adam was strong upon all points.

Reference has been made to the temptation story, and I seldom hear it referred to without a desire to say something upon that great subject. Surely the teaching of that unhappy event is comparatively simple; it was the first battle between the fleshly appetites and mind, the conflict that Paul refers to in Rom. vii, 14–24. Alas, in that fatal conflict the flesh won! Adam fell, and we his descendants fell with him. I believe that, properly analysed, every temptation is at the fountain-head a fight of the flesh against the spirit.

The drunkard is one whose body—saturated with alcohol—calls incessantly for more drink, and so insistently that the flesh conquers every time. The lustful and vicious are men and women whose fleshly appetites and passions have overcome the will and paralysed all spiritual volitions.

Concerning the dispersion of the sons of Noah, if a person will in imagination stand upon the slopes of Mount Ararat and think out Gen. x, they will, I think, find that the streams of emigration were alongside great rivers.

I once took three crayons : red, for the descendants of Shem ; black, for the children of Ham ; and blue, for those of Japheth. I then tried to place the names of Gen. x, with interesting results. I came to a conclusion that the land called Canaan was probably a part of the donation to the sons of Shem and *not* to Canaan or the sons of Ham.

Gen. x, xi, seems to point to something that began a long series of recurrent wars, Ham and his descendants trying to occupy and plunder the lands that were the birthrights of the sons of Shem. This reminds me of those centuries of wars between France and Germany, that seem to have been begun by one Orgetorix, as described by Julius Cæsar in his *Gallic Wars*, bk. I, chap. 2-5.

MR. AVARY H. FORBES said : Man is not provided with fur or feathers or anything to protect him from the cold. May we not argue from this, that the climate of Paradise was, as Milton puts it, where "spring perpetual smiled on earth with verdant flowers" (*Paradise Lost*, X, 679) ? Shakspeare has the same thought in *As You Like It*, where the Duke, in the Forest of Arden, says : "Here feel we not the penalty of Adam—the season's difference." ["But," for "not," is another reading ; but that does not affect the argument.] Man in Paradise needed no clothing, as he knew nothing of shame or indecency ; so neither did he need any against the weather, as there was no inclemency in it. It would even seem that we have inherited a relic of this immunity. An ancient Greek king, riding by in winter, stopped to commiserate a half-naked beggar. "How can you possibly stand the cold ?" asked the king. "Does your face stand it ?" said the beggar. "Well, yes ; but no other part of my body could." "Well, I'm *all* face," returned the other. This points to a very remarkable fact, for it is surely by a special Providence that the face, which includes (in the under-lip) the most sensitive part of the skin, can stand cold such as the coarsest parts of the body—the hands and the feet—cannot withstand ?

By the way, how does the lecturer know that man in Paradise "did nothing to subdue the earth, or keep the Garden in order," or "had not put his capabilities into exercise" ? For aught we are told, he might have been at work there for years before the Fall.

Colonel H. BIDDULPH, C.M.G., D.S.O., writes : Does not Dr. Kyle, on pp. 130 and 131 of his valuable paper, assume that the temptation of Adam was the same as that of Eve ? The Bible record appears to me to make a most definite distinction, and to show that Adam's temptation was of a more complex and subtle character. Eve's temptation was as described by Dr. Kyle ; being deceived, she was in the transgression, but Adam was not deceived (1 Tim. ii, 14). The simple, primitive temptation deceived Eve, whose spiritual perceptions perhaps were not on the same level as those of Adam. Eve having transgressed and fallen before Adam, the temptation presented to Adam was God's companionship without Eve's, or Eve's companionship at all costs. Was he to revert to his former condition or not ? Here we see the devilish subtlety of the temptation of Adam, for God Himself had said : " It is not good that the man should be alone " (Gen. ii, 18). It is difficult to imagine a more cruel temptation for the man ; and, unlike Eve, he sinned with his eyes open.

Further, with reference to the statement on p. 133 : " The genealogy of Moses presents three generations from Levi to cover a period of 430 years," it should be noted that the Samaritan Pentateuch (with which the Septuagint is in substantial agreement here) reads in Exodus xii, 40 : " Now the sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers, which they dwelt in the Land of Canaan and in the Land of Egypt was 430 years " ; a statement which is supported by the Palestine Targum on this passage : " Now the days of the sojourning of the children of Israel in Egypt were 30 weeks of years, which is the sum of 210 years, for the number of 430 years was since the Lord spake to Abraham in the hour that He spake with him on the 15th of Nisan, between the divided parts (Gen. xv, 9-18) until the day that they went out of Egypt."

The AUTHOR'S reply: Referring to Mr. Collett's remarks he said:—"That skill is an attainment that comes from practice, but as this 'primitive' man was the very first man at the very beginning, who had not yet practised, he could not be otherwise than unskilled."