

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

VOL. LXXII

1940

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

VOL. LXXII

1940



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, W.C.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HARRISON AND SONS, LTD.,
PRINTERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING,
44-47, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, LONDON, W.C.2.

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| REPORT OF COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1939.... | viii |
| THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, MAY 20TH, 1940 | xv |
| THE INFLUENCE ON HUMAN CONDUCT AND BELIEF OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESES. BY SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, F.R.S., PRESIDENT | 1 |
| <i>Discussion—Communications.</i> —Rev. H. T. Wills, M.A., B.Sc., Dr. R. E. D. Clark, Mr. Douglas Dewar, The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, W. Poynter Adams, Esq., M.I.E.E., A.K.C., J. Barcroft Anderson, Brigadier N. M. McLeod, D.S.O., M.C. | 11 |
| SOME INFALLIBLE PROOFS OF OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION. BY REV. PRINCIPAL H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt..... | 23 |
| <i>Discussion—Communications.</i> —The Rev. W. G. Scroggie, D.D., Sidney Collett, Esq., George A. Heath, Esq., A.M.I.Mech.E., Col. the Rev. F. J. Miles, D.S.O., O.B.E., V.D., Norman S. Denham, Esq., D.Litt., Col. A. H. van Straubenzee, Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies | 32 |
| GENESIS AND PAGAN COSMOGONIES. BY REV. EDWARD MCCRADY, D.D. | 44 |
| <i>Discussion—Communications.</i> —Mr. E. J. G. Titterington, Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies | 64 |
| THE WHOLESOMENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS ILLUSTRATED BY BRITISH HISTORY. BY THE REV. P. H. SCOTT, B.D. (being the Runsie Craig Memorial Paper, 1939.) | 72 |
| <i>Discussion—Communications.</i> —The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, Dr. J. Barcroft Anderson | 82 |
| DEUTERONOMY : ITS ANTIQUITY AND MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP. BY CHIEF RABBI J. H. HERTZ, PH.D., D.LITT. | 86 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Lt.-Col. F. A., Molony, Mr. Sidney Collett, Dr. J. Barcroft Anderson, The Rev. W. A. Wordsworth | 96 |
| <i>Communications.</i> —The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, Colonel A. H. Van Straubenzee | 99 |
| A PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO CHRIST'S TEACHING IN THE GOSPELS. BY THE REV. L. WYATT LANG, M.A..... | 104 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. W. E. Leslie, Rev. A. W. Payne, Dr. J. Barcroft Anderson.... | 113 |
| <i>Communications.</i> —Colonel A. H. van Straubenzee, Mr. G. Brewer, The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, Mr. P. O. Ruoff | 115 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| THE WHOLESOMENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS ILLUSTRATED BY RECENT EVENTS IN INDIA. BY THE REV. G. F. CRANSWICK, B.A. | 124 |
| PART II.—BY MRS. MAY T. INGRAM | 129 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Colonel Skinner, Colonel Molony, The Rev. A. W. Payne | 134 |
| <i>Communication.</i> —The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr | 135 |
| THE STONES CRY OUT: SCRIPTURAL CONFIRMATIONS OFTEN OVER- LOOKED. BY REV. T. W. FAWTHROP, D.D., D.LITT., F.R.G.S. | 137 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Sir F. G. Kenyon, K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., Percy O. Ruoff, Colonel Skinner, The Rev. H. K. Bentley | 148 |
| <i>Communication.</i> —Rev. Principal H. S. Curr | 152 |
| NEW EVIDENCE RELATING TO THE RELIABILITY OF TESTIMONY—A STUDY OF THE RECORDS OF UNCOMMON LUMINOUS PHENOMENA. BY R. E. D. CLARK, ESQ., M.A., Ph.D. | 156 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Mr. Douglas Dewar, Mr. Sidney T. E. Dark, B.Sc., M.R.S.T., F.Z.S., F.R.Met.S. | 167 |
| <i>Communications.</i> —The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, Mr. G. Brewer, Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies, The Rev. Arthur W. Payne, Brigadier N. M. McLeod, D.S.O., M.C., late R.A., Dr. Louis Wood | 171 |
| THE UNITY OF ISAIAH. BY THE REV. W. A. WORDSWORTH, M.A. | 180 |
| <i>Discussion.</i> —Remarks by the Chairman, Rev. C. W. Cooper, Colonel Molony, Mr. Sidney Collett. The Rev. F. W. Pitt | 190 |
| <i>Communications.</i> —The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Mrs. A. M. Hodgkin, Colonel A. H. van Straubensee, Dr. J. Barcroft Anderson | 195 |
| THE RELATION OF GEOLOGY TO THE DAYS OF CREATION IN GENESIS. BY WILLIAM BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (Can.) | 202 |
| LIST OF FELLOWS, MEMBERS, ASSOCIATES, ETC. | 213 |
| CONTENTS OF THE LAST TWENTY-EIGHT VOLUMES | 234 |
| OBJECTS, CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS | 246 |

* * * The object of the Institute being to investigate, it must not be held to endorse the various views expressed either in the papers or in the discussions.

VICTORIA INSTITUTE

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1939,

TO BE READ AT THE

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, MAY 20TH, 1940.

1. *Progress of the Institute.*

The Council present the Seventy-second Annual Report completing the seventy-fifth year of the Society's labours.

Of necessity the reduced syllabus has been adhered to, but short measure should not be interpreted as implying any decline in quality, and the Council have every confidence that in the papers read and the discussions thereon the essential witness of the Institute is well maintained as heretofore.

To all authors who have so generously contributed of their knowledge and research, as well as to those who have taken part in the discussions, warm thanks are due and are here recorded.

2. *Meetings.*

Ten ordinary meetings were held during the Session 1939. The papers published were :—

“ A Discussion on the recent Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922,” by SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., President.

The Rev. H. A. Edwards, L.Th., in the Chair.

“ Seafaring and its results in the Apostolic Age,” by Dr. J. HOLLAND ROSE, D.Litt., F.B.A., Emeritus Professor of Naval History in the University of Cambridge.

Commander F. C. Corbyn, R.N., in the Chair.

“ The Earth's Atmosphere. Its design and significance in Creation,” by F. T. FARMER, Esq., B.Sc., Ph.D.

R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., in the Chair.

“ The Spiritual Nature and Constitution of the Universe,” by the Revd. JOHN THOMAS, M.A.

The Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., in the Chair.

‘On Ants’ Ninth Sense ; One of the Mysteries of Ant Life,’
by D. WRAGG MORLEY, Esq., M.I.C.Ent., M.S.B.E., M.S.
Ent. de France.

Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S., in the Chair.

“Survival of Old Testament forms of Religion on the Western
Frontier of Modern China,” by the Revd. T. TORRANCE,
F.R.G.S. (Chosen by the Council as the Rev. S. Runsie
Craig Memorial Paper.)

Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., in the Chair.

“The Mystery of Evil in relation to the Divine Economy,”
by R. E. D. CLARK, Esq., M.A., Ph.D. (being the Langhorne
Orchard Prize Essay, 1939).

The Rev. W. J. Downes, M.A., B.D., in the Chair.

“The History of India, as reflected in the Astronomy and
Meteorology in the Hymns of the Rig Veda,” by Mrs.
WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

Mrs. John Evershed, F.R.A.S., in the Chair.

“How the Old Testament stands To-day. The more recent
light thrown upon Old Testament History by Excavations
in Palestine,” by SIR CHARLES MARSTON, J.P., F.S.A.

Brig.-Gen. H. Biddulph, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., in the Chair.

“Man in the Image of God,” by LIEUT.-COL. L. MERSON
DAVIES, M.A., Ph.D., F.G.S., F.R.S.E. (being the Dr. A. T.
Schofield Memorial Lecture).

R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., in the Chair.

3. Council and Officers.

The following is a list of the Council and Officers for the
year 1939 :—

President.

Sir Ambrose Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.

Vice-Presidents.

(Limited to seven.)

Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E.
A. W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S.
Lt.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.
Prof. A. Rendle Short, M.D., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S.
L. E. Wood, Esq., M.B., D.P.H., F.R.S.A.
Rev. H. Temple Wills, M.A., B.Sc.
Sir Charles Marston, J.P., F.S.A.

Trustees.

Alfred W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S.
Lieut.-Colonel Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A.
William C. Edwards, Esq.
R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D.

Council.

(In Order of Original Election.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Alfred William Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S. | Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S |
| Lieut.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E. | Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, M.A., Ph D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S., F.R.A.I., late R.A. |
| Lieut.-Col. Hope Biddulph, D.S.O., late R.F.A. | Wilson E. Leslie, Esq. |
| William C. Edwards, Esq. | Rev. Charles W. Cooper, F.G.S. |
| Louis E. Wood, Esq., M.B., D.P.H., F.R.S.A. | Percy O. Ruoff, Esq. |
| Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S. | The Rev. W. J. Downes, M.A., B.D. |
| Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt. | R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D. |
| | Group Captain P. J. Wiseman, R.A.F. |

Honorary Officers.

Douglas Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S., Treasurer.
 Lieut.-Col. T. C. Skinner, late R.E., F.R.Met.S., Secretary.
 Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Editor.
 Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., late R.E., Papers Secretary.

Auditor.

E. Luff-Smith, Esq. (Incorporated Accountant).

Assistant Secretary:

Mrs. L. L. Malcolm-Ellis.

4. Election of Officers.

In accordance with the Rules the following Members of Council retire by rotation: Lieut.-Col. L. M. Davies, M.A., Ph.D., late R.A., F.G.S., F.R.S.E., W. E. Leslie, Esq., Rev. C. W. Cooper, F.G.S., P. O. Ruoff, Esq., who offer (and are nominated by the Council) for re-election. W. H. Molesworth, Esq., C.E., is nominated for election, in confirmation of previous appointment by the Council to fill a vacancy, and is further nominated as Hon. Treasurer, vice Mr. Dewar, relinquishing the office.

5. Obituary.

The Council regret to announce the deaths of the following Fellows, Members and Associates:—

Canon J. C. M. Mansel-Pleydell, M.A., Paul Caudwell, Esq., B.A., Miss M. E. Galloway, Mrs. Florence Moser, C. E. Arundel, Esq., James Cuthbert, Esq., S. H. Wilkinson, Esq., Colonel A. W. C. Bell (late Indian Army), Colonel J. J. Galloway (late R.E.), Avary W. Holmes Forbes, Esq., M.A., Rev. A. B. Miller.

6. New Fellows, Members and Associates.

The following are the names of new Fellows, Members and Associates up to the end of 1939:—

FELLOWS: The Rev. W. B. Monahan, M.A., B.D., Leslie J. Moser, Esq., Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., B. D. W. Morley, Esq., F.R.E.S., F.R.H.S., F.Z.S.

MEMBERS: Frank Fitzgibbon, Esq., K.C., B.A., H.H. Princess Despina Karadja, A. R. B. Morrisby, Esq., Noel Paul, Esq., Dr. J. R. Howitt, V.D., M.D., G. Ramsay, Esq., W. B. Grant, Esq., Vernon Hewes, Esq., J. C. Scott, Esq., L. G. H. Sarsfield, Esq., D.Sc., M.I.E.E., S. J. Frame, Esq., Ernest G. Lee, Esq., Rev. Edward G. Courtman, Miss Kitty Cheatham, A. Pierson Kelley, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., Professor L. Allen Highley, Ph.D., D.Sc.

ASSOCIATES : T. A. M. Barnett, Esq., J. J. Young, Esq., A.P. Kelsey, Esq., Richard Allen, Esq., Colonel G. M. Oldham, D.S.O., Colonel F. C. Molesworth, W. Leon Dale, Esq., Rev. A. K. Cragg, M.A., E. W. Battersbey, Esq., Miss A. A. Philpotts, Robert A. Cressy, Esq., Rev. F. Knattries, A.K.C.

7. Membership.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Life Fellows | ... | ... | ... | 17 |
| Annual Fellows | ... | ... | ... | 83 |
| Life Members | ... | ... | ... | 37 |
| Annual Members | ... | ... | ... | 266 |
| Associates | ... | ... | ... | 36 |
| Library Associates | ... | ... | ... | 42 |
| Total Nominal Membership | | | | 481 |

8. Donations.

C. C. Brown Douglas, Esq., £1 1s. ; W. Hogarth, Esq., 10s. ; Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, £7 3s. ; Dr. Louis E. Wood, £10 ; Lt.-Col. Hope Biddulph, £2 ; Albert Hiorth, Esq., £3 10s. ; F. Junkinson, Esq., 4s. 6d. ; Henry Wilson, Esq., £1 1s. ; Edgar F. Chance, Esq., £2 ; A. G. Secrett, Esq., 5s. ; Mrs. C. M. Craig, £3 1s. ; Lt.-Col. A. C. MacDonald, £1 1s. ; Dr. Faris Nimr Pasha, £3 ; J. W. Laing, Esq., £9 9s. ; Major W. J. Rowland, 12s. 6d. ; Dr. C. G. S. Baronsfeather, £1 1s. ; Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, £1 1s. ; Readers of *The Christian*, £5 ; Douglas Dewar, Esq., £2 ; Rev. H. Temple Wills, £5 ; A. W. Oke, Esq., £10 ; Lt.-Col. P. W. O'Gorman, 9s. ; Colonel F. V. Jeffrys, £1 1s. ; A. H. Roberts, Esq., £1 1s. ; G. Neville, Esq., 4s. ; A. Cowper Field, Esq., 10s. 6d. ; W. Wardle Sales, Esq., £3 3s. ; H. H. Goodwin, Esq., 4s.

9. Finance.

The Balance Sheet shows that the expenditure during 1939 exceeded normal income by £93. This is less unsatisfactory than the previous year's figure of £182. The reduction is accounted for in part by voluntary increase of subscriptions by a number of Subscribers, for which the Council again record their warm thanks, and in part by the encouraging upward movement resulting from the drive for increased membership adumbrated in the 1938 Report.

With the incidence of war, however, the position has worsened. Some capital outlay, small but immediate, has had to be undertaken, to meet A.R.P. requirements, while the erection of colossal taxation on a quicksand of falling dividends has created grave problems for many people, and these are inevitably being reflected in withdrawals from the Society.

But side by side with discouragements, there is evidence of strong conviction among many old and staunch supporters that the work of the Victoria Institute must continue. This accords well with the feeling of your Council who are facing the new situation with determination. Though the "broadcast" drive has to be delayed pending more settled conditions, there is no apparent reason why it should not be effectively resumed later on, given only a little time for readjustment to the novel conditions.

The Council therefore ask for renewal of your confidence and the strong support of your prayers that they may be divinely helped in the task which lies before them.

A. W. OKE,

Chairman of Council.

BALANCE SHEET, 31ST DECEMBER, 1939.

| LIABILITIES. | | | | ASSETS. | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----|----|---------|-----|---|---|---|----|---|
| | | £ | s. | d. | | | £ | s. | d. | |
| SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID IN ADVANCE | | | | 8 | 18 | 6 | CASH AT BANK :— | | | |
| SUNDRY CREDITORS FOR EXPENSES | | | | 176 | 16 | 9 | Current Account | | | |
| LIFE SUBSCRIPTIONS :— | | | | | | | 62 | 0 | 7 | |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 350 | 0 | 0 | | | 84 | 1 | 0 | |
| Additions :— | £ s. d. | | | | | | 13 | 2 | 11 | |
| Fellows | | 35 | 6 | 0 | | | 16 | 12 | 10 | |
| | | 35 | 6 | 0 | | | 175 | 17 | 4 | |
| | | 385 | 6 | 0 | | | 0 | 9 | 11 | |
| <i>Less</i> Amount carried to Income and Expenditure Account | | 10 | 6 | 0 | | | CASH AND STAMPS IN HAND | | | |
| | | | | | 375 | 0 | 0 | SUBSCRIPTIONS IN ARREAR :— | | |
| | | | | | 508 | 0 | 0 | Estimated to produce | | |
| " GUNNING " FUND (<i>per contra</i>) | | | | | | | | 17 | 17 | 0 |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 60 | 6 | 5 | | | INVESTMENTS :— | | | |
| Add Dividends and Interest received | | 23 | 14 | 7 | | | " Gunning " Fund :— | | | |
| | | 84 | 1 | 0 | | | £673 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock at cost | | | |
| " LANGHORNE ORCHARD " FUND (<i>per contra</i>) | | | | | 200 | 0 | 0 | " Langhorne Orchard " Fund :— | | |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 4 | 1 | 9 | | | | £258 18s. 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock at cost | | |
| Add Dividends received | | 9 | 1 | 2 | | | 200 | 0 | 0 | |
| | | 13 | 2 | 11 | | | " Schofield " Memorial Fund :— | | | |
| " SCHOFIELD " MEMORIAL FUND (<i>per contra</i>) | | | | | 220 | 0 | 0 | £378 14s. 6d. 2½ per cent. Consolidated Stock at cost | | |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 3 | 7 | 4 | | | | " Craig " Memorial Trust Fund :— | | |
| Add Dividends received | | 9 | 9 | 4 | | | £200 Merchant's Trust Limited 4 per cent. Perpetual Debenture Stock at cost | | | |
| | | 12 | 16 | 8 | | | 209 | 9 | 0 | |
| <i>Deduct</i> :— | | | | | | | £180 Trust Union Limited 4 per cent. Debenture Stock at cost | | | |
| Prize | | 10 | 0 | 0 | | | 188 | 11 | 6 | |
| | | 2 | 16 | 8 | | | 1,326 | 0 | 6 | |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|-------|---------------------|
| "CRAIG" MEMORIAL TRUST FUND (<i>per contra</i>) | | | | 400 0 0 |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 1 18 0 | | |
| Dividends received <i>less</i> tax | | 12 9 10 | | |
| | | <hr/> | | |
| Amount transferred to Income and Expenditure Account | | 14 7 10 | | |
| | | <hr/> | | |
| | | | | <hr/> |
| | | | | <u>£1,988 15 10</u> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|----------|--|---------------------|
| INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT :— | | | | |
| Balance at 1st January, 1939 | | 421 10 3 | | |
| Add Excess of Expenditure over | | | | |
| Income for the year 1939 | | 93 8 6 | | |
| | | <hr/> | | |
| | | 514 18 9 | | |
| <i>Deduct :—</i> | | | | |
| Donations received | | 46 7 8 | | |
| | | <hr/> | | |
| | | | | 468 11 1 |
| | | | | <hr/> |
| | | | | <u>£1,988 15 10</u> |

I report to the members of The Victoria Institute that I have audited the foregoing Balance Sheet dated 31st December, 1939, and have obtained all the information and explanations I have required. I have verified the Cash Balances and Investments. No valuation of the Library, Furniture or Tracts in hand has been taken. In my opinion the Balance Sheet is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the affairs of the Institute according to the best of my information and the explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Institute. Rectification of the Craig Memorial Trust Investments, to conform to the terms of the Trust Agreement, as also the stabilisation of the finances of the Institute, are matters of urgent importance.

143-145, Abbey House,
Victoria Street, Westminster,
London, S.W.1.
8th May, 1940.

E. LUFF-SMITH,
Incorporated Accountant.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER, 1939.

| EXPENDITURE. | | | | INCOME. | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|---------|----|----|--|------|------|------|------|-----|----|---|
| | | | | £ | s. | d. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | £ | s. | d. | | | | | | | | |
| To Rent, Light, Cleaning and Hire of | | | | | | | By SUBSCRIPTIONS :— | | | | | | | |
| Lecture Room | | | | 74 | 12 | 8 | Fellows | | | | 157 | 10 | 0 | |
| „ Salary | | | | 169 | 0 | 0 | Members | | | | 251 | 15 | 9 | |
| „ Pension—A. E. Montague | | | | 52 | 0 | 0 | Associates | | | | 22 | 7 | 0 | |
| „ National Insurance | | | | 3 | 5 | 0 | Library Associates | | | | 18 | 15 | 9 | |
| „ Printing and Stationery | | | | 273 | 0 | 5 | „ Voluntary increase | | | | — | 450 | 8 | 6 |
| „ Postages | | | | 64 | 2 | 10 | „ Proportion of Life Subscriptions | | | | 10 | 6 | 0 | |
| „ Audit Fee | | | | 3 | 3 | 0 | „ Sale of Publications | | | | 44 | 18 | 7 | |
| „ Fire Insurance | | | | 12 | 0 | 0 | „ Special contributions | | | | 40 | 0 | 0 | |
| „ Sundry and Office Expenses | | | | 32 | 9 | 6 | „ Craig Memorial Trust Fund Income transferred | | | | 14 | 7 | 10 | |
| | | | | — | — | — | „ BALANCE, being Excess of Expenditure over Income for the Year 1939 | | | | 93 | 8 | 6 | |
| | | | | — | — | — | | | | | — | — | — | |
| | | | | £672 | 5 | 5 | | | | | £672 | 5 | 5 | |
| | | | | £672 | 5 | 5 | | | | | £672 | 5 | 5 | |

THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
OF THE
VICTORIA INSTITUTE

WAS HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 20TH, 1940,
AT 4.30 P.M.

The Chair was taken by A. W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S., in the unavoidable absence of the President, Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 6th, were read, confirmed, and signed.

The Reports and Accounts for 1939 having previously been circulated, were taken as read. After some explanatory remarks on the work of the Society and the state of finances, the Chairman called upon Mr. A. COWPER FIELD, to propose, and Mr. R. DUNCAN to second the *First Resolution*, viz. :—

“ That the Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1939, presented by the Council, be received and adopted ; and that the thanks of the Meeting be given to the Council, Officers and Auditor, for their efficient conduct of the business of the Victoria Institute during the year.”

After opportunity for discussion, there being no Amendment, the Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The Chairman then called upon the Rev. A. E. HUGHES, M.A., to propose, and Mr. E. LUFF-SMITH to second the *Second Resolution*, viz. :—

“ That Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies, M.A., Ph.D., F.G.S., F.R.S.E., W. E. Leslie, Esq., Rev. C. W. Cooper, F.G.S., and P. O. Ruoff, Esq., retiring members of the Council be, and hereby are, re-elected. Also that W. H. Molesworth, Esq., C.E., be, and hereby is, elected a member of the Council, in confirmation of appointment to fill a vacancy.”

After opportunity for discussion, there being no Amendment the Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The Chairman then called upon the Rev. F. W. PITT, to propose, and Mr. A. E. MONTAGUE to second the *Third Resolution*, viz. :—

“ That the President, Sir Ambrose Fleming, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., The Vice-Presidents, Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., A. W. Oke, Esq., M.A., LL.M., F.G.S., L. E. Wood, Esq., M.B., D.P.H., Rev. H. Temple Wills, M.A., B.Sc., Sir Charles Marston, J.P., F.S.A., The Hon. Secretary, Lt.-Col. T. C. Skinner, F.R.Met.S., The Hon. Editor, Rev. Principal H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., and the Hon. Papers Secretary, Lt.-Col. F. A. Molony, O.B.E., be, and hereby are, re-elected to their offices.

Also that W. H. Molesworth, Esq., C.E., be, and hereby is, elected Hon. Treasurer, *vice* D. Dewar, Esq., B.A., F.Z.S., resigning the office.

Also that E. Luff-Smith, Esq., Incorporated Accountant, be, and hereby is, re-elected Auditor, at a fee of three guineas.”

Some general discussion followed in which the Rev. F. W. Pitt, Mr. A. Cowper Field, Rev. J. W. Wenham and others took part and after explanations by the Hon. Secretary, there being no Amendment, the Resolution was put to the Meeting and carried unanimously.

At the request of the Chairman, the Hon. Secretary then announced the name of the winner of the 1940 Gunning Prize Essay entitled : “ Inanimate Nature. Its Evidence of Beneficent Design,” viz. : Brian Porter Sutherland, Esq., M.Sc., Ph.D., of Rossland, British Columbia.

There being no other business, the Meeting was brought to a close by a vote of thanks to Mr. Oke for presiding, proposed by The Rev. J. W. Wenham and carried with acclamation.

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on January 8th, 1940, the Paper to be read on that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion elicited.

*THE INFLUENCE ON HUMAN CONDUCT AND BELIEF
OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESES.*

By SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, F.R.S., President.

1. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.

OUR English word *science*, derived from the Latin *scientia*, is used to denote exact systematic or formulated knowledge of any subject, and more particularly the expression in terms of definite units of observed measurable phenomena. This quantitative determination is especially an object of scientific investigation, and the scientific character of any branch of knowledge is largely determined by the degree to which such measurements are possible. Thus we have a science of musical sounds, because we can measure the number of vibrations and nature of them, which give rise to such sounds. But we have no corresponding science of tastes or scents because no exact measurements of them are possible. We can, for instance, assert that one thing is more sweet than another, or scent more agreeable, but we cannot define these differences in terms of any units or make our knowledge quantitative. Hence Lord Kelvin once said: "Science is measurement," and those branches of knowledge in which exact measurement is possible stand in the front rank of all we call scientific knowledge. Although there are

large departments of knowledge in which such quantitative determinations are difficult, or not possible, such as the study of the human mind, or operations of living beings generally, the term science is commonly applied to all ordered knowledge of external Nature and material things, including man himself, which affect our senses or intermediate appliances which create sense impressions. To all this knowledge the term "Natural Science" is usually applied.

2. METHODS OF OBTAINING SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.

Although much knowledge of natural things and events has been gathered in ancient and mediæval times, yet the effort to obtain it was marred by the approach to the subject with pre-conceived ideas or unproved assumptions. It was not until about 300 years ago that Galileo (1564–1642) in Italy, and William Gilbert (1544–1603) in England, began to employ the true method of seeking scientific knowledge by systematic experiment and observation, with minds free from any suppositions as to the nature of the events considered. The events in Nature take place for the most part with such variation and complexity that prolonged observations and persevering experiment are necessary, and above all things an attitude of mind absolutely free from any hasty guesses as to the results, before we can conclude we have reached truth on the matters under investigation. Hence such unbiased observation and experiment, with logical or mathematical deduction therefrom, is now recognised as the only method of gaining true scientific knowledge concerning natural phenomena. In many cases the starting point for a train of scientific investigation has been an observation made accidentally or in the course of some other line of investigation. But such accidents can only be fruitful if they are made by men equipped with the necessary faculties for following them up. Thus in 1856, W. H. Perkin, a chemist, endeavouring to produce synthetic quinine, obtained a purple substance which proved to be a useful dye called mauve, and thus initiated discoveries of the so-called coal-tar dyes which developed into a vast and useful industry, although British slackness allowed it to fall at first entirely into German hands. Some 1,200 dyes and colours are now, however, made here in England from coal-tar. Then the discovery of the so-called X-rays, due to Röntgen in 1896, originated in a casual observation with a Crookes high-vacuum tube; and the starting

point for the extremely important discovery of the radio-active substances was an observation by H. Becquerel, in 1896, of the blackening of photographic plates kept in the same drawer as samples of uranium ore.

In all these cases, however, persevering observation and experiment were necessary to follow up the initial observation.

3. THE MAIN OBJECT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

The collection of isolated facts or statements of events is not the primal aim of scientific research. We have an underlying conviction that the physical Universe is an ordered entity and that there must be general principles or controlling conditions which govern phenomena. One great purpose, therefore, of scientific research is to discover, if possible, these general principles. This can only be done by very extensive experiments or observation, made without presuppositions of any kind. One of these, called the Law of Conservation of Mass, was recognised as soon as the exact determination of weight by means of the balance or scales was introduced in chemistry. It was then found that in all chemical transformations, however much change in nature of the materials might take place, there was no loss in total weight or annihilation or creation of matter. Thus when a combustible body such as a piece of charcoal or carbon is heated in air, the oxygen gas in the air chemically combines with the carbon, producing a gas called carbon-dioxide. But exact weighing showed that the total weight of carbon and oxygen used are exactly equal to the weight of the carbon-dioxide and any ash or unconsumed matter which remains over. This is called the law of conservation of mass.

Then about the beginning of the last century it was recognised that there is another physical quantity, besides mass, which is also conserved, namely, that called *energy*. Certain physical changes take place of themselves in Nature. Thus heavy bodies at a height above the earth's surface when left unsupported fall to the earth. Charged electric conductors become discharged when connected to the earth by a conducting wire. Also hot bodies left to themselves cool by radiation. To reverse these states, thus to lift up a mass to a height above the earth's surface, or to heat it, or to charge it with electricity, or to set it in motion, requires an exertion or expenditure of *energy*. These different forms of energy can be converted into one another. The elevated

mass has potential energy measured by the product of its weight and the height to which it is lifted. If allowed to fall its potential energy disappears, but it gains kinetic energy, measured by the product of its mass and half the square of its velocity. On striking the ground its kinetic energy vanishes and heat is produced. Careful experiment shows that in these changes *energy* is not created or destroyed, but there is a conservation of the total quantity of energy. An important discovery of recent times is that *energy* and *mass* or matter are related and interconvertible so that mass can be taken as equivalent to a certain amount of energy. Energy is measured in units called ergs and mass is measured in grammes. Einstein has shown that one millionth of a gramme of mass is equivalent of 900 million million ergs. The only sufficient account of the source of the radiant energy emitted from our sun as heat and light is that 250 tons of the sun's mass disappears every minute by conversion into the solar radiation. Two other great generalisations which are the result of prolonged experiment and observation are contained in the statements we call the first and second laws of thermodynamics. The first of these tells us that all forms of energy can be entirely converted into heat at a certain rate of exchange. Thus a moving body such as a train or motor car has kinetic energy. But when brought to rest by the brakes all this energy is converted into heat at the rate of one calorie for 42 million ergs. The calorie is the amount of heat which will raise one gramme of water 1 degree Centigrade at a temperature of about 4 degrees Centigrade.

The second law is equally important. It asserts that heat cannot be entirely converted into mechanical energy, but in all transformation of energy some of it is converted into heat of low temperature which becomes equally diffused. It leads, therefore, to the conclusion that there is continually a dissipation of energy, as Kelvin called it, in which energy is passing from forms in which it is useful to us to a non-useful form. This heat-death, as it has been named, implies progress of the Universe to a state in which physical phenomena will cease, and equally that at some past time, not infinitely remote, some external Power must have intervened to create energy in various forms or distribute them.

Finally, another very important generalisation has been reached called the Principle of Least Action. The word action in physics is defined as follows. If we consider a planet moving in an orbit without constraint, and having its total energy potential *plus*

kinetic constant, then it can be shown that if we divide up its path into little elements of length in each of which it has a certain velocity, the product of mass, velocity, and element of length, when summed up over the whole actual path, is less in value for the actual path followed than for any slightly different neighbouring path. This summed-up product is called the Action. The Law of Least Action enables us then to determine what that path must be.

4. THE USE AND NECESSITY FOR WORKING HYPOTHESES IN RESEARCH.

In conducting experimental research, we can avoid useless or random work by the adoption of certain assumptions as to the underlying phenomena which suggest possible useful experiments and are called working hypotheses. Thus in making experiments in optics with the object of reaching consistent possible explanations, we may assume that light consists in the vibrations of a space-filling æther which also pervades and exists in all material substances. The important fact to bear in mind is that such working hypothesis is not to be taken as definite scientific knowledge. It is no more scientific knowledge than the scaffolding used in the erection of a house is part of the house. It is only a convenient temporary structure which facilitates operations. Such scientific hypotheses may have use for a time but invariably have to be abandoned when found inconsistent with further ascertained facts. The history of science is, in short, the story of discarded hypotheses. It is instructive, therefore, to look back at some of these in order to guard against the assumption that theories or hypotheses now held will escape from a similar fate of destruction by discovery of incompatible facts. In the middle part of the seventeenth century the curious hypothesis of *phlogiston* was firmly held as an explanation of combustion. It was assumed that inflammable substances such as wood, charcoal, dry vegetable matter, oils, or fats contained a great store of an imponderable fluid called *phlogiston* which escaped in the form of flame and heat when the substance was set on fire. Also it was assumed that some metals lost *phlogiston* when heated and formed powders then called *calxes*. The *calx* could be brought back to the metallic state by heating with some substance such as charcoal which contained a large store of *phlogiston*. The pure metal was assumed to be a compound of *phlogiston* and the *calx*.

This theory had vogue for some time, but was invalidated when the French chemist Lavoisier showed that the process of combustion was a combination of the gas oxygen in the air with the carbon of the combustible and that the calx was an oxide of the metal.

Then the hypothesis that heat was an imponderable substance called *caloric* was another scientific hypothesis held for many years. A hot body was one full of caloric which escaped from it as it cooled.

This hypothesis was discarded when Count Rumford showed that an unlimited quantity of heat could be produced by the friction of metallic substances, as in boring out cannon. Also Sir Humphrey Davy proved that two pieces of ice could be melted to water by rubbing them together. Little by little it became clear that heat was not a substance but the kinetic energy of atoms in rapid vibration.

A large number of optical theories have been proposed. Newton held that the emission of light from luminous bodies consisted in throwing out small corpuscles. But the phenomenon of interference in which two rays of light destroy each other showed that light must be a kind of motion and not a kind of substance. If, however, it is an undulation, then there must be something that undulates. Hence the hypothesis of an æther. The phenomena of polarised light proved that a ray of light has differences on its sides which imply that the vibrations are perpendicular to the direction of propagation, and not along it, as in the case of sound. This involved the assumption that the æther must be like a solid body and possess both inertia and resistance to distortion. Although the eminent mathematicians of the nineteenth century were able to make such conceptions the basis of an explanation of many optical effects, yet the theory of an elastic solid æther had to be discarded when Maxwell proved that light probably consisted in an electromagnetic vibration, and also when the experiments of Michelson and Morley and others showed that no experiment could detect motion of the earth through the æther, or resistance of the æther to motion of matter through it. All such mechanical æther theories have therefore been discarded. We have now for the most part abandoned the attempt to make visualisations of unseen processes or mechanical theories of phenomena. We are satisfied if we can arrive at mathematical expressions which enable us to predict results of observation or experiment, and we have found that the laws of

motion which are true for large masses of matter do not hold good for very small masses, such as atoms.

5. SOME SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESES OF THE PRESENT DAY.

The scientific outlook of to-day is largely dominated by two very widely accepted hypotheses, namely, that of the absolute uniformity of events in Nature, and the doctrine of Evolution. The theory of Uniformity was originally suggested by the geologists James Hutton (1725-97) and Sir Charles Lyell (1797-1875), and asserts that the agencies which produce changes in earth strata such as earthquakes, rain, floods, waves and storms, have always acted in the same way and with the same force as at present and no cataclysmic or abnormal events have occurred.

This hypothesis has been extended to apply to all branches of science, and it proclaims, in short, that all events such as those called miracles which are out of line with present experience are impossible and have never happened. But this is an unwarrantable assumption. Those uniformities we call the Laws of Nature have only been studied carefully for the last few hundred years, and we have no right to assume for the far past conditions derived from a very limited present experience. Moreover, the gradual transformation of radio-active elements, such as uranium and thorium, into non-radio active elements such as lead, proves that in past time there must have been much more radio-active matter in the earth than at present.*

Also since the temperature at the earth's surface was at one time above that at which living tissue could exist, there must have been a beginning to living organisms and therefore of events not now taking place.

It will not be necessary here to discuss the hypothesis of the

* Lord Kelvin, then Sir William Thomson, wrote two important papers in 1862 dealing with the age of the earth, that is the distance in time from the present to the date when the earth solidified from the condition of a rotating liquid spheroid. From its shape and rate of slowing in rotation, viz., 22 seconds per century, Thomson concluded that the earth was not solid 5,000 million years ago and perhaps not 1,000 million years ago. The estimates of the time have been affected by the discovery that the earth's crust contains radio-active matter which generates heat. At present the earth temperature increases as we descend into it about 1° Fah. per 50 feet, but in past time it must have been far more rapid, and Thomson pointed out that this renders it probable that volcanic energy, earthquakes, and Plutonic action generally must have been far more violent than in the present age, which contradicts the assumption of the doctrine of uniformity.

evolution of animal species nor the arguments against it, because this has been very fully done in previous papers read to this Institute. There is one point, however, which needs consideration.

Many religious teachers and others who are wrongly under the impression that the case for organic evolution is clearly proved, and yet do not wish to commit themselves entirely to a denial of Divine Creation, take refuge in the assertion that evolution is a method of creation. But this position is an illogical one. The truth of Darwinian natural selection, or other process of evolution for the production of new species, is either proved or it is not proved. If it is proved it renders the employment of the word creation unnecessary, and if it is not proved, then it cannot be a method of creation. In any case the starting point for the beginning of the evolution of species must have been in an act of creation, as Darwin himself admits in the last paragraph of his *Origin of Species*, unless we admit the possibility of spontaneous generation of life, an assumption against which there is much evidence. The advocates of organic evolution never attempt to meet objections fairly by effective counter argument. They take refuge in the excuse that the case is so fully proved as not to require further discussion or else that the critics are ignorant or prejudiced.*

Accordingly, there are a large number of science teachers in elementary and higher schools who have never had the opportunity of hearing the case against spontaneous organic evolution properly stated. They themselves do not wish to take an antagonistic attitude to the hypothesis as this might injure their prospects of advancement. Hence as a matter of prudence they fall in line with those who accept it entirely without demanding proof.

* The advocates of the origin of species by Darwinian natural selection do not give sufficient weight to the objection that this theory implies an enormous number of intermediate forms of life between those of past and existing species. There is no evidence of this in the remains in fossiliferous strata of the earth. Neither do they attach adequate importance to the fact of the sterility of hybrids. That means that while the members of any species can interbreed and produce offspring which are fertile, the results of interbreeding between members of different species are sterile. This tends to preserve constancy in form in species and not to produce variation. A third objection is that, whatever theory of evolution is adopted, it is requisite to assume the spontaneous appearance of forms of life to start it, and this is negatived by the fact that all experiments and researches have shown that spontaneous generation of living matter or living organisms is impossible.

6. THE ETHICAL AND RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES OF SCIENTIFIC HYPOTHESIS.

The human mind is gifted with many faculties and powers such as the intellectual or ratiocinative, the æsthetic, the ethical, and religious. But these cannot be separated entirely as it were in water-tight compartments. The conclusions reached or accepted by anyone in one department may or must influence those in another.

If a man has convinced himself that this marvellous Universe has arisen as a matter of chance and struggle to exist, and that the so-called argument from design for a creator has been invalidated or destroyed by the principle of natural selection or automatic organic evolution, he may by this become agnostic in attitude, even if not unbelieving, in the existence of a creating God. It will then be impossible for him to accept the Bible as a divine revelation from a Deity who he thinks does not exist or is unknowable, and therefore the Deity or supernatural powers of the Christ, who is its chief subject, must also be rejected. Accordingly, acceptance of the doctrine of organic evolution as scientific truth is inconsistent with belief in the literal truth of the statements which form the Christian creed. But if belief in a God who is the Creator of all things visible and invisible has been weakened or destroyed by the diffusion of unproved hypotheses in the name of science, then also belief in a God who is the righteous judge of all men and will give to every man according to his work will be obliterated, and with that will disappear the strong control of human actions by religion. We may be back then in the state in which brute force or the politics of the jungle are the only Law, and as regards material benefits "those will take who have the power and those will keep who can." Have we not nearly reached this state already? We see great nations armed to the teeth with weapons for the wholesale slaughter of mankind. International treaties by them are considered as scraps of paper to be torn up when not convenient to observe, notable inventions such as the conquest of the air are consecrated to the murder of helpless men, women and children, and the wealth of the world cast away in the form of munitions of war.

There can be no doubt that a wide popular acceptance of the unproved hypothesis of organic evolution held to be scientific truth concerning the origin of animal species, when allowed to influence national ideals, is spiritually deteriorating. The basic conception of this evolutionary philosophy is that individual

improvement and species advancement is the result of the survival of the fittest in a struggle for existence. This means in the case of animal races the success of the strongest, swiftest, or most cunning in the struggle for food or escape from enemies; in short, the race is to the swift and victory to the strong. When these conclusions are accepted as also applying to the human race, war is elevated into an ennobling pursuit and as a result the individual becomes of no account but the State is to be supreme. All forces and agencies are therefore to be organised for successful war, so that the valuable possessions of weaker or less skilful nations may be transferred to the strongest and most ruthless peoples. The ideals of human life for the individual or nation set before us in Christianity are therefore deemed to be mere contemptible weakness to be derided and avoided, whilst relentless self-advancement or world dominion is the aim to be pursued at all costs and by any possible means. We see that to-day in several nations of the world.

One worthy aim of scientific research should be to discover means by which the great energies of nature can be utilised and applied for the benefit of all mankind and not its destruction. It is realised in those beneficial researches which have given us anaesthetics and antiseptic surgery, or the electrical discoveries which have enabled us to harness the water power of the world in the service of mankind, or in those which have annihilated distance and brought the nations of the world into closer contact by telegraphy, telephony and television.

Another equally worthy purpose is the discovery of great general principles of action which reveal to us the physical universe as "a mighty maze but not without a plan." Even if the argument for the existence of God derived from specific instances of apparent purposive design in nature has been to some extent weakened by the recognition of the great influence of environment, we may still rest firmly on the fact that the increasing intelligibility of the universe to our human minds, and the abundance of numerical relations in it, give us an unquestionable proof that it had its origin, not in chance, but in a Supreme Intelligence. The same argument applies in regard to our appreciation of its beauty in seen or hidden things. As regards processes, we must always remember that even if we can conceive a mechanism which can produce some effect we see in nature, it does not in the least follow it is done in that way. In any case, we have a right to demand that in the efforts of science

to discover how certain things are done in the visible world, popular science teaching shall not represent unconfirmed speculations as ascertained scientific knowledge to the injury of religious faith.

The practical inventions and discoveries of science have been of enormous utility and advantage to mankind. But in the endeavour to penetrate into the past history of the universe, or discover the means by which it has been brought to its present condition, scientific hypothesis has greatly erred and misled many. It has considered the universe rather as a thing than a thought, as a mechanism largely determined in its operations by chance, which may be explored by the human mind selecting some things as important and others which may be neglected.

We cannot ignore nor deny the existence in animals and mankind of intelligence and purposive actions; in other words, of Mind. Exact research has shown us that living matter can only proceed from previously existing living matter. We can then make another equally valid statement, viz., that mind can only be derived from mind.

Any hypothesis which assumes that animal or human intelligence can arise spontaneously by automatic bodily development, or causes which have no mentality, must then be erroneous. In the same way when we note the potential or actual religious or spiritual qualities in man, of which there is no trace in the animal races, we must account for them by an agency which is itself spiritual in nature. All scientific theories of origins which are materialistic in essence, and take no account of the psychic facts or "invisible things of creation" are destined to pass away, because they omit to take heed of the thought evidently present in the universe, and this necessarily implies that there must be a source of this thought or creative intelligence as its final cause.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. H. T. WILLS, M.A., B.Sc., wrote: I have read this paper with great interest, but I feel that there is one point against the doctrine of Evolution that has not been stressed as it might be. The point to which I refer is that of the unity of the human race. Granting, for the sake of argument, that Evolution was the method which the Creator used in the making of Adam, it was as real a

miracle of Divine power as the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It has never been repeated, for if Evolution were what its exponents imagine, there is no reason why it should have stopped its work. Instead of mankind being one, as it certainly is, it must be obvious to any thinker that millions of men are even now being evolved from diverse sources, and the race would be a mass of unrelated units. This is so utterly contrary to fact as to be absolute nonsense, unbelievable by any save those who are enemies of truth.

Dr. R. E. D. CLARK wrote: Without wishing to be destructive, it is perhaps worth pointing out that Sir Ambrose's argument about evolution appears, *on the surface*, to be self-destructive. First of all he appeals to the obvious falsity of the law of uniformity of nature in order to urge that the possibility of miracles cannot be lightly discarded. He then points out that life must have arisen either by creation or by spontaneous generation, but remarks that there is much evidence against the latter possibility. True: but might not a critic reply that all the evidence against spontaneous generation amounts to this—that no one has seen it happen to-day and, therefore, by the law of uniformity, it probably did not happen in the past? It might add somewhat to the value of Sir Ambrose's paper if he would care to make some comments on this matter.

The comparison made in the paper between present and past hypotheses in science is very instructive. It might, perhaps, be urged that *phlogiston* is an unfortunate case to cite, for, as Crum Brown pointed out long ago (*Proc. Roy. Soc. Edin.*, 1864, 5, 328), *phlogiston* is a perfectly sensible theory, and soon after its overthrow it was again revived under such names as "potential energy", "chemical affinity" and "free energy". The theory under the name of *phlogiston* was only overthrown when enthusiasts tried to make it explain chemical facts which depended not upon energy but upon the atomic nature of matter. In addition, Professor J. R. Partington has recently pointed out how remarkably closely the modern theory of "Redox" potentials corresponds to *phlogiston* (*Scientia*, Sept., 1938).

However this may be, the history of *caloric* is certainly very instructive, especially as the scientists of the seventeenth century had had perfectly correct views on the subject (*see, for e.g., J. Tyndall,*

Heat a Mode of Motion, 6th ed., 1880, p. 34 ff.), which were later abandoned. Dampier-Whetham (*History of Science*, 2nd ed., p. 245) argues that, historically, the true view of heat did little to stimulate research, while the caloric view "played a useful part in suggesting and interpreting experiments on the measurement of quantities of heat". For this reason *caloric* was still generally accepted for half a century after Rumford and Davy had performed the experiments which eventually resulted in its overthrow. During this period, upholders of the true and then "old-fashioned" view had often to contend with ridicule and prejudice.

As an example of the way in which believers in *caloric* tried to explain away facts, we may take the case of William Higgins, a man of great scientific insight who had anticipated Dalton's views on the atomic theory. Writing in 1814, Higgins says:—

"Heat evolved by friction, however unaccountable and mysterious it may appear, is not sufficient to invalidate the doctrine of the materiality of *caloric*, being only a solitary fact opposed to thousands that tend to establish its existence as an elementary substance" (*Experiments and Observations on the Atomic Theory*, Dublin, 1814, p. 37).

In the same way, the evolutionist of to-day finds spontaneous generation to be "unaccountable and mysterious", but the difficulty is turned on one side because it is "only a solitary fact opposed to thousands" which are supposed to indicate that living organisms have become more and more complex through the ages. Likewise, when we inquire *why* scientists hold evolutionary views, they will often confess that the real reasons are precisely analogous to those by which *caloric* was maintained—namely, that evolution has stimulated research, whereas the alternative view of special creation has not proved heuristically useful.

Mr. DOUGLAS DEWAR wrote: I am glad that Sir Ambrose Fleming has commented on the disgraceful manner in which biology is being taught in our schools. Many years ago, T. H. Huxley said "Science commits suicide when it adopts a creed". This is what has happened to biology; it has adopted evolution as a creed—a religion. That this assertion is not an exaggeration is easily demonstrated.

Professor J. Lefèvre, Director of the Laboratoire Bioénergétique of Paris, writes (*Manuel Critique de Biologie* (1938), p. 37): "Whether on account of routine, or of materialistic fanaticism, or of defective education, reflection or method, the transformist faith reigns supreme". He then proceeds to show that this faith is against reason, and against the data of morphology, embryology and palæontology.

In this country the editors of *Nature* periodically exhort biologists not to rest on their oars, but to row hard in order to stem the current of anti-evolutionism. Here we have the exhortations of priests to their people to defend the faith! The B.B.C. persistently propagates the doctrine of evolution through the medium of clergy and professors of biology.

In the United States matters are even worse, if possible. In the *Journal of Heredity* for January 1939, a letter was published castigating Dr. E. Grace White for substituting in her *A Textbook of Biology* the word "development" for "evolution", and for the splitting of the inadequate treatment of evolution into parts that are deftly subordinated to positions of inconspicuousness. The writer bleats: "Zoology teachers know that while *they* see evolution in structural 'advances', the beginning student does not (unless very specific reference is made to evolution at every opportunity)." The irate writer concludes his effusion with the following gem: "To accept heredity and to deny evolution is surely to be counted the neatest biological trick of the week, or of the year, for that matter". The truth is that the strict laws of heredity constitute one of the main objections to the doctrine of evolution.

Let us be thankful that the Victoria Institute has all along held its ground against the great flood of the transformist theory, according to which, again to quote Lefèvre, "animals fight one another, elongate themselves, re-arrange themselves, twist themselves, turn themselves, fold themselves, re-dress their limbs, ornament themselves with appendages, create organs for themselves, manufacture for themselves tentacles and eyes, transform themselves into one another, and differentiate and perfect themselves at will: prodigies more marvellous and far more miraculous than the idea of creation itself".

I subscribe to everything Sir Ambrose has said about the effects

of the acceptance of the evolutionary faith. The Germans deem themselves the finest of the recently evolved super-apes, and mean to dominate, at all costs, the other breeds of super-ape.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote : Sir Ambrose has rendered valuable service to the cause of conservative and evangelical theology by his reminders that certain scientific doctrines are, in the last analysis, incompatible with Christianity. They may seem to have little bearing on religious questions, since their interest and implications seem to be exclusively technical, but when they are followed to their logical conclusions, it becomes perfectly plain that they are as uncongenial to the Christian faith as oil to water. In the paper, the doctrine of organic evolution is cited, and reference is made to its subversive effects on the Christian conception of God, and on Christian ethics. To my thinking, an even stronger case could be made out on the score that organic evolution is nonplussed by the facts of sin and salvation, and, above and beyond all, by the fact of Christ. These basic factors in the story of the universe cannot be explained on any theory of continuous and spontaneous development.

It is striking that the Bible should touch so many phrases of human life and knowledge. Its primary subject is God, but it has much to say on a vast variety of subjects, including scientific references which have been acknowledged by authorities to be remarkable in their anticipations of modern discoveries. These facts serve to confirm the view just expressed that neither science nor theology can be fully understood in isolation. Their claims must be tested with reference to the conclusions of other branches of inquiry. In the long last, truth is one, and our Lord Jesus Christ declared that He is the truth, and that no man cometh to the Ultimate Unity but by Him. Any scientific theory, therefore, which cannot give Christ the pre-eminence is condemned already.

It may not be irrelevant to remark that modern science is the result of Christianity. Sir Ambrose has referred to ancient scientific speculations and to their value. While giving full weight to these, it cannot be denied that the Bible has provided the key whereby the mysteries of the natural world have been unlocked one by one. If, then, views be entertained which are incompatible with the system

to which they ultimately owe their origin, they must be substantiated by evidence of the most clear and convincing order. "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh" (James iii, 11-12). Christianity is Christ, and in the evolutionary scheme Christ can have no place, on which the best comment is Our Lord's words: "I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (John xv, 5-6). These sentences state the only foundation for all man's endeavours on which lasting results can be obtained.

W. POYNTER ADAMS, Esq., M.I.E.E., A.K.C., wrote: Sir Ambrose Fleming is doing a notable service by drawing attention to one of the most pressing needs of the day. There can be no question that the failure to understand the limitations of science is a stumbling block with many who are unacquainted with scientific investigation.

I have always deplored the tendency of the human mind to place in opposition Science and Religion. That which is true in Science cannot possibly be opposed to Religion—that is, belief in God, resulting in the service of God. The problem is, however, not new, for even in Apostolic times, St. Paul found it necessary to warn Timothy against "oppositions of Science, falsely so called".

It has been frequently remarked recently that the testimony of scientific men to belief in Holy Scripture is of immense importance in these days, and I verily believe it is so. It cannot but be difficult for those who have had nothing to do with scientific investigations to sift the false from the true, and the human mind is only too ready, in its unbelief, to find an excuse in the uncertainty of things to let itself go in matters of conduct. Here, again, one can quote Holy Scripture as evidence that Sir Ambrose Fleming is dealing with no new problem. "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die." This is undoubtedly the principle, or perhaps want of principle, with multitudes in these days.

However, thanks largely, I believe, to broadcasting and to the wonder of wireless itself, a very great body of opinion has been brought into the line of right thinking as regards Science and God. Wireless is a tremendous help in understanding the fact of prayer.

That Science should present difficulties is, of course, not at all surprising, but the right attitude of mind is what we scientific and Christian men desire. In all these great questions there should be the open mind—a readiness to learn and to wait, and also to pray, for if we take our reasonable difficulties to God and ask for light, He gives light. This I can state most emphatically from personal experience. I well remember hearing a young curate state from the pulpit in my parish church of Barnes in Surrey, when I was a lad, that the revealed facts of astronomy were a difficulty to many, the thought being how can God, so great and marvellous, “the Creator of the rolling spheres ineffably sublime”, take cognisance of the children of men, little better than “worms of earth”. He pointed out very faithfully that man has the faculty of love, and, infinite though God is, the love of the human race (seeing that God is Love) must be of more value to Him than the rolling spheres marching in their stately array upon their stupendous orbits. It is thoughts such as these that can prove of untold value to the seeking souls of men.

J. BARCROFT ANDERSON wrote: Sir Ambrose has mentioned one supposition of the so-called scientists which is contrary to the teaching of Scripture—the supposition that the animals and vegetation which Our Lord made to reproduce, each after its kind (לְמִינֵהוּ LMINE): have not always done so. An unprovable supposition, which many believe to be a fact, chiefly because one known cross does not reproduce anything.

There is another such supposition to which he has not referred, the supposition that the matter of which this Earth is made up always existed. This supposition seems to be equally demoralising and equally unscientific. There is no known evidence to prove this Earth to have been existing for as far back as seven of our days before Adam was created. But those who seem to believe that matter had no origin, seem equally to believe that the spirit of every man coming into this world is a new creation, as stated in

Zechariah xii, 1. They seem rightly to believe that thousands of new creations take place daily.

Brigadier N. M. McLEOD, D.S.O., M.C., wrote : I have read with great satisfaction and benefit Sir Ambrose Fleming's comprehensive and illuminating paper, and, if I venture to offer comment on one point that presents a difficulty, I do so in the hope that it may lead to a pronouncement by a scientist of distinction that will go far towards ending a long-drawn controversy.

On page 4 appears the statement that ". . . the experiments of Michelson and Morley and others showed that no experiment could detect motion of the earth through the æther," a statement so often repeated by leading scientists as to have acquired almost axiomatic effect.

On the other hand, in apparently direct contradiction, stands the report by Professor Dayton C. Miller on the "Ether-Drift Experiment,"* carried out with the most refined apparatus at Ether Rock, Mount Wilson, in which not only was the ether drift detected in many thousands of observations, but measurements of the shift of the colour fringes disclosed data sufficient for the calculation of the velocity and direction of the movement of the solar system. So far as I am aware, these results have never been successfully challenged.

The matter is one of importance, since on the same belief (that the Michelson-Morley experiment had yielded a nul result), I understand, the entire Einstein theory of "relativity" had been built up; whereas, according to the evidence of the scientists who carried out the famous experiment, "the indicated effect was not Zero".

The elaborate and exhaustive experiments by Morley and Miller at Mount Wilson confirmed the earlier results, and gave seemingly irrefutable evidence of an ether drift.

From the vast amount of data obtained in these experiments it was possible to determine the cosmic component of the Earth's absolute velocity, *i.e.*, the velocity of the motion of the solar system.

* "The Ether-Drift Experiment and the Determination of the Absolute Motion of the Earth" in *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Vol. 5, No. 3, July 1933.

This was found by Professor Dayton Miller to be 208 km. per sec. in the direction of R.A. 4 h. 54 m., Dec., $70^{\circ} 33'$ South (7° from the South Ecliptic Pole).

After studying Professor Miller's detailed report one feels inclined to ask whether this theory, based as it was on the assumption that the ether drift effect was exactly nil, should not now be abandoned.

The whole question seems to have been left in confusion, and, if our distinguished author could clarify it, I am sure his statement would be received with relief and gratitude.

REPLY COMMUNICATED.

In attempting a reply to some of the contributions made to the discussion on my paper, one remark which may be made is that more than one of the contributors fail to keep in touch with the precise topic defined by the title of the paper, viz., the influence on human conduct of adherence to certain scientific hypotheses.

Taking the contributions in order, the first is that of the Rev. H. Temple Wills. His argument in a few words is as follows:— Assuming that the human race originated by evolution, how comes it to pass that it has apparently ceased to be operative at present in producing new and greater varieties of human beings ?

The conclusion I presume he desires to be drawn is, because evolution never had any share at all in the origin of mankind.

This argument is sound as far as it goes, but is not so forcible as many other reasons which can be given against the evolution of Man from the animal species.

Then next Dr. R. E. D. Clark opens his discussion by an ingenious attempt to impale me on the horns of a dilemma.

In effect his argument is as follows:—He quotes my objection to the theory of uniformity, in which I maintain that we cannot from a limited present experience of Nature say that no events of a vastly different character may not have taken place in the far past. He then proceeds to argue from this that though the spontaneous generation of life is not taking place now, my statement does not exclude the possibility it has taken place in past distant ages.

In reply I may say that the term "spontaneous generation", Dr. Clark uses, is an unphilosophical term. It suggests the idea of an event or events taking place without adequate cause or

dependence on some sufficient prior event. The problem of causation has often been fully discussed, but I do not think that any competent scientific opinion would admit that however obscure an event may be it is entirely without cause or absolutely spontaneous, self-produced and without connection with some previous events. Thus, in the case of radium we know that at intervals some of its atoms break up and fling out so-called *Alpha* and *Beta* particles. But we do not know why one atom of radium should break up rather than another. All we do know that in about 1,500 years one-half of the atoms of any mass of radium break up, and in the next 1,500 years one-half of the remainder and so on. In spite of this apparent spontaneity, I think prevalent opinion is that some adequate selective cause is at work in this case.

Returning, then, to Dr. Clark's argument. We know that at the present time all the evidence of fact goes to show that life only proceeds from some previous life or biogenesis holds the field. We know also that life cannot have existed on this earth for an infinite past time and hence it is legitimate to conclude that at some past time events must have taken place calling into existence some initial forms of life.

We cannot, however, assume that "spontaneous generation" is an adequate explanation or that life originated in a fortuitous concurrence of atoms or that living matter in the form of protoplasm came into existence by chance.

Each supposed origination must be examined on its merits as regards sufficiency and probability. The evolutionist asserts that accidental variations under the influence of environment and a struggle to continue to exist constitute such sufficient cause. But others of us claim that the manifold and beautiful forms of life and their exquisite adaptations can only have had a sufficient cause in the Will and Power of a Supreme Intelligence.

I submit, then, that there is no inconsistency in my arguments. Dr. Clark then criticises certain instances I have given of the essentially transient nature of scientific hypotheses. The facts of observation or experiment remain permanent, but our explanations of them are subject to continual change.

As regards the phlogiston hypothesis, I have long been aware of the suggestion of Crum Brown that it may be regarded as a

name for potential energy. But I have always thought this to be a fanciful analogy not consistent with facts. The phlogistonists assumed it to be an imponderable fluid and that pure metals were compounds of phlogiston with metallic calxes or what we now call metallic oxides. If so, then the weight of metal obtained from a certain mass of calx should have been equal to that of the calx. But as a matter of fact it is less, as was found as soon as the quantitative study of chemical changes began in the use of the chemical balance.

In the same way the caloric theory of Heat was destroyed by the measurements of Hirn, Colding and Joule. Nothing therefore has been said which contradicts the statement of the necessarily finite duration of any scientific hypothesis. The inference I wished to draw from the instances given was that the hypotheses of continuity and evolution cannot be regarded as having more permanent durability than those of phlogiston caloric or an elastic solid ether. Each hypothesis has its day and then ceases to be of use. Its only claim to consideration is as a stimulus to further research, but it has no claim to be regarded as a final statement of truth or fact. Even if we can imagine a means able to explain some fact in Nature, it does not in the least follow that events happen in that way.

I entirely agree with the remarks of Mr. Douglas Dewar. I think it is deplorable that wireless broadcasting, the most powerful means of influencing public opinion since the invention of printing, should have been used so exclusively to support the theory of organic evolution without giving an opportunity for stating the reasons against it. The teaching of evolutionary ideas in school books is unquestionably a dangerous and blameworthy thing. I entirely agree with the opinions of the Rev. Principal Curr that there is an anti-religious influence in evolutionary teaching which could be proved by many instances.

When unscientific people are told in the Press or even from the Pulpit that all scientific men agree with the theory of organic evolution, the inference they at once make is that if the Bible is misleading in its statements as to the origin of animals and man, it may also be in error in regard to its other statements as to the state and destiny of mankind or in those regarding the Deity it

reveals, and hence the hypothesis is an influence tending to undermine religious faith in "things not seen."

With regard to the matter mentioned in the communication of Brigadier N. M. McLeod on the experiments of Dayton C. Miller, which are assumed to contradict those of Michelson and Morley on the invariable velocity of light, I think that further investigation will show that Miller's conclusions are not accepted by those best fitted to judge. His conclusions that the ether is partly carried along by the moving earth is quite inconsistent with the well-known fact of the aberration of light discovered more than 200 years ago by the Astronomer James Bradley (1693-1762). This effect enables us to determine the ratio between the velocity of light coming from any star and the velocity of the earth in its orbit at the place of reception, and the result is to show that the velocity of light is not affected either by the motion of its source or of the observer. Also the important experiments of Michelson and Gale, made since those of Miller, have proved to contradict the conclusions of Miller that the ether is dragged along by the moving earth. Brigadier McLeod will find a full discussion of this matter in the little book, *Space and Time*, by Émile Borel, an eminent French Physicist (English translation published by Blackie & Son, 7s. 6d.).

Miller's results are therefore not accepted as final and I think my statement is perfectly correct that the original experiments of Michelson and Morley are entirely trustworthy and valid as a basis for the foundation of Einstein's doctrine of Relativity.

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on January 22nd, 1940, the Paper to be read on that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion elicited.

*SOME INFALLIBLE PROOFS OF OUR LORD'S
RESURRECTION.*

By REV. PRINCIPAL H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.

IT has been well and truly said by Principal Marcus Dods, a great Scots theologian of a previous generation, that the Resurrection of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is not only the most important event in the history of Christianity, but also the most important event in the history of the world. In support of the earlier part of that statement it is only necessary to recall the words of Paul, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (1 Cor. xv, 14). Neither friends nor foes of the Christian faith take any exception to that statement. They acknowledge with one voice that there can be no other explanation of the rise and diffusion of Christianity except the fact that its Divine Founder died and rose again, or that His followers believed that to be the case with such intensity that they were ready to suffer the loss of all things, and to accept death itself rather than to abandon the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth, the prophet mighty in word and deed, who claimed to be the Son of God, was demonstrated indeed to be God manifest in the flesh by His rising from the dead. It is thus admitted on all sides and in all schools that the religion whose centre and soul is Christ Jesus and Him Crucified, has for its keystone the fact, or the belief, that He could not be holden of the grave but rose triumphant over the last enemy of mortal man. This distinction between the fact of history and its acceptance by faith will be discussed in greater detail at a later stage. For our present purpose, it is mentioned without comment as part of the proof demanded by the great apostle's reference to the centrality of the Resurrection of the

Redeemer in the Christian religion. As for the latter part of the statement with which this paper begins, it is only necessary to remark that the greater includes the less. The core of universal history is the history of redemption, if it be not its outermost periphery as well. For what is the history of the world but the condemnation of the world by its righteous and faithful Creator, Preserver and Sovereign, and its reclamation in virtue of the gospel of Jesus Christ, God's Son, and Man's Saviour? If that be so, then the Resurrection of that same Lord and Christ must be the centre both of sacred and secular history.

Our present concern is the discussion of the infallible grounds on which the belief of the Christian Church from its very inception has held that its Divine Head actually returned from the dead more than conqueror over its terrors. The fact of the belief is universally acknowledged, and so is its cardinal importance, but opinion is gravely divided as to the foundations on which that belief rests. To take a simple analogy, everybody concedes that the taproot of Islam is the belief that there is one God, and that Mohammed is His prophet. To many the basis of that belief is a partial lie. There is indeed but one God, but Mohammed has no right or claim to be regarded as His prophet. In the same way, the Christian believes that Jesus died and rose again, but the basis of that belief is the veritable truth of God expressed in an historical incident. If the belief that Our Divine Lord rose from the dead be only a case of the wish being father to the thought, to put it in an extreme way, then such a belief would be more astounding than the fact itself. Such a figment of the imagination would be a greater miracle than the actual occurrence. It is easier far to believe that Our Lord actually did rise from the dead than to take the view that the story owed its origin to the fond faith and hope of His followers that death had no power over Him. There can only be one explanation of the belief in the Resurrection of Our Lord, and that is its historicity. Such an event defies the inventive powers of men's minds. Just as it is impossible to believe that the portrait of Christ in the Four Gospels was produced by the authors like some character in fiction, in the same fashion it is incredible that the narrative of the Resurrection was due to the same cause. In both cases, it is not such a severe tax on the human heart and mind to acknowledge that these things were true as a matter of historical fact.

The narrative of the Resurrection seems to carry the proof of its trustworthiness on the face of it. That sentence is solely concerned with the bare fact not with the details associated with it. When reduced to an irreducible minimum the story illustrates the old dictum that truth is stranger and stronger than fiction. It defies manufacture by the credulity or ingenuity of men. It may be said to prove itself by its intrinsic character. If we think for a moment of what it contains, we shall be persuaded that these things are so. The narrative is self-evidencing in its unique features. That must be characteristic of it, if the incident be all that it is claimed to be. It is too good not to be true, as my old teacher, Professor Pringle-Pattison once observed in a different connection. Two features of the event will illustrate and demonstrate that point. On the one hand there is the fact that Our Lord's Resurrection differs as the poles apart from all similar incidents in the Old and New Testaments. There are various narratives of people being raised from the dead. Indeed, one gets the impression from the message sent by Christ to John the Baptist when the latter was in prison that the raising of the dead was as common as the cleansing of lepers (Matthew xi, 7), although the words may not bear that interpretation. But the Resurrection of Our Lord differs from all other cases of the same kind in the fact that it took place without any external intervention. In every other case mentioned in the Bible, the soul is recalled to the body by some outward agency, such as the corpse which came to life when it touched the bones of Elisha the prophet (2 Kings xiii, 21). Our Lord, however, raised Himself from the tomb. He laid down His life that He might take it again. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father" (John x, 17-18, R.V.). Christ rose from the grave like a man rising from sleep which, as the old adage reminds us, is the brother of death. We are not concerned at present with the parts played in redemption by the Father and the Eternal Spirit. The point, on which stress is laid, consists in the fact that Christ returned from the tomb by His own will. That defies invention or fabrication. It never could have entered the mind of man.

Is not the same observation justified by the manner of Our

Lord's Resurrection ? Of that, too, it may be said that it passeth knowledge. In contrast to the hideous publicity of the Cross, the Resurrection took place in secrecy, and while it was yet dark. It is pleasant to think that Our Lord rose from the dead about the time when He was accustomed to get up in the morning. Mark tells us that Jesus rose up a great while before day (Mark i, 35). That was probably His usual practice, and it is arguable that at the same hour He awakened from the sleep of death, and rose in newness of life. His followers would have probably desired a more spectacular and dramatic return from the unseen world, if they had been permitted any voice in the matter. But the actual manner of the Resurrection was of a piece with its peerless grace and glory. It seems to be preposterous to speak of a faith which could beget such a story that Christ raised Himself from the dead, and that this unique indication of His claims was not performed at high noon when all might see and believe, but in the darkness which precedes the dawn. The faith cannot account for the fact. The fact must be anterior to the faith. The extraordinary nature of its record leaves no choice but to take that view. It is indeed self-evidencing. On its face it bears the marks of truth, at once historic and heavenly. Its invention is an impossibility. Water cannot rise higher than its own level. Such a narrative was never produced, or even embellished by the pen of man.

But such a line of reasoning does not carry universal or even general conviction. Many can be found who refuse to believe that the account of Our Lord's Resurrection in its barest outlines offers features which make it unique, and compel the admission that the story must be true for it could never have been fabricated. Accordingly, it is necessary to approach the records from another standpoint. Dr. Sanday has observed that such an event as the Resurrection of Christ would require evidence of remarkable quantity and quality. It is, of course, an event in human history. Two thousand years have elapsed since it took place, and we are dependent for all that we know regarding it on the written testimonies of contemporaries preserved in the pages of the New Testament. The evidence thus furnished can be examined and tested by the ordinary laws of historical investigation. It will be found, as I have already observed, to offer some problems, when it is considered in detail, but the main fact that Our Lord did indeed rise from the dead emerges clear and plain. The narratives of the four evangelists, and the

statements of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv, 1-8 may not be easy to weave into a connected and harmonious whole. Indeed, there are not wanting modern scholars who suggest that the discrepancies and difficulties are insuperable. Such a position seems quite unjustifiable to the devout student of Holy Scripture, but the very fact that it has been maintained shows that the accounts of Our Lord's various appearances to His disciples are not without problems. The central fact is, however, attested in unassailable fashion. There can be no doubt that Our Lord died and rose again. The death of Nelson provides an interesting analogy of the way in which the main fact is decisively attested despite differences in detail. Thus the descriptions of the event by his colleagues do not tally in every particular, but they all agree in bearing witness to Nelson's death in the hour of victory during the Battle of Trafalgar. The evidence for Our Lord's Resurrection is of the same kind. Regarding the main fact, Bishop Westcott said that no event in history has better attestation.

The full force of that statement will be better appreciated if we glance at the evidence which is so highly commended. There is a reference of one kind or another in the overwhelming majority of the New Testament books. These were all written during the life of the Apostle John who saw with his own eyes the Risen Christ and the empty tomb. They vary very much in their proximity to the actual event. The references in some of the Pauline Epistles are probably the earliest, but these are separated from the others by a comparatively brief space of time. Indeed, the books of the New Testament can be likened in their witness to the Resurrection to a constellation where one star differeth from another in glory. It is not necessary or desirable to appraise their dates with a view to grading the value of their evidence. It is enough that the New Testament should contain such ample evidence to the great event from which it derives all its power in the last analysis. A possible exception may be made in favour of the speeches recorded in the earlier chapters of Acts. These bear eloquent testimony to the Resurrection of Our Lord within a few weeks, or months, or years of that stupendous miracle. Reference might also be made to the way in which it is mentioned. Speakers and writers alike are absolutely sure of it, so sure that they evince no tendency to dwell upon it, and to emphasise it to the dwarfing of all else. Indeed, many of the allusions are of a casual type. The apostolic

believer seems to have no difficulty in accepting that article of the gospel which states that Christ was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification.

A different type of proof is furnished by the failure of rationalist critics of Christianity and others to explain the origin of the Church's belief in the Lord's Resurrection so that it can be regarded as without any adequate basis in actual fact. The various theories have often been described and dismissed, but that is no reason why they should not be reviewed again, if for no other reason than because of their inexhaustible vitality. Despite the refutations which they have received again and again from defenders of the faith, they have been revived again and again with all manner of plausible modifications. There are always minds which are offended at the supernatural and the miraculous, even when these are completely free from these crude and unsophisticated associations which tend to make them stones of stumbling in such an age as this. They seem to regard it as an incredible and impossible thing that Jesus Christ rose from the tomb and was seen of many. The New Testament narratives of such happenings are regarded as psychological problems, capable of being resolved into stories of visions and traditions of men and such like. These attempts must now be surveyed that we may discover how inadequate they are to account for the ancient faith of Christians in a Risen Lord and Saviour.

As an illustration of the lengths to which the opponents of Christianity will go, reference may be made to the theory that Our Lord never rose from the grave, and that the report of His Resurrection was a fraud concocted by His followers. It bears considerable resemblance to the instructions given by the Jewish authorities to the soldiers who were stationed as guards over Our Lord's tomb. They bade them to father and foster a report that Our Lord's disciples had surreptitiously removed His body and then disseminated a story to the effect that their Divine Master had risen from the dead as He himself predicted. Theories of that kind are now wholly abandoned so that no time may be spent in exposing their hollowness beyond remarking that men do not gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles. It is contrary to the nature of things that a religion so beneficent and uplifting as Christianity should have for its foundation a piece of trickery. "The hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies" (Isaiah xxviii, 17). As Carlyle is never weary of pointing out, shams and falsehoods destroy themselves in due season. If our faith had

no better foundation than that, it would have long since gone to the wall.

Another theory which has been advanced in sceptical and rationalistic circles as an explanation of belief in the Resurrection of Christ endeavours to eliminate the miraculous by supposing that Our Lord never really died on the Cross. He only swooned, and in that condition he was laid in the new tomb wherein never man was laid. He subsequently recovered consciousness, and, by some means or other, he managed to make good his escape. He was afterwards seen of His disciples and by Paul, finally dying in obscurity. The mere statement of such a hypothesis seems to condemn it, to say nothing of its contradiction of explicit statements in the Four Gospels, and its being in opposition to all the laws of probability. The wonder is that distinguished scholars should have thought it worth while to champion it. For our present purpose, it is chiefly interesting as illustrating the desperate shifts to which men have been driven to escape the acceptance of the clear and convincing testimony borne by the New Testament that Our Lord actually burst the bonds of death. To suggest as an alternative explanation that Our Lord never departed this life on the Cross, but only became unconscious, is surely a counsel of despair.

Two other explanations of this great fact of redemption call for more detailed discussion. Both are variants of what is known as the vision theory. Its champions maintain that the successive appearances of the Risen Christ were neither more nor less than visions, resembling those which are described in so many books of the Old and New Testaments. Thus these manifestations of the Lord after His Passion are of such stuff as dreams are made of. There was no material and substantial reality in them. This theory assumes two forms. One is that these visions which explained the appearance of the Risen Redeemer were purely subjective. They were, so to speak, hallucinations. The disciples could not believe that their Divine Master was really dead. They called to mind dark sayings in which He had intimated that He would rise again. They dwelt on these until they became obsessed with the idea that Our Lord had actually conquered death with the result that they began to see Him in vision. By reflex action these visions strengthened their delusion until it became the Church's faith in a Risen and Glorified Saviour. At the first glance, it must be obvious that such a theory is attended with some serious

difficulties. It takes no account of the deep despondency of the apostles, and the other followers of Jesus. They were in no mood to dream of a resurrection of their Lord. On the contrary, He seems to have carried with Him to the grave their fondest ambitions. The words of Cleopas and his companion to the unrecognised stranger, who met them as they walked to Emmaus, accurately represented the spirit of the earliest disciples: "We trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel" (Luke xxiv, 21). They were disappointed and disillusioned, and yet we are invited to believe that, in a short time after the Crucifixion, these same men were in the settled mood to see the Lord before their eyes, although the sight had no existence outside of their imaginations. Such a theory surely does serious violence to the mentality of Christ's followers, especially the apostles. Our Lord never suffered fools gladly, and never does, and His apostles, with all their shortcomings, mental and moral, were anything but irresponsible and misguided visionaries, such as this theory inexorably required them to be.

The other version of the vision theory is known as the objective. On this view the visions were of heavenly origin. They were not the projections of the disordered minds and imaginations of those who had loved Christ well and lost Him. On the contrary, they were intimations from heaven that their Divine Saviour who was dead, was now alive for evermore. It is true that He never returned to the earth that He might go before them into Galilee, but He revealed Himself in visions which proved that death could not hold Him. The grounds for this theory are the references of Paul to the appearances of the Risen Christ with which he classes that heavenly vision of his Lord on the way to Damascus when he was apprehended of the Saviour. It is argued that all the so-called appearances of Christ after His Resurrection partook of that character. The full significance of these contentions will be grasped at once when it is realised that, on this theory, there could be no empty tomb. Our Lord's body saw corruption. It is surely unnecessary for me to remind you that, on the old and orthodox theory, Our Lord's body illustrated in some measure and prophesied of that change which our mortal vesture will yet undergo. The change is described by Paul in these ineffable words: "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual

body" (1 Cor. xv, 42-44). I quote these words because it is a joy to do so, not because they apply with strict accuracy to Him who became the first-fruits of them that slept. They serve as a reminder of the mighty change which will be undergone by His people through the power of His Resurrection.

According to the theory which is now being discussed, there was no empty tomb. It is based on a view of the New Testament which denies absolutely the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit in its composition. In the space available, it is impossible to consider the reasoning on which it rests in detail. Its adherents succeed to their own satisfaction in explaining away the references to the empty tomb, and in restricting the Resurrection appearances to a series of visions. I content myself with one comment. These so-called visions are recorded and described by their recipients, or by those who had every opportunity of learning about them from eye witnesses. It is remarkable that the language used should convey the impression that Christ was not beheld in vision but in the flesh. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me here" (Luke xxiv, 39). Nothing less would have convinced His apostles that He was alive from the dead. A vision would be inadequate for the purpose, especially when more than five hundred brethren were concerned (1 Cor. xv, 6). In any case, the sealed tomb would contradict all such airy phantasies. Nothing less, and nothing more, and nothing else but the literal truth of the N.T. testimony on the subject will suffice to explain the rise and perseverance of the Christian Church. As Prebendary Row observes, we are not dealing with the genesis of a ghost story but with the source and origin of a spiritual society which will endure as long as the moon endureth, and longer still.

I conclude with a few sentences on a proof which can truly be called infallible although its appeal may be very limited. I refer to the evidence of religious experience. The saints believe that their Lord rose from the dead on the basis of all the proofs and arguments just adduced, chiefly because of the clear and express teaching of the Bible on the subject. But for them deep calls unto deep. The deep things of God are answered from the depths of their own souls, and they can bear witness that Our Lord is the victor over death and the grave, for they have died with Him by faith, and been raised again to set their affections on things which are above, where Christ sitteth at

the right hand of God. It is said that an ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory. In religion that principle applies with tremendous force. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John vii, 17). But there is no opposition between experience and theory. Rather it is their separation which is so prolific in mischief of all kinds. They have been designed by God to sustain each other, as Luke implies when he tells us that Our Lord showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of His disciples forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

All laud we would render ;
 O help us to see,
 'Tis only the splendour
 Of light hideth Thee ;
 And so let Thy glory,
 Almighty, impart
 Through Christ in the story
 Thy Christ in the heart.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. W. G. SCROGGIE, D.D., writing from a sick bed, expressed his opinion that the emphasis in the paper fell unduly on antagonistic theories. Insufficient attention has been paid to the proofs of Our Lord's Resurrection. These are very many and very varied. When taken together, they form such a phalanx of evidence as to be impregnable. Ten such lines of demonstration might be mentioned :—

- (1) Our Lord being what He was, made His Resurrection absolutely necessary.
- (2) The work, which He came to do, demanded it.
- (3) Jesus Himself predicted it.
- (4) The empty tomb demonstrated it.
- (5) The Primitive Belief is inexplicable without it.
- (6) The appearances of the Lord elaborate the certainty of it.
- (7) The testimony of Paul endorses it.
- (8) The evidence of the Christian Church enforces and affirms it.

- (9) The convicting and converting power of the Christian message requires it.
- (10) The experience of countless Christians for 1,900 years bears witness to it.

SIDNEY COLLETT, Esq., wrote: I would like first to say how very much I have enjoyed Principal Curr's article on the Resurrection of Christ. Indeed his writings are always good.

Then I wish to call attention to a few points which he does not seem to mention with regard to the suggestion that Christ only swooned on the Cross:

- (1) Joseph, who had the body of Christ taken down from the Cross, and laid in the tomb, *must* have known that He was really dead.
- (2) Again, there is the Centurion's two-fold testimony: (a) "He *saw* that . . . Christ gave up the Ghost" (Mark xv, 39); (b) *He assured Pilate that it was so* (Mark xv, 44-45).
- (3) The testimony of the soldiers who *saw* that Christ was *really dead*, and therefore "they brake not His legs" (John xix, 33).
- (4) The individual testimony of one of the soldiers who, in order to *settle the question beyond any doubt, pierced His side*, and forthwith came thereout blood and water, *indicative of a broken heart!* (John xix, 34).
- (5) Then there were the soldiers who were specially warned by Pilate to watch the sepulchre in order to make sure that there was no trickery (Matt. xxvii, 65-66). These actually saw the angel descend from Heaven and roll back the stone from the then *empty tomb!* (Matt. xxviii, 2-4). In addition, they deliberately went into the city and told the authorities what they had seen; which so *impressed*—we may say *convinced*—the latter that they had actually *to bribe the soldiers to tell a deliberate lie about it* (Matt. xxviii, 11-15).

GEORGE A. HEATH, Esq., A.M.I.Mech.E., wrote: I would like to comment, in the spirit of enquiry, on two sentences in the Paper

which epitomize two of the arguments, viz., page 24, line 35, "Such an event defies the imagination of Man," and page 26, line 18, "the fact must be anterior to the faith."

As to man's *imagination* the statement may be true, but that the idea of a Saviour's Resurrection is present in man's *mind* is shown by a study of many human religions, notably in the Myths of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, &c. The pagan festival of the Yule Log (death) and Christmas Tree (resurrection) is only a relic of a widespread ancient belief in the death and resurrection of a God who became a man.

The women weeping for Tammuz and making cakes to the Queen of Heaven also refer to the same belief (Ezekiel viii, 14; Jeremiah xlv, 19). Doubtless these ceremonies are degradations of the original revelation of God, but the root-thought seems to be found in the mind of mankind. If there was this original revelation, and as the event was clearly revealed in the Old Testament by the prophetic word (*e.g.*, Isaiah liii, etc.) and by Mosaic types, to which faith responded, then surely the faith was anterior to the fact!

Again (on page 31, line 31), we have the suggestion that a society which believes that the Lord is risen exists and "shall continue to endure as long as the moon endureth."

Does this not need some modification? Or at least a reference to the time, probably not far distant, when A LIE (Gk. *THE LIE*) will be *universally* believed (see II Thess. ii)? The Man of Sin will so arrogate to himself the worship and faith due to the Lord Jesus that the whole World will believe in and worship the beast "*whose deadly wound was healed*" (Rev. xiii, 3).

Thus even Satan's masterpiece has as a chief characteristic a form of death and resurrection; and the words of our Lord are true "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find the faith on the Earth?"

I find these considerations weaken in measure some of the important arguments of the Paper—regarded simply as arguments. Faith, which is light from God, is another matter and has very happily been given its proper place in the Paper.

Col. the Rev. F. J. MILES, D.S.O., O.B.E., V.D., wrote: My friend Principal Curr is to be congratulated on his very excellent

Paper on the Resurrection of Our Lord. I am sure he will not mind my adding one or two items.

1. It seems to me that one of the greatest evidences of the reality of the Resurrection of Our Lord is found in the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. It has been and is argued, in spite of all the New Testament evidence to the contrary, that the disciples were pre-disposed, and therefore anticipated from the Lord's teaching His Resurrection, so came to believe what they had expected. Of course this is sheer nonsense, but the same argument cannot lie in the case of Saul of Tarsus. He not only had not known Jesus in the flesh, he had never seen His wondrous works, had never been moved by His winsome and wooing personality, but he was taught to hate Him as a blasphemer, as one who was a great spiritual force against that Judaism of which he was a sincere and forceful exponent. He went out of his way to persecute and to do to death those who dared to proclaim Jesus as Lord, the Christ of God, the Messiah; yet he became Paul the pointed and powerful preacher of the Gospel, whole-souledly devoted to Him Whom he had regarded as a malefactor and blasphemer, exercising the whole of his powers in the ministry of the Messiah. Nothing short of the reality of the Resurrection, of his seeing Jesus face to face, could have accomplished this.

2. Along similar lines can be taken the evidence of James the Lord's brother. Certainly the members of His family were not pre-disposed to regard their brother according to the flesh as the Christ of God. The attitude of James, both in the Acts of the Apostles and subsequently, is a further indication of the reality of the Resurrection as realised by him.

3. I think too, some notice should be taken of the fact that the appearance of Jesus subsequent to His Resurrection was only to the spiritually minded. For twelve months I was honorary lecturer in Hyde Park for the Christian Evidence Society. I usually lectured for 40 to 45 minutes and then answered questions on the subject of the evening for another hour and twenty minutes. After lecturing on "Why must we believe in the Resurrection," a man who carried several degrees, but had gone down through the drug demon, said to me at question time: "You know me, sir, you understand my sceptical turn of mind, how difficult it is for me to

believe ; cannot you see that if the tomb had remained intact with the stone in front, and the seal unbroken, it would have made a greater impact upon my mind and influence me more than the story of the Empty Tomb does ? ” I admit that for the moment I was “ stumped,” but while addressing the man in reply I inwardly prayed, “ Lord help me,” and the answer came immediately. I asked the man to whom Jesus appeared after His Resurrection, and after some fishing to get the right answer, I got him to state that the Lord only appeared to His disciples. Of course I then stressed the fact that our Lord could only be spiritually discerned by those who had the eyes of their understanding opened, and that in view of this Romans and Jews would, on the testimony of the Disciples, argue that they had not seen Him because they could not. There was the closed tomb and stone *in situ*, the seal unbroken, and of course the body of the Crucified was within.

NORMAN S. DENHAM, Esq., D.Litt., wrote : A closing quotation in Principal Curr’s admirable summary appeals as the most cogent argument for the Resurrection, “ An ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory.” It is impossible to discount the personal experience of Christ’s power in one’s life. But in recounting “ infallible proofs,” the author has left most fallible the line of argument dealing with documentary proofs, rightly admitting that “ all we know . . . is preserved in the pages of the New Testament.”

There is one, and only one, inspired record of the actual Resurrection, that in Matthew’s Gospel. Each and all of the ten principal translations of the account agree in placing this sublime event at the close of the Jewish Sabbath. Matthew xxviii, 1-2, actually reads “ In the even of (*i.e.*, late on) the sabbaths, as it began to draw towards the first of sabbaths.” *Epiphosko* here means the dawning of a new (Jewish) day, not sunrise, for which *orthros* would have been used. Admitting that we have here a Hebraism, yet there is no Scriptural usage permitting the gloss of the early fathers and later translators, which advances the Resurrection to the approach of Sunday’s dawn. Our Lord left the cerements and the tomb intact towards sunset of Saturday, as the first day of the Jewish week approached. The correlative usage in Luke xxiii, 54, of the verb *epiphosken* confirms this.

It is only natural that modern scholars "suggest that the discrepancies and difficulties are insuperable." The accepted reading and gloss of Matthew xxviii must for ever conflict with the utterance of Our Lord Himself, "The Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii, 40). The arbitrary traditional view makes our Lord to be one day and two nights in the grave. Combining the truth of Matthew xxviii with tradition, makes the period one day and one night only. Yet the anxious and astute Pharisees said, "Command that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day" (Matt. xxvii, 64).

The orthodox view prevents the plain understanding of Jonah i, 17, the solemn sign of Christ's death and burial. It denies to the Greek language and to the evangelist the possibility of prescribing a vital period of time which was to be the significant sign to the nation of our Lord's Messiahship. It makes the watch of the Temple guard a farce, rendering reprehensible the looseness with which Pilate gave, and the soldiers performed, his orders. It precludes, by Jewish law, all opportunity for the women to purchase the spices.

The ordinary laws of historical investigation are confounded for all, who, prejudiced by the orthodox belief, approach the plain evidence of the Gospels. Allow that Our Lord was buried, as Luke shows, as the Paschal Sabbath at sunset of Wednesday "drew on," and that He rose as the first day of the Jewish week "drew on" at sunset on Saturday, and the specific time of Matt. xii, 40, is scientifically accounted for.

This view was presented and generally accepted by this Society at its meeting of May 28th, 1934 (see Vol. LXVI), and all dissidence was adequately met by Scriptural evidences then adduced. To these I would here add significant typical foreshadowings of the very datings of the Passion Week.

The Ark rested upon Ararat on the seventeenth day of the seventh month, later known as the first month, Abib (Ex. xii, 2). From Exodus xvi it can be shown that the Exodus fell on *Wednesday*, 14th Abib or Nisan. On the night of the 17th Abib, Israel passed out of Egypt through the Sea of Reeds, and on its anniversary our Lord passed out of death into Resurrection life. The Exodus was upon the selfsame day, or anniversary, of Abraham's exodus from

Haran, on 14th Abib, A.H. 2083, 430 years before the Exodus. Our Lord suffered His Exodus upon Calvary's Cross on *Wednesday*, the 14th Nisan, A.D. 30. Further, it can be demonstrated that the Crucifixion took place in the middle of the 70th Week of the 70 *Sabbatic* weeks of years, foretold by Daniel, dating from the outstanding Decree of Cyrus' first year, emphasised by Ezra (i, 1). Thus 457 B.C. added to 30 A.D., by the Hebrew system of inclusive reckoning, gives $69\frac{1}{2}$ sevens, or 487 years. A.D. 26, the Baptism year, is proved to be a *Sabbatic* and *Jubilee* year.

It is submitted that the one vital weakness of the substantial evidences offered by our brother rests in the problem he himself stresses—a problem which has been resolved repeatedly, and notably by Dr. Torrey years ago. With this irrefutable argument added to the author's armoury, the vindication of the Gospel records would be complete and unassailable.

Col. A. H. VAN STRAUBENZEE wrote : Man is a very self-righteous animal, and the aim of some clever and scientific persons has been to get rid of the necessity of a Saviour at all. As the Resurrection is the corner-stone of Christianity, such persons endeavour to get rid of its truth and power.

What was the necessity of its secrecy ? Both Christ's death and resurrection were said to be according to the Scriptures—that means that He fulfilled all that was foretold of them in type. The Heave Offering, so called because it was lifted up on high in presentation to Jehovah, for himself alone, foreshadowed the resurrection. Likewise with the two goats on the day of Atonement. The blood of one was brought within the veil and sprinkled upon the mercy seat, in closest proximity to the Shekinah, which represented the immediate presence of God. The other goat goes into the solitude of the Wilderness ; Christ thus bore sin away, never to return to us.

One of the greatest proofs of the Resurrection is the condition of the linen cloths which John in his Gospel (xxii, 8) states " he saw and believed " (that He was risen).

Our Lord was treated like the rich, being swathed in linen bandages—criminals were wrapped in old rags. John xx, 7, " And the napkin that was about His head, not lying with the linen cloths, but wrapped together (rolled or coiled round and round) in a place

by itself." Here it implies that the cloth had been folded round the head as a turban is folded, and that it lay still in that form with the linen cloths also. The Lord had passed out of them not needing to be loosed.

In John xx, 17, Christ says "Do not be holding me (Why?) because I am not yet ascended to my Father." On this day, the morrow after the Sabbath, the High Priest, would be waving the sheaf of the first fruits before the Lord, according to Lev. xxiii, 10, 11. "And he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be accepted for you; on the morrow after the Sabbath the priest shall wave it." Meanwhile Our Lord, the first fruits from the dead, 1 Cor. xv, 23, would be fulfilling the type by presenting Himself before the Father.

1 Cor. xv, 13, "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, not even has Christ been raised."

How did our Lord Himself deal with this question? In Matt. xx, 23, we read "Then came the Sadducees, which say that there is not a resurrection." They propound the case of a woman with seven husbands; verse 28, "In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven?" Our Lord replies, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God, but as concerning the resurrection of dead bodies did ye never read that which was spoken unto you by God saying, I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of dead people, but of living people." The clever Sadducees were silenced by the only possible conclusion to Our Lord's words, namely, that those named must rise and live again in resurrection, in order that He may be their God.

The two Angels at either end of the rock-cut ledge, wherein the Lord had been laid, represent the cherubims at either end of the mercy seat.

The importance of the occasion demanded the presence of two of the highest angels, probably Gabriel and Michael.

Lieut.-Col. L. M. DAVIES wrote: The fact of Our Lord's Resurrection is indeed vital to Christianity. If the Resurrection did not take place, then, as St. Paul bluntly said in the passage (1 Cor. xv, 14-19) quoted by Principal Curr, our faith is vain, the apostles are false guides, and we—who discount this life for a life to come—are

of all men the most miserable. But if the Resurrection did take place, then this life is nothing by comparison with the next; instead of being fortuitous concourses of atoms, hardly more durable or significant than waves on the surface of the sea, we are eternal entities destined to a fulness and permanence of life which cannot even be conceived under present limitations. Christ is our Type as well as our Head. His experience is both the pattern and the guarantee of ours.

It is noticeable, in this connection, that the enemies of Our Lord were much clearer-sighted than the disciples. The latter seem to have been too stunned by the Crucifixion to appreciate further issues. To them, all seemed over; nothing remained but to pay the last tributes of affection to the supremely lovable Teacher who had come to so tragic an end. His enemies, however, realised that their triumph was not yet perfect; for had their victim not repeatedly declared that they would kill Him, but that He would rise again on the third day? (Matt. xii, 40; xvi, 21; xvii, 23; xx, 19). Unless they could show, therefore, that that day had passed without His rising again, the Crucifixion itself might be turned against them. So they sealed the tomb, and also set a guard to watch it until the critical period should have passed (Matt. xxxvii, 63-66).

It is essential to remember that all-important time limit; for if Our Lord had not risen *within it*, His prophecy enlisting the Crucifixion itself as part of His own programme (*cf.* Luke xxiv, 25-26) would have been discounted. Later sceptics may forget this circumstance; contemporaries did not. So the Resurrection was first testified *by the Pagan guard itself*—Roman soldiers, subject to rigorous discipline and fearless of natural danger.

How is it, since the tomb was admittedly sealed and watched, that the *contemporary* enemies of Our Lord never claimed that it remained intact for the period that it was under guard? They had no need to claim more than that—yet they could not claim as much. There is no possibility of doubting that Matt. xxviii, 11-15, records the actual state of affairs at the time—a demoralised body of soldiers being bribed by disgusted priests to tell a story discreditable to themselves; while the priests engaged to protect them from the punishment which, if the story had been true, those priests would have been the first to demand. It seems significant that “a great

company of the priests" joined the early church (Acts vi, 7); for these men, though belonging to the most hostile class at the Crucifixion, had seen most of what happened behind the scenes afterwards.

And we may well ask who would have wished to rob the tomb—granting, as we must, the fact of its emptying *while under guard*? The disciples were popularly accused; yet sceptics themselves now admit the impossibility of charging such men with deliberate deception. Indeed, the disciples' utter disillusionment, timidity and despair before the Resurrection, together with their astounding courage and self-sacrifice after it, certify that they neither fabricated a sham Resurrection nor doubted a real one. But in that case, who robbed the tomb?

Both the absence of the mangled body, and the sudden exultant courage of these truth-loving men, are inexplicable apart from the literal Resurrection. If robbery will not explain the one, neither will hallucination explain the other, for let us remember that:

- (1) Though the disciples did not find the body, when they themselves visited the tomb on hearing of its emptying, they *did see the clothes*. Who would have stolen the body without the clothes? How could hallucination have separated the clothes from the body?
- (2) Many as Our Lord's appearances were, and differing with the circumstances of each case, they were at first utterly unexpected by the persons who saw them; yet many of these earliest appearances were to *several persons simultaneously*; and in each case, all present both saw and heard *essentially the same things*.
- (3) In many cases the most tangible, as well as visible and audible, evidence was afforded of Our Lord's actual presence. In one case, He broke the bread which was to be eaten; in another, He both brought and cooked the fish which they ate; in another, He Himself ate part of the meal; yet again, He insisted upon the most obstinately sceptical disciple examining and handling His wounds; and at His last appearance, before the whole company of disciples and friends, He was seen by all to pass above a material cloud which hid Him from their sight.

It is worth recalling, at the same time, the supernatural elements in these appearances—the sudden vanishing after breaking the bread ; the passing into and out of a room with closed doors ; the final deliberate ascent into Heaven. For these show that the appearances were not due to an exhausted and desperately wounded survivor revisiting his friends before finally eluding them somehow to die in solitude. No such person could have rolled aside, from within the tomb, the great stone which several women could not move even from the outside (Mark xvi, 3-4), nor have appeared as anything but the shattered victim he was, to the rough Galilean fishermen. But the Christ they saw was obviously above human limitations, evoking their awe and worship instead of their horror and pity.

Only one conclusion fits all the facts, and it is that Our Lord did indeed rise from the grave, as and when He said He would—complete victor over death, on the third day after tasting death to the full.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am deeply touched by the kind words which have been written regarding my paper by those who have contributed to the discussion. The number of these is even more gratifying since the result is that paper and discussion taken together present a very helpful conspectus of a subject whose importance cannot be exaggerated. My hope and prayer will be that the perusal of these pages will prove to be a source of inspiration and consolation to many by the blessing of Almighty God.

It is gratifying to find oneself in cordial agreement with all that has been written. A few points on which clearer explanations are suggested may, however, be mentioned. With regard to Mr. George Heath's kindly criticisms, I should be disposed to reply that the aspect of the Resurrection of Christ, which baffled all expectations, was the fact that He raised Himself from the dead like a man awakening from slumber. It is not disputed that the idea of resurrection often appears in the Old Testament and in ancient mythologies. I intended to lay stress not on the fact, but on the phase of the fact to which I have called attention so emphatically. Our Lord laid down His life that He might take it

again. To my thinking that was a new thing in the world's story but I may be too dogmatic. As for the faith preceding the fact, the primary reference was to the contention of rationalistic schools that the Resurrection is a case of the wish being father to the thought. By the society which will never perish, I meant the Church of Christ whose members have been begotten of God unto a lively hope by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

Dr. Denham's learned contribution deals with the problem as to whether Our Lord's body lay in Joseph's tomb for about seventy-two hours. As he himself reminds me, that is a large question by itself, ably argued in his paper, published in a previous volume of these Transactions. Despite the fact that such a great and gracious teacher as Dr. R. A. Torrey took this view, I am unable to accept of it since it seriously disturbs the narrative of the Passion Week as recorded in the four Gospels, and accepted as accurate by a mighty multitude of authorities, drawn from various schools of thought, when tabulated and distributed over the various days.

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on February 5th, 1940, the Paper appointed to be read on that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion elicited.

*GENESIS AND PAGAN COSMOGONIES.**

By REV. EDWARD MCCRADY, D.D.

(Former Head of Philosophy Dept., University of Miss., U.S.A.)

IT was the well-nigh universal belief of scholars a century or more ago that the cosmogonies of pagan mythology, together with many associated legends of early events in human history, such as the existence of a primal Golden Age, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, etc., were but the half-forgotten and badly distorted recollections of a Divine Revelation vouchsafed to man at the very beginning of human history—the correct account of which had been providentially preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures. There were some distinguished opponents of this theory, it is true—especially among the Deists of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, who, curiously enough, substituted the conception of a primitive *Religion of Nature* for the orthodox Christian belief—but it nevertheless remains a fact that the great majority of scholars during this period were partial to the Church's view and, when not accepting the orthodox faith in its entirety, at least admitted that the pagan accounts in general were corruptions of the Genesis narrative. Indeed, it was not until after the publications of Spencer and Darwin had received widespread acceptance, that the sudden reversal of thought in the direction of materialism and atheism took place, and a view—the very antithesis of that formerly entertained—was introduced to explain the origin and

* With Professor McCrady's kind permission this paper has been abridged owing to lack of space. All the essential facts and arguments are preserved.—[Ed.]

evolution of Religion in general, and in particular to explain the relation existing between the monotheism of Genesis, and the polytheism of the Chaldeo-Assyrian Cosmogony. Under the leadership of Spencer, Lubbock, Tylor, and others, the principles of materialistic evolution were employed to explain the origin of Religion out of animism, dreams, hallucinations, magic, etc., and to prove that our present-day monotheism has come into existence only as the result of long ages of development.

Even men of a very different type—idealistic scholars like Max Müller and M. Reville—were so impressed with the evidence presented by Comparative Philology and Mythology to the effect that all the divinities of polytheism were personifications of the forces and phenomena of Nature, that they were driven to accept, in part or in whole, the general truth of these conclusions, until to-day we find this conception of the matter firmly established in educational circles, incorporated in every college textbook on the subject, and even accepted by the great majority of educated clergymen and laymen as a matter of course. Indeed, it is amazing to discover how few people, even of education, are aware that the old, materialistic conception of an uninterrupted evolution such as that entertained by Haeckel—a process utterly excluding the notion of all creative acts, emergences, and other miraculous events—is now thoroughly discredited by recent physical and biological science; and that in place of the tenet that all monotheism has evolved out of polytheism, the very reverse of that theory is now the accepted doctrine of the leading specialists in that field. We have only to consult such eminent authorities as Sayce, Flinders Petrie, Schmidt of Vienna, Langdon of Oxford, and numbers of other eminent students of the subject, to learn that (in the words of the last mentioned) “the history of the oldest religion of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism” (*Field Museum Leaflet*, 28). Nor, in accepting this interpretation of the matter, is there any need to deny the general truth of Max Müller’s assertion that the divinities of Paganism are, for the most part, personifications of the forces and phenomena of Nature, but only is it necessary for us to realise that inasmuch as there is abundant evidence to show that many of the stories told of these pagan deities follow the order of events recorded in Genesis in which the corresponding physical phenomena are said to have been created, and can only be understood in connection with certain specific statements of Genesis concerning them,

we begin to realise that the "*personifications*" followed and were based upon the particular story contained in this narrative. To illustrate what is meant. It is generally conceded that the Dragon, as a personification of the Evil Spirit, is more or less identified with the destructive and rebellious forces of Nature, especially as they bring chaos and suffering to mankind (the flood, storm, tempest, whirlwind, etc.), but it is only in connection with such stories as that of Bel and the Dragon that we begin to catch a glimpse of the *origin* of the myth, and only again as we compare this Chaldeo-Assyrian legend with the first chapter of Genesis that we begin to realise that this *Tiamat* (Dragon) of the former is but a personification of the *Tehom*—the watery abyss or chaos mentioned in Genesis; while Bel or Bel-Merodach (Marduk) is a personification of the sun which, appearing on the Fourth Day, "*breaks through this watery abyss that envelops the earth—piercing, or rather tearing asunder this Dragon of the abyss, with his glittering sword—and, eventually, after a long struggle, bringing order, law, and cosmos out of chaos, that we begin to see the explanation of the whole.*" Similarly, we see little significance in the Egyptian picture of Kneph sailing in a boat over the water, and breathing life into its tumultuous depths; or the Phœnician legend of Colpias and his Wife Bau, or Bahu, effecting a like organisation of the waste of primal matter; until we remember that *Kneph* signifies wind, air, living breath or spirit; and *Colpias* likewise means "wind," while *Bahu* is evidently the Phœnician form of the Hebrew "*Bohu,*" the *waste of waters.*

With this discovery, however, it immediately dawns upon us that these legends must obviously refer to the statement of Genesis that "The Spirit (wind or breath) of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." A further careful study of the succession of male and female divinities of the Chaldeo-Assyrian Theogony—Lachmu and Lachamu; An-Sar and Ki-Sar—will also bring to light the fact that they are, respectively, personifications of the Light with his consort, Darkness; of the upper and lower "waters" (divided by the "expanse"), and occur exactly in the order of their appearance in Genesis narrative; while the divinities Anos (or Anu), Ilinos (Enlil) and Aos (Ea) which follow next, and which are universally identified with the heavens, the earth, and the sea, are obviously personifications of these physical phenomena which, as Genesis records, were separated

one from another as the next step in the creative process ; while as the hero of the next succeeding generation appears Bel Merodach or Marduk, easily identified as the sun which, as Genesis again tells us, shone now for the first time upon the earth, and which, together with the moon and stars, completed the creative work of the Fourth Day, which last events are still further reflected in the Chaldean myth of the birth of Sin (Moon), Adar (Saturn), Merodach (Jupiter, *i.e.*, " the *Star* of Marduk "), Nergal (Mars), Nebo (Mercury) and others. The order of the appearance of these pagan divinities, we say, is exactly the order of the appearance of the corresponding physical phenomena given in Genesis—the *Theogony* (*Toledoth* or " Generation of the Gods ") of the Chaldeans is simultaneously a *cosmogony* and a cosmogony based on the cosmogony of Genesis.

So much for this general statement. Let us now examine the problem more exhaustively.

“ When above the heavens were not yet named,
 And below, the earth was without a name,
 The limitless abyss (*apsu*) was their generator
 And the chaotic sea (*Mummu-Tiamat*) she who produced
 the whole,
 Their waters flowed together in one,
 No flock of animals was as yet collected, no plant had
 sprung up.
 When none of the gods had as yet been produced,
 When they were not designated by a name, when no fate
 was as yet (fixed)
 The great gods were then formed,
 Lahmu and Lahamu were produced (first)
 And they grew in (solitude).
 Asshur and Kishar were produced (next).
 (Then) rolled on a long course of days (and)
 Anu, (Bel and Ea
 Were born) of Asshur and (Kishar).”

Such are the opening lines of the great Chaldean Epic of Creation as given by Lenormant (*Beginnings of History*, Appendix, p. 491) and based upon the original translation furnished the world by George Smith in his now famous *Chaldean Account of Genesis* (p. 62 *et seq.*). Since the publication of Smith's work, however, many other fragments of this early Chaldean cosmogony have been discovered, and many other scholars have been at

pains to piece together, and retranslate the text, with the result that we have now a fairly complete reproduction of the entire Seven Tablets which constituted the original narrative.*

As it is not in line with the purpose of this brief study, however, to do more than point out the significance of certain allusions and statements of the Chaldean account which have their counterparts in other ancient cosmogonies, no attempt will here be made to discuss the entire text; but attention will be directed solely to those features of the narrative which bear directly upon the matter under consideration.

Returning, therefore, to the examination of these opening lines of the First Tablet, we find that later commentators have modified the reading in a few more or less important particulars. Thus, following what he claims to be "the latest and best commentaries," Dr. Theophilus G. Pinches renders them as follows :—

“ When on high the heavens were unnamed,
 Beneath the earth bore not a name ;
 The primæval ocean was their producer ;
 Mummu Tiamtu was she who begot the whole of them,
 Their waters in one united themselves, and
 The plains were not outlined, marshes were not to be seen.
 When none of the gods had come forth,
 They bore no name, the fates (had not been determined).
 There were produced the gods (all of them ?) :
 Lahmu and Lahamu went forth (as the first ?) :
 The ages were great, (the times were long ?).
 Ansar and Kisar were produced and over (them) . . .
 Long grew the days ; there came forth (?) . . .
 Ansar, the god Anu. . . .”

(*The Old Testament*, p. 16.)

Now, ignoring the minor rhetorical differences, it is apparent that the actual meaning of certain words and passages of the original are differently interpreted here. For example, the Assyrian word "apsu," first rendered "abyss" ("the limitless abyss"—Smith-Lenormant) is here rendered "ocean" (the primæval ocean); while the meaning of the expression "Mummu-Tiamat" or "Mummu-Tiamtu," in the first transla-

* Those interested in examining the complete work will find a most readable translation presented in Dr. George A. Barton's *Archæology and the Bible* (p. 251, et seq.).

tion given as "the chaotic sea," is here ignored altogether. We shall have occasion to comment on this difficulty later on, when we come to discuss the significant Hebrew expressions *Ihohu va bohu** and *Tehom*,† in Gen. i, 2. For the present, we merely call attention to the problem here presented. Again, a very marked discrepancy is apparent in regard to the correct interpretation of the Assyrian "*gipara la giççura çuça la seh.*" Here the literal translation of the earlier authorities, as given by Lenormant (*Id.*, p. 490), is "a flock not was folded a plant not had put forth," whereas Pinches has it "the plains were not outlines, marshes were not to be seen"—an interpretation which now seems to be very generally adopted—to wit: "No field had been formed, no marsh land seen" (Barton, *Archæology and the Bible*, p. 251). Other differences present themselves also in the concluding lines of each translation, but these are due more to the fragmentary and uncertain character of the cuneiform inscriptions themselves than to any disagreement among scholars as to the real meaning of words. Before considering this last matter, attention must be called to the very valuable exposition of the religious views of the Babylonians given by the Syrian Neo-Platonist, Damascius (*circa* A.D. 560), which has served to throw much light on certain phases of the text. "The Babylonians, like the rest of the Barbarians," says he, "pass over in silence the one principle of the Universe, and they constitute two, Tauthe and Apon, making Apon the husband of Tauthe, and denominating her the mother of the gods. And from these proceeds an only-begotten son, Moumis, which I conceive, is no other than the intelligible world proceeding from the two principles. From them, also another, progeny is derived, Daché and Dachos; and again a third, Kissare and Assoros, from which last three others proceed, Anos, and Illinos, and Aos. And of Aos and Dauke is born a son called Belos, who, they say, is the fabricator of the world, the Creator." (*De Prim. Princip.*, 125, p. 384, ed. Kopp.)

Commenting upon this passage, Pinches says "the likeness of the names given in this extract from Damascius will be noticed, and will probably also be recognised as a valuable verification of the certainty now attained by Assyriologists in the reading of the proper names. In Tiamtu, or, rather, Tiawtu, will be

* יְהוּהוּ וַבּוּהוּ.

† תְּהוֹם.

easily recognised the Tauthe of Damascius, whose son, as appears from a later fragment, was called Mummu (Moumis).” Apon he gives as the husband of Tauthe, but of this we know nothing from the Babylonian tablet, which, however, speaks of this Apon (*apsu*, “the abyss”), which corresponds with the “primæval ocean” of the Babylonian tablet.

In Daché and Dachos it is easy to see that there has been a confusion between Greek Λ and Δ , which so closely resemble each other. Daché and Dachos should, therefore, be corrected into Laché and Lachos, the Lahmu and Lahamu (better Lahwu and Lahawu) of the Babylonian text. They were the male and female personifications of the heavens. Ansar and Kisar are the Greek author’s Assoros and Kisare, the “Host of Heaven” and the “Host of Earth,” respectively. The three proceeding from them, Anos, Illinos, and Aos, are the well-known Anu, the god of the heavens; Enilia, the Akkadian name of the god Bel, afterwards identified with Merodach; and Aa or Ea, the god of the waters, who seems to have been identified by some with Yau or Jah. Aa or Ea was the husband of Damkina, or Dawkina, the Dauke of Damascius, from whom, as he says, Belus, *i.e.*, Bel-Merodach, was born, and if he did not “fabricate the world,” at least he ordered it anew, after his great fight with the Dragon of Chaos, as we shall see when we come to a third tablet of the series. (*The Old Testament*, pp. 17, 18.)

Without attempting to go into any criticism of the above, we may summarise the main conclusion at which scholars have now arrived in the following tabular statement:—

TABLE I.

| | |
|----|--|
| 1. | Tauthé (-Tiamat) × Apon (-Apsu) |
| | |
| 2. | Mummu (Moumis) |
| | |
| 3. | Laché (-Lachamu) × Lachos (Lachmu) |
| | |
| 4. | Kissare (-Ki-shar) × Assoros (-An-shar) |
| | |
| 5. | Anos (-Anu); Illinos (-Enlil); Aos (-Ea) |
| | |
| | (Aos × Damkina) |
| | |
| 6. | Bel-Merodach. |

We may now note certain further meanings attached to the above, which, in one way or another, have the endorsement of scholars.

1. Tauthe (Tiamat)—Hebrew *Thohu* (תְּהוֹ), waste (*i.e.*, of matter), hence *unformed* matter—cloud-like or nebulous material—the so-called celestial “waters” (fluids); shapeless *nebulae*.
Apsan (Apsu)—Hebrew *Bohu* (בְּהוּ), void, emptiness, chaos proper (*i.e.*, empty space), the “deep.”
2. Mummu (Moumis) or Mummu Tiantu—*organised* matter, *formed* matter, hence the beginning of the Cosmos. N.B., Damascius, in explaining the meaning of Moumis (Greek *Μωμυς* calls it *νοητός κόσμος* “which is generally translated by ‘intelligible world’” (Hugo Radau, *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*, p. 11). But an “intelligible world” is a rationalised or organised world—a *cosmos* as distinguished from a *chaos*.
3. Laché (Lachamu) and Lachos (Lachmu)—conflict, opposition, a tearing asunder (see note below). Hypothetically, a rending of the existing material through the opposition of polar forces—Lachos *versus* Laché.
4. Kissare (Ki-Shar)—“lower hosts” or “waters.” Assoros (An-Shar)—“upper hosts” or “waters.”
5. Anos (Anu) heaven; Illinos (Enlil) Earth (?); Aos (Aa or Ea) Sea.
Aos and Dauke (Damkina), his wife, are said to bring forth Bel (Belus) or Bel-Merodach (Marduk)—the Sun.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to comment more particularly upon the words *Lachmu* and *Lachamu* in the third generation cited above. The meaning of these words is very obscure. However, a probable connection with such Hebrew words as לָחַם, לְחֹם, and מְלַחֵמָה has been pointed out (Houtsma—*Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, p. 329 ff. Cited by Hugo Radau, *Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times*, p. 17, note). These words, together with לָחַם (war), are derived from the verb לָחַם, to eat or consume, but also (acc. to Gesenius) to fight, to war. “Soldiers in war or battles are hyperbolically said to devour their enemies.” Hence we find also

such meanings as *to contend, to fight together, to fight against*. The connection between eating, devouring, biting, *tearing asunder*, fighting, therefore, is obvious, and seems amply to justify the interpretation that Lachmu and Lachamu refer to some kind of "*tearing asunder*," *division* or *separation* of the embryonic cosmic material; an event which is clearly implied in the statement of Gen. i, 4; where God, in creating light, is said to have "*divided* the light from the darkness, and again, in creating the firmament ("expanse"), is said to have "*divided*" the waters from the waters (*Id.* vs. 6-8—literally *torn them asunder*).

But whatever interpretation we prefer, it remains true that, in any case, the circumstantial evidence points to "the breaking forth of light out of darkness" as the true meaning of this passage.

We say "the circumstantial evidence," for, as aforesaid, it is not the mere identification of the pagan divinities with certain phenomena and forces of Nature that is the point to be stressed, but the further fact that the "phenomena and forces" are the same as those mentioned in Genesis as the "creations" of God, and are brought to the attention of the reader in the same general order of succession as they appear in Genesis. It is these very *parallelisms* which constitute the main force of the argument. There are differences, of course, but they are not of sufficient magnitude to eclipse the manifest resemblances which have forced themselves upon the attention of all students of the subject.

In this connection, too, we call further attention to the curious fact that the sexual distinctions among the divinities correspond to the polar differentiations of the cosmic material in the Divine acts of creation; and that it is the female to whom is ascribed the greater honour in the Chaldean system—her name always preceding that of her consort—while even parthenogenetic powers are apparently ascribed to her in certain instances. That with the Chaldeans the female principle is supreme in Nature will readily be seen from the prominence of the Dragon Goddess *Tiamat*, who is the central figure of the whole drama until finally overthrown, in the course of ages, by one of her own progeny.

Before entering upon any discussion of the remarkable correspondences presented here between the Hebrew and Chaldean cosmogonies, let us state at the very outset, for the benefit of

a certain class of critics, that we are quite aware that there are also many *great differences*. No one denies this fact. Indeed, if it were not the case, there would be no object in writing this paper. If there were *no* differences, why call attention to the obvious identities? Of course, there are differences—very conspicuous differences—but it is this very fact that makes a certain series of identities all the more remarkable. No one denies the fact, for example, that an Intelligent Creator of the world is not mentioned in the Chaldean account—that the Hebrew narrative is monotheistic, the Chaldean polytheistic; that the one is purely spiritual while the other is grossly materialistic; that one bears all the evidence of being a Divine Revelation, while the other has all the ear-marks of a human, sensual production. But true as this is, there are also a number of remarkable points of agreement between the two, which upon closer examination clearly indicate that the Chaldean is a gross perversion of the statements of the Hebrew—a revolting parody *which has been built upon the latter*—and that it is exceedingly important that we recognise this fact, as it further indicates the priority of Genesis and monotheism, and confirms the traditional view that the Chaldean Epic together with all the gross materialistic conceptions of polytheism generally are, the result of ages of *spiritual degeneration*—indisputable evidence of the “*Fall*” of Man. Just as there is no better evidence of a “*forgery*” than the number of “*agreements*” which it manifests with the original, so there can be no better evidence of the borrowed but degenerate character of this Chaldean Epic than the number of “*correspondences*” which it manifests with this inspired document of pure Hebrew monotheism. But the importance of this statement will appear as we proceed with the enumeration of these details. For the present, we must call attention to one singular fact which must be considered before entering further into the matter.

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION.

It has been asserted by critics that there is at least one “*difference*” between the two accounts that cannot be lightly disregarded. It has been said that, *unlike* the narrative in Genesis, the Chaldean account makes no allusion to the six days of creation or to the seventh day of rest. This is true.

But while we are considering this, why not also call attention to the further significant coincidence that, *like* the Genesis account, the Chaldean is divided into *seven* sections, and that at least five out of these seven sections refer to matters specifically mentioned in the corresponding "days" of Genesis? Nay, more—we may go further and say that five out of the first six tablets of the Chaldean Epic refer to phenomena duly recorded in Genesis as "*creations*" of God occurring on the corresponding "*days*" of His creative work. Is that an accident? Not only is this a most remarkable circumstance but, as we propose to show, it finds no satisfactory explanation, save upon the hypothesis that the Chaldeans followed the general arrangement of events recorded in Genesis, both as regards the successive *periods* of time (days) into which these events were divided, as well as regards the actual order of the events themselves *within* each of these "periods." Indeed, as we propose further to show, it should be evident to all "who have eyes to see," that the successive *physical phenomena* created by Elohim during the six days of His creative works, ARE the gods and goddesses of the Chaldean Religion. They have simply deified the numberless *works* of God—exalting the "*creature*" in place of the "*Creator*."

But to return to the number "seven," evidently regarded as sacred in both narratives. Merely to assert that the Chaldeans, like the Hebrews, regarded this number as sacred, explains nothing. The real question is, *Why* did they hold it sacred? The Hebrew account gives us a *reason* for their attitude on the subject; the Chaldean does not; and it is this very "reason" which, when coupled with other remarkable "correspondences" elsewhere, give us the key to the solution of the whole problem. In short, the very retention of this sevenfold division in the Chaldean Epic, though unexplained anywhere in the text, throws light on its origin, and, taken in connection with other remarkable "*correspondences*," proves that the work was a subsequent degenerate version, or rather *distortion*, of the original spiritual document preserved for us in Genesis—a conclusion which is now thoroughly in line with the latest opinion of scholars concerning the priority of monotheism to polytheism, as well as with all the evidence that the trend of religious life and worship is ever *downwards*—from the spiritual to the material—from the purest idealism to the grossest idolatry.

But let us now proceed to a more detailed comparison of the two records.*

Naturally the first thing which one observes on comparing these two narratives is the absence of all reference to a Supreme, Intelligent Deity in the Chaldean account. It is a distinctly materialistic and polytheistic narrative; and the fact that even the God whom the Hebrew writer acknowledges is called *Elohim*—a *plural form* though curiously enough used with a verb in the *singular*—was for a long time pointed out by critics as further confirming their theory that polytheism antedated monotheism, and that even Moses himself, in attempting to introduce the latter, could not afford to drop a term which has been so long familiar to his people, though he attempted to belittle its true significance by invariably using a singular verb in connection with it—an explanation so utterly improbable that it could never have gained the support of any sensible body of men had it not served the purpose of justifying a preconceived theory. Now, however, that we know that this basic assumption of scepticism is unfounded—that the latest authorities assert that, “wherever we can trace back polytheism to its earliest stages we find that it results from combinations of monotheism” —that “the history of the oldest religion of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism,” etc.—we are compelled to acknowledge the validity of the position assumed by the old school theologians. Nor should there ever have been any question in regard to the matter as all the earliest testimony of the various religions themselves indicate that polytheism resulted from many diverse manifestations of the one all-supreme God, and the fact that He was worshipped under many different names by different peoples and in different localities until finally men lost sight of the unity underlying all this vast multiplicity. Yet even the Rig-Veda (Book I, p. 164) assures us that (in that early day) the gods were regarded as simply diverse manifestations of a single Divine Being—“They call *him* Indra, Mithra, Varuna, Agni—that which is One, the wise name by different terms.” Now the word *Elohim* is only an example of this statement occurring among the Hebrews and the Chaldeans. We now know that a Supreme Deity—the God *par excellence*—was recognised even among the Chaldeans under the name of

* The reader is requested to compare what has preceded, as well as what is to follow, with Tables II and III, at end of paper.

El, Il, or Ilu. He was acknowledged as "the Supreme God, the first and sole principle from whom all other deities were derived" (Lenormant, *Ancient History of the East*, p. 452). That is to say all subsequent divinities—the entire *theogony of polytheism* were born of him as *personifications* of his numberless attributes; the various *Elohim*, in other words, were only the diverse aspects (personified) of the One *El, Il, or Ilu*,* and it is this *unity* underlying all the diversity of *names* assigned to him that Moses *emphasises* in the very opening words of the first chapter of Genesis when he affirms that: "In the beginning *Elohim*—(the *One God of many names*)—*He* created (*bara*) the heavens and the earth." In such language, therefore, Moses merely stresses a fact that was universally recognised by the Chaldeans themselves, in the beginning of their history, but was all but forgotten in the polytheism of later years. A similar history attaches to the names *Baal* and *Baalim* of Phœnician fame. The names *Baal, Ba-el, or Bel* were various renderings of the same title, and, in the opinion of the writer, were all corruptions of the original *Ba-ra El* (the "*bara Elohim* of Gen. i, 1), *i.e.*, the God who *created*—the *Creator-God*. But just as the various manifestations (theophanies) of *El* were later spoken of collectively as the *Elohim*, so the various manifestations of *Baal* became the *Baalim*. There were many of these *Baalim*. As referred to the localities in which they were worshipped, they were *Baal-Tsur*, Baal of Tyre; *Baal-Sidon*, Baal of Sidon; *Baal-Tars*, Baal of Tarsus; *Baal-Hermon*, Baal of Mt. Hermon; *Baal-Pisgah*, Baal of Mt. Pisgah, etc. With reference to the particular phenomena of Nature in which he manifested himself, he was called *Baal-Thammuz* (the god who controlled the decay and regeneration of vegetation); *Baal-Chon*, Baal the Preserver; *Baal-Molcch* the Destroyer; and *Baal-Zebub*, another personification of the death and resurrection of vegetation in the spring. As Lenormant remarks, "This Phœnician deity, like those of all ancient pantheisms, *was at the same time one and several*. He was subdivided into a number of hypostases called *Baalim*, secondary divinities, emanating from and (of) the substance of the deity, and who were merely personifications of his attributes." (*Ancient Hist. East*, i, 219.) In short, the historical process from pure monotheism to gross polytheism and idolatry seems to have been somewhat as follows. The pure, spiritual conception

* The *Al* or *Allah* of the Arabians to-day.

of the Creator entertained at the beginning was difficult for the average worshipper to visualise; but as this God was the Creator of Nature, His ineffable presence was assumed to be *everywhere* in Nature; indeed (as the next step), Nature itself was God (pantheism); and this being the case, every *physical object*, every *phenomenon* of Nature was a definite theophany of embodiment of God, and so could be regarded as a definite *representative* of God and worshipped accordingly, with the result that the *Creature* was soon substituted for the *Creator*, polytheism taking the place of monotheism. Before this unity underlying the plurality of names had been entirely forgotten, however, there was nothing unusual in the employment of a verb in the singular number in connection with both the terms of Baalim and Elohim, and this usage so characteristic of the first chapter of Genesis only bespeaks its great antiquity.

In the case of the Chaldean narrative, however, the decadence of all true spiritual conceptions has gone so far that the very existence of *El*, *Il* or *Ilu* appears to be forgotten, and only His material creations remembered. These, now, are personified and deified—yea, the works of His own hands are exalted above Him—the creature worshipped in place of the Creator. Not only so, but hardly a single material phenomenon or event of His Divine work mentioned in Genesis appears to have been overlooked in the Chaldean theogony, while the actual chronological order of their creation, though occasionally forgotten, is followed in the main with amazing fidelity. The very opening words, "*In the Beginning*," naturally suggest the idea of "*Time*" as existent before the appearance of the watery abyss of matter—the Goddess *Tiamat*. And accordingly we find that the Chaldean account opening with the statement "*Time was* (that is existed) when above heaven was not named; Below to the earth no name was given." But do not imagine that this "*Time*" that existed before the world was, was a mere abstraction. To them he was a concrete reality; a true divinity—the equivalent of the Chronos of the Greeks, who is said to have devoured his own children; and the *Ulom* of the Phœnicians who "never grows old," and embraces all things in himself. Moreover, he is actually associated in some of the myths with *Ilu*, *Asshur*, and *Asura* (all of whom appear to have been identical)—This "*Time*" was said to be "*the Father of the gods*," a statement which has never been forgotten, but which still lingers on in the familiar expression "*Father Time*." Again, while the etymology of the

word *Yahveh* (apparently identical with *Iao*, *Jah*, etc.) is a matter of dispute, the God referred to was undoubtedly the same as *El* or *Elohim*—the Creator of the world, the two names being conjoined, in later passages, as *Jahveh-Elohim* and, according to the interpretation of Damascius, this word *Yahveh* means not simply “*the existent One*” but “*He who lives eternally*”—that is *The Eternal Life*. But this again only serves to identify *El* or *Yahveh* as the Author of *Time* and *Matter*, and this is exactly what the Phœnician myth implies. While there is much confusion in the various accounts as to the exact order in which they should be named, yet it appears that *Zes*, *Chthonia*, and *Chronos*—*i.e.*, Ether (Light or Fire); Matter (later Earth) and *Time* are everywhere mentioned as the originators of all things—an allusion to the statement of Genesis that the *Eternal Elohim* “begins” (*i.e.*, in *Time*) His work, and first creates *Matter* (formless or chaotic) and then, out of Chaos, produces *Light*. Thus, in the opinion of Lenormant, the whole Phœnician system reduces to the following: “In the beginning were *Yahveh* (*He who lives eternally*); *Bahu* (feminine *Chaos*), and *Ulom* (*Time*)—and *Yahveh*, who was *breath* (*ruach*), made himself into *Desire* (*hipec*) to operate the creative work in the womb of *Bahu*. And *Bahu* became *Earth* (*erets*) when *Yahveh* had accorded her honour to her, and the Sea (*Yam*) was separated from the dry land. And *Ulom* begat the three celestial elements, fire (*esh*), breath (*ruach*) and water (*mem*).” (*Beginnings of History*, p. 557.) As already stated, there is some confusion in the various myths as to the exact order of the appearance of these first divinities. In the above, *Time* (*Ulom*) is mentioned as the *third*; and it may be observed, parenthetically, that the poet Vergil (apparently following Pherecydes) gives the order as “fire, earth and time”; while the Sidonians are very emphatic in their statement that “*Before all else was Time*.” However this may be, it is very easy to see that when these various myths are taken together, they are all concerned with the same created phenomena and events recorded in the opening verses of this first chapter of Genesis. *Elohim* (the *Eternal Life*) begins His creative work in *Time*, and successively produces *Chaos* or *formless matter* (*Bahu* of the Phœnicians being the *Bohu* of the Hebrews—“*Tnohu va Bohu*”—the Dragon Goddess, *Tiamat*, etc.); then brings *Light* out of Darkness (Ether, Fire, *Esh*, *Lachmu* and *Lachamu*); Evening and Morning; Day and Night; though His *Spirit* (*rauch*, Wind, *Colpias*,

Kneph, Air, Breath) hovering over the *watery abyss* (Tehom, Tiamat, etc.) and eventually produces the organised world of Sky (Heaven), Land (Earth) and Ocean, etc.

Indeed, the echoes of this primal revelation, transformed and corrupted as we have just explained, are to be found in nearly all the mythologies, cosmogonies, and theogonies of paganism. For besides the Chaldean, Assyrian, Phœnician and other narratives just cited, we find them in Greek and Latin literature.

To attempt to carry the story beyond the evidence presented in the above-mentioned extracts from the Chaldean, Assyrian and Phœnician religion, however, is obviously impossible in this brief essay.

In our discussion of the *Light-gods* we have, thus far, failed to mention that deity who, in many of the theogonies, is represented as the real *source* of the light embodied in sun, moon, and stars—viz., *Heaven* or the *Sky-father* himself. It will be noticed in the account given us in Genesis that Heaven, in the sense of the *clear, open sky*, was not created until the Second Day, and was the result of the “*expanse*” (raqia‘) or “*opening*” which God caused to exist in the midst of the clouds. Indeed, it was this very “*opening*” or “*expanse*” *per se* that God designated Heaven—to wit: “*And God called the firmament (expanse) Heaven.*” (v, 8.)

“*Heaven and Earth*—that is the beginning of all mythologies and cosmogonies,” says Dr. Otto Rhyn. “*Heaven and Earth* are for the Israelite the first *works* of the Eternal; for the Chinese they are ‘*Father and Mother* of all things’; for the Hellenes and Teutons the first divine beings (Uranos and Gaea, Wodan and Ertha. . . . *Heaven and Earth* were regarded as sexed beings, Heaven as fructifying, noble, lofty, male, controlling the lightning and thunder; Earth as prolific, conceptive, passive, female. *Heaven and Earth formed a union, and Sun, Moon, and Stars were reputed their children.*” (*Mysteria*, p. 7, *italics ours.*) This birth of the Sun as the result of the union of the Sky-father and the Earth-mother is presented every morning at sunrise, when out of the apparent union of Sky and Earth on the horizon, the Sun emerges out of the very womb of Earth.

All that we are here interested in pointing out is the important fact that even this famous Sun-myth of which critics have made to much in attempting to undermine the story of the Christ—so say nothing of destroying our entire belief in Genesis and a

primitive "Revelation"—finds its very roots in Genesis, and is nothing more or less than a gross materialisation and corruption of the statements of that sacred document, in which "*Heaven and Earth* (which) are for the Israelite the first *works of the Eternal*" (see Dr. Rhyn's testimony above), as well as the *Sun* which God also created and caused to emerge out of the very substance of the former, have been exalted to the rank of *gods*, and the story of these *natural phenomena*, together with the phenomenal inter-relations, movements, etc., and connections with other similar phenomena, are woven into a long and intricate story—the drama of the *Sun-god*. It is the ingenuity of Man himself that has changed the original truth into this baseless fabrication—Man himself "*who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator.*" (Romans i, 25.)

But even as it is, "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God," and knowing their pride, "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness."

We have now presented the main evidence in support of our thesis that the *gods* of paganism are simply personifications of the "*works*" (*creations*) of God enumerated in the first chapter of Genesis, and even the very order of their "descent," as given in the pagan theogonies and cosmogonies follows, with but few exceptions, identically the *order* of God's creative acts as recounted in the sacred narrative. It is true that this remarkable parallelism can only be demonstrated in connection with the events recorded as having taken place during the first Four Days of God's creative work,* for after the creation of the sun, moon, and stars, which afford the basis for the apotheosis of these heavenly bodies in the Chaldean narrative, there is a sudden break in the continuity—the Fifth Tablet making no reference to the creation or appearance of "animals." Nevertheless, this is the only exception, for the Sixth Tablet of the Chaldean Epic, like the Sixth Day of the Hebrew narrative, is particularly concerned with the creation of Man, while the Seventh Tablet—though making no allusion to a day of "Rest," nevertheless recounts the final consummation of all things in the happiness of the gods, who now dwell with Man, their servant in a wonderful "*garden*"—the "*Eden*" of Genesis ii, 8.† The omission of any reference to the appearance of animals is,

* See Table II.

† See Table III.

however, a serious divergence from the Genesis account, which would be a matter of more than usual significance were it not that we now know that other Babylonian accounts of the cosmogony make distinct reference thereto.

In conclusion, then, we remind our readers once more that the object of this essay is not simply to defend the theory that the vast majority of the pagan gods are personifications of the phenomena and forces of Nature—a proposition which is no longer seriously questioned—but to point out the further fact, of which few are apparently aware, viz., that the *history* of the earliest of these divinities—as given us in nearly all the old theogonies and cosmogonies of the ancients—that is the traditional story of their *origin, order of generation or appearance in time, together with their inter-relations one with another*, follows with amazing exactness the story given us in Genesis of the order of appearance of God's successive *physical creations*, thus testifying to the fact that the theogonies of paganism have been built upon the Genesis narrative, or else upon some yet earlier record of that primitive revelation from which Genesis itself has been derived. In short, it is not merely the fact that the gods of paganism are personifications of physical phenomena that is the important thing to be noted, but the further fact that they are the personifications of *those particular* physical phenomena enumerated in Genesis i as *the first* of God's creative works—the very order of the theogony or “*generation*” of gods presented in the pagan narrative, following, with remarkable fidelity the order of God's “*creations*” given in the sacred text. This cannot be explained on any theory of chance or accident. Moreover, it is only on this interpretation of the matter that we can discover any reasonable explanation of all these marvellously concordant, though none the less mysterious, legends. Here, in other words, we have a principle which will account for the genealogies of the pagan divinities, and simultaneously give us the key to the solution of the whole controversy between theism and atheism in this particular field of investigation.

TABLE II.

Showing earliest gods of Chaldean theogony to be simply *personifications* of the “*works*” (*i.e.*, physical creations) of Elohim recorded in the first Four “*Days*” of Creation—Gen. i.
(For further “*correspondences*” see Table III.)

GENESIS.

"In the beginning (*Time*) Elohim created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was, . . ."

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 1. | <i>Thohu</i> Waste of matter Watery fluid, or shapeless Nebula. | <i>va</i> and | <i>Bohu</i> a Void or Chaos (<i>i.e.</i> , empty Space) and darkness of the abyss. |
| 2. | | <i>The Spirit of God</i> (<i>Breath</i> or <i>Wind</i> of God—the "Organiser" of Nature, hovered above the waters, and said, "Let there be <i>Light</i> ." (divided from) | <i>Light</i> (Morning, Day.) |
| 3. | <i>Darkness</i> (Evening, Night.) | | |
| 4. | <i>Waters below</i> | separated by an "expanse" from Final differentiation of <i>Lands</i> | <i>Waters above</i> |
| 5. | <i>Heavens</i> | | <i>Seas</i> . |
| 6. | Sun, Moon, Stars, appear fully formed created for signs and for seasons. | | |

BABYLONIAN THEOGONY ACCORDING TO DAMASCIUS.

(Cited by Lenormant, *Begin. History*, p. 489.)

"*Time* was (*i.e.*, existed) when above heaven was not named," etc. (Tablet 1.)

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| 1. | <i>Tauthe (Tiamat)</i> <i>Dragon Goddess</i> —Personi- fication of Watery waste | × | <i>Apason (Apsu)</i> Husband of Tiamat— Personification of Chaos. |
| 2. | | <i>Mummu (Moumis)</i> <i>Organising Principle</i> personi- fied; called by Phœnicians "the <i>Wind Colpias</i> (<i>i.e.</i> , the <i>Breath</i> or <i>Spirit</i> of God) Egyptian, <i>Kneph</i> . | |
| 3. | <i>Lache (Lachamu)</i> <i>Darkness</i> , spouse of <i>Light</i> . | × | <i>Lachos (Lachmu)</i> <i>Light</i> , Husband of Dark- ness. |
| 4. | <i>Kissare (Ki-shar)</i> (<i>Waters below</i> —Wife) "Terrestrial Ocean"— Radau. | × | <i>Assoros (An-shar)</i> (<i>Waters above</i> —Husband) "Heavenly Ocean"— Radau. |
| 5. | <i>Anos (Anu)</i> (Heavens.) | <i>Ilinos (Enlil)</i> (Earth or Land.) | <i>Aos (Ea)</i> (Sea.) Aos × Damkina Bel or Marduk (<i>Sun</i>) and also |
| 6. | <i>Sin</i> (Moon); <i>Adar</i> (Saturn); <i>Merodach</i> (Jupiter) or the " <i>Star of Marduk</i> "; <i>Nergal</i> (Mars); <i>Ihtar</i> (Venus) and <i>Nebo</i> (Mercury). The Sun was also called <i>Shamash</i> . | | |

TABLE III.

Showing other "correspondences" between the Genesis and Chaldean cosmogonies.

GENESIS.

Day 1.

The earth a watery waste of matter, and an abyss—*Tehom*.

The Spirit (Breath or Wind) of God creates *Light* out of *Darkness*, differentiating *Morning* and *Evening*, *Day* and *Night*.

Day 2.

By means of an *expanse* in the midst of the waters. God divides "the waters above" from "the waters below."

Day 3.

God differentiates the *Heavens*, *Lands* and *Seas*.

God creates vegetation.

Day 4.

God causes Sun, Moon, and Stars to appear—the Sun to rule over the day, and to organise Nature.

Day 5.

God creates the animal life of sea and air.

Day 6.

God creates the higher land animals. God culminates His work with the creation of MAN—into whom He breathes His Divine Life.

Day 7.

After finishing His work of creation God "*rests*."

CHALDEAN COSMOGONY.

Tablet 1.

Origin of all things the Primeval Abyss and the Roaring Sea—*Tiamat*. The Wind of God (Phœnician) organises the world, begetting the deities *Lachamu* (darkness) and *Lackmu* (Light).

Tablet 2.

The deities *An-shar* (the waters above) and *Ki-shar* (the waters below) are begotten.

Tablet 3.

The divinities *Anu* (Heaven), *Enlil* (Land) and *Ea* (Sea) are begotten.

Marduk (the Sun) is born.

Tablet 4.

"Marduk (the Sun) is King"—goes forth to war with *Tiamat* (the Dragon of chaos) and slays her.

Tablet 5.

Marduk (the Sun-god) continues his organisation of Nature—assigning the stations and duties of the stars and constellations.

Tablet 6.

The gods culminate their work with the creation of MAN, who is made of the blood (life) of a god (Kingu). Man created "to serve the gods—to satisfy them or "give them rest."* The gods dwell happily with Man in a beautiful "garden" (Garden of Eden).

Tablet 7.

Further allusions to the agricultural life in the "garden." (Compare Gen. iii, 15.)

* Barton, *Arch. of Bible*, p. 270.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. E. J. G. TITTERINGTON wrote: I have read this paper with great interest, and much regret that it has not been possible to hear a discussion upon it. However, there is one small question I should like to ask. I note on page 58 that Dr. McCrady equates Kronos with Chronos (time). Perhaps he would kindly explain this point.

Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote: I am unable to agree with Dr. McCrady in the importance which he attaches to the resemblances between the Babylonian traditions regarding the origin of created things and the narrative which makes such a sublime beginning for Genesis. A certain similarity seems to exist, although it is much exaggerated, and inferences are drawn from the supposed parallels which are greater than the evidence can bear. Dr. McCrady admits the presence of differences, but he seems to dismiss that fact in a way which would hardly convey to the uninstructed reader an adequate impression of their extent. Let me illustrate my meaning by a simple analogy. Men and monkeys resemble each other in astonishing fashion. A monkey is much more like a man than a bear. But while the likeness is indisputable, the distinction between the two is so tremendous that these points of similarity are

hopelessly overshadowed. In the same way, the narrative in Genesis may offer some points of similarity to that in the Babylonian epic which deals more or less with the beginning of things, but the differences are immeasurable. Only one point need be mentioned. The pure and profound monotheism of Genesis contrasts with the hideous polytheism of the pagan poem.

In these circumstances, I would deprecate any attempt to base an argument for primæval theology as being akin to that of the Old Testament on such points of resemblance. One reason is that these very resemblances are employed by modern critical scholarship to explain the origin of the story, told with such matchless grace and truth in the opening chapter of Genesis, on purely naturalistic grounds. The facts of that chapter are said to have been borrowed from Babylonian religion with which the Hebrews came into close contact during the Exile in the sixth century B.C. They have been transfigured by the lofty piety of Israel; but that does not alter the fact of their origin. In view of such a contention, which is widely accepted in these days, one should hesitate to emphasise these points of likeness lest it plays into the hands of those who take a very different view of the Bible from that associated with the Victoria Institute.

Again, the Bible itself gives no warrant for these inferences. It is true that there are passages in which the Apostle Paul clearly teaches that the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, as imparted to the progenitors of the human race, has been corrupted and abused by reason of sin and unbelief, but there is no hint that this early monotheism extended to a detailed revelation regarding the creation of all things, such as we find in Genesis. Indeed, the Bible seems to lay stress on its own uniqueness. When it refers to heathendom, it is only to condemn it. It might have been expected that some hint would be given regarding a widespread tradition and testimony to these basic things, if that had existed. The same argument applies to the Deluge, of which there are myths in many languages; but these stand in a different category entirely from the records in Genesis. It is a familiar fact in human experience that things which most closely resemble each other are farthest apart. Jacob and Esau were twin brothers, and yet they were as the poles apart. The same applies to Judaism, whose Bible is the Old

Testament, and Christianity. I should rather be disposed to regard the Babylonian legends as mere coincidences so far as their resemblance to the narratives in Genesis is concerned.

Lt.-Col. L. M. DAVIES wrote : I welcome Dr. McCrady's paper. The facts adduced in evidence of the priority of Genesis to pagan cosmic stories are of great importance to all who believe in the literal inspiration of Scripture.

I would like to add, in further evidence of the seniority of Genesis, some remarks about its account of the Deluge of Noah—the greatest cosmic event after the Creation and Curse. Thus, although the tendency has recently arisen, in deference to Chaldean flood legends from which the Genesis account is assumed to have been derived, to treat the Deluge as a mere local calamity confined to the Euphrates valley region, this seems obviously out of accord with the statements in Genesis itself, and I had to protest against it when answering remarks made at the close of my paper dealing with physical evidence of the flood (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, LXII, 1930, pp. 62–95). I there alluded, in a final footnote, to the fact that the Genesis account contains details which are missing from the Chaldean flood stories, but link it to others all over the world, and thereby prove its seniority.

The most striking of these is indicated by Col. Garnier in his book *The Worship of the Dead*. He shows that a festival of the dead is widespread among the nations of the world, and is “ held by all on or about the very day on which, according to the Mosaic account, the Deluge took place, viz., the seventeenth day of the second month ” (Gen. vii, 11). He remarks that “ The Jewish civil year commenced at the autumnal equinox, or about September 20th, and the seventeenth day of the second month would therefore correspond with the fifth day of our month of November ; but as the feast was originally, as in Egypt, preceded by three days' mourning, it appears to have been put back three days in countries where one day's festival only was observed, and to have been more generally kept on November 2nd ” (p. 4).

According to R. G. Haliburton (*The Year of the Pleiades*), “ The festival of the dead . . . is now, or was formerly, observed at or near the beginning of November by the Peruvians, the Hindus, the

Pacific Islanders, the people of the Tonga Islands, the Australians, the ancient Persians, the ancient Egyptians and the northern nations of Europe . . . Wherever the Roman Catholic Church exists, solemn Mass for All Souls is said on the 2nd November, and . . . the Church of England, which rejects All Souls. . . clings devoutly to All Saints". Garnier tells us that "In Rome the festival of the dead, or 'Ferialia', called 'Dii Manes' or 'the day of the spirits of the dead', commenced on February 17th, the second month of their year".

Space forbids quoting more details; but, as Garnier says, "the observance of this festival at, or about, the seventeenth day of the second month of the recognised year, by almost every race and nation of the earth" affords a striking commentary on the Genesis account of a world-wide cataclysm "in which a few survivors saw all their friends and relations swept away by a mighty flood of waters" *on that day*. The absence of any mention of this day in the Chaldean legends forbids our deriving the Genesis account from those legends; while the observance of the festival by people like the Peruvians and Australians, whose very existence was unknown to Moses and the Chaldeans, shows that Moses' source of information was—to say the least—unique.

This widespread festival of the dead, on the very day indicated in Genesis as having witnessed the annihilation of the old world, affords the most striking piece of evidence in this connection; but others might also be quoted. For why should the dove, and the olive branch, have been so commonly regarded as symbols of peace and reconciliation in the ancient world? Certainly the Chaldean legends offer no explanation; but Genesis does—for did not the dove, returning with the olive leaf to the ark, certify the end of God's wrath and the termination of the flood?

How often, too, do other legends (not the Chaldean) talk of eight persons—the number mentioned in Genesis—being saved from the flood! According to Garnier (pp. 184–185), "Menu Satyavrata" (the Indian Noah) "is represented as being saved with seven saints from the Deluge . . . The Druids have a similar tradition; they say that the Patriarch was saved with seven companions on a floating island with a strong door". (Note this seemingly irrelevant reference to a "door", which is more naturally emphasised in

Gen. vi, 16; vii, 16.) The Chinese flood story not only talks of eight survivors, but says they were Fo-hi (the Chinese Noah) and his wife, their three sons and three daughters, which closely resembles the Bible account (*cf.* Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, iii, p. 16). Even Fijians talk of eight survivors from the flood being landed on the island of Mbenga (*cf.* Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, pp. 252-253). According to Catlin, American Indian flood stories habitually talk of "one, three or eight" persons being saved; the recurrence of the number eight being thus remarkable (*Letters*, etc., i).

The Chaldean flood legends, describing a ship with steersman (or pilot) and numerous passengers (family, relations, servants, etc.), have obviously lost all primitive simplicity; and their details are actually incongruous, for navigation would be at a discount during a general chaotic flood and downpour, which a great chest or ark would be more likely to survive than any ship.

So I would suggest that its flood story, as well as its creation narrative, shows the priority of Genesis to all other versions of these early events. In simple, straightforward language Genesis gives an account which is consistent to itself, and affords both common factors and explanations of otherwise arbitrary and disconnected ideas found among the most widely scattered races of mankind. No such features appear in the Chaldean legends, which could therefore in no case be ancestral to Genesis.

To quote a final illustration. According to Lenormant (*Les Origines*, v, pp. 16-17), the Peruvians believed that the sea encircled the land, which it could not overflow because the ends of the rainbow press upon its surface. This looks remarkably like an echo of Gen. ix, 12-16; and in any case it is Genesis, not the Chaldean legends, which supplies an explanation.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Space prohibits anything but the briefest reply to the courteous and much appreciated criticisms of my paper.

First, then, in answer to the question of Mr. Titterington. He says—"I note on page 58 that Dr. McCrady equates Kronos with Chronos (time). Perhaps he would kindly explain this point".

Of course, Mr. Titterington will agree with me that this is *an inference* only, as neither on p. 57, nor again on p. 58, nor elsewhere

in my paper have I formally identified the two, but—as a matter of fact—have purposely refrained from using the word Kronos in connection with what I have to say about Chronos. The reason for this precaution is that the name Kronos has long been associated with two very distinct deities—(a) The Latin Cronus or Saturn; and (b) An Oriental divinity presiding over vegetation, harvests, etc. So far as Chronos (Time) and the Kronos of vegetation are concerned, there is (so far as I am aware) no connection whatever; and, consequently, no possibility of “equating” them. On the other hand, the distinction existing between Chronos (Time), and the Kronos or Cronus (Saturn) of Roman mythology is not so clear as it was once supposed to be. According to Liddell and Scott (Greek-English Lexicon, Art. Κρόνος) this name (Kronos or Cronus) was “later . . . interpreted as = χρόνος”; and whatever the explanation, it is unquestionably true that some of the stories told of Saturn (e.g., as devouring his children) have been told likewise of Time or Chronos. But this supposed derivation of the Time Myth from the Saturn Myth has itself been called in question by scholars. Thus, Mr. T. W. Doane, in his *Bible Myths*, writes as follows:—“Every one is familiar with the story of Kronos, who devoured his own children. Now, Kronos is a mere creation from the older and misunderstood epithet *Kronides* or *Kronion*, the ancient of days.* When these *days* or *Time* had come to be regarded as a person, the myth would certainly follow that he devoured his own children, as *Time is the devourer of the Dawns. Saturn, who devours his own children, is the same power whom the Greeks called Kronos (Time)† which may truly be said to destroy whatever it has brought into existence.*” (*Id.*, p. 559. Italics ours.)

Now, in my paper (*Genesis and Pagan Cosmogonies*) I do not attempt to dogmatise on this vexed question one way or another, and have purposely refrained from all reference to the myths of Kronos. All I have sought to show is that the same *Chronos* or *Time* who is certainly said to have devoured his own children, is evidently connected with the *Ulom* of the Phœnicians who “never

* This very expression—*The Ancient of Days*—is preserved for us in the Hebrew Scriptures, but is there used of the *Creator* Himself and not of the *Creature*.

† Misprint for *Chronos*.

grows old" and embraces all things in himself; also with the *Time* of the Chaldean and other pagan Cosmogonies who is said to have *existed* before all the other gods were brought forth—and indeed to have been the *Father of Gods* ("*Father Time*"); and who—like all other pagan gods—owes his divinity to the *personification* and *deification* of the various creative acts and works of God—recorded in Genesis i—in this case that *primary act of creation* whereby the world "*in the beginning*"—i.e., *under the condition of Time*—took definite shape and form.

In conclusion, then, I would say that my statements regarding *Chronos*, *Ulom*, etc., are, in my opinion, unaffected by any theory regarding the relation of the former (*Chronos*) to *Kronos*.

I regret that the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr finds that he is "unable to agree" with me respecting my general interpretation of the problem, and much prefers the old orthodox view of the Higher Critics, in which the facts of Genesis i "are said to have been borrowed from Babylonian religion with which the Hebrews came into close contact during the Exile in the sixth century B.C.", and that "in view of such a contention which is widely accepted in these days", he thinks that "one should hesitate to emphasise these points", etc. But while I deeply regret that Principal Curr is thus unable to agree with me, and appreciate his solemn warning against presuming to question the infallibility of the Higher Critics, I am nevertheless forced to confess that after more than forty years of diligent study I am convinced that these "confident assertions" referred to, have *never been proved*. They still remain "*assertions*" only; while not only these, but many other conclusions of the same school have been definitely overthrown in recent years, partly by the revelations of archæological research, partly by advances made in anthropological science, partly by greater familiarity with the facts of Comparative Religion and Mythology; but more especially in our whole conception of the Theory of Evolution which has radically changed since the days of Spencer, Darwin, and Haeckel, upon whose fundamental assumptions as to the nature of primitive man (e.g., his purely animal mind; his long, but steady *ascent* (*without degeneration*) from this brutal state; the lateness of civilisation; especially of the art of writing; and this particularly in case of the Hebrews, etc.) many of the tenets of Higher Criticism have been erected.

In short, there is nothing sacrosanct about the conclusions of this school, many of which have already been overthrown, and others as yet *unproved—pure speculations*. Moreover, while we gladly recognise the “scholarship” exhibited by many of these writers, it would be ridiculous to assume that they alone represent the opinions of scholars generally on the subject. Principal Curr seems to have forgotten that from the earliest days of the controversy there have been numbers of scholars who have protested against the conclusions of this school. George Smith, Rawlinson, Lenormant, Sayce, Flinders Petrie, Schmidt, Langdon, Kyle, Wiener, represent only the merest fragment of a list that could be indefinitely extended—and one, too, that is growing daily.

But enough of this. Beyond these “generalities” there is nothing to answer in Principal Curr’s criticism. Beyond the expression of his general disapprobation of my views, he has attempted no rebuttal of any one of my arguments. He has challenged the evidence for no specific statement; nor has he attempted to refute any particular point that I have made. Under these circumstances, therefore, there is nothing that calls for any specific reply on my part, as there is nothing to refute. On the other hand, I cheerfully accord him the right to his own opinions.

Finally, as regards the remarks of Col. L. M. Davies, I have only to express my very grateful appreciation of the same. It is obvious that his views are in substantial agreement with my own.

The Rev. S. Runsie Craig Memorial, 1940.

In accordance with the terms of the Trust, the Council have selected for the 1940 Memorial the paper on "The Wholesomeness of Christianity as Illustrated by British History," presented to the Society on 19th February, 1940, by the Rev. P. H. Scott, B.D., as affording strong confirmation of the genuineness of the "Faith once delivered to the Saints."

War conditions having rendered it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on February 19th, 1940, the Paper appointed to be read on that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion elicited.

THE WHOLESOMENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS ILLUSTRATED BY BRITISH HISTORY.

By the REV. P. H. SCOTT, B.D.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Christian Faith has been one of the most potent forces which have operated upon the history of the human race during the past two millenniums. This Faith is much more than a code of doctrine; it is something which can only express itself in terms of active human life, for, unlike other religions, its vital basis is a living Human Personality—indeed Human Personality in the perfection of likeness to God the Creator. Apart from its historic basis in the Incarnate Christ, there can properly be no Christian Faith.

If the claims which Christianity makes for itself are justified, then the influence which it has exerted upon the life of a nation should prove to be beneficial in the highest degree. Moreover, since the dynamic power of this faith makes itself felt in every department of human life, evidence of its beneficial influence should be found in everything which is an expression of national character, viz., in politics, literature, art, social conditions, as well as in religion. An examination of some of the salient features of British history since Christianity first spread to these islands may therefore be expected to yield ample evidence of the wholesomeness of Christianity.

THE CELTIC AND ANGLO-SAXON PERIODS.

The origin of the Early British Church is lost in obscurity, and only occasional glimpses are vouchsafed during the whole of the

period of the Roman occupation, of the spread of Christianity in Britain. Foundations of a Christian basilica dating from the fourth century A.D. were discovered in 1892 at Silchester. Three British bishops attended the Council of Arles in A.D. 314, and three more were present at that of Ariminum in A.D. 359. The fact that the latter were the only ones to accept the Emperor's offer to defray the travelling expenses of episcopal delegates indicates that the British Churches were very poor. Probably the ranks of British Christians were recruited mainly from the slave classes. Howbeit, the British Church produced the heresiarch Pelagius and the great St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland.

After the withdrawal of the Roman legions between A.D. 410 and 450, Britain succumbed to the repeated attacks of the wild sea-rovers from the north-western coasts of Germany. It is not clear whether the Celtic population of the eastern portion of England completely disappeared, or whether, as is more probable, a considerable number of the poorer classes remained as hewers of wood and drawers of water to their Anglo-Saxon conquerors. At all events, the practical observance of Christian rites seems to have utterly perished in the districts conquered by the pagan hordes.

Celtic Christianity of the sixth and seventh centuries was mainly monastic in character and was most active in Ireland where the monasteries were organised on the basis of the clan. From Ireland the Picts of Western Scotland were evangelised by monks who settled at Iona. These Northern missionaries, led by men like Saints Columba, Aidan, Cedd and Chad, journeyed into the Saxon kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia, and from centres like the wind-swept Island of Lindisfarne, evangelised the interior of the land. Meanwhile the Roman Mission, dispatched by the missionary-hearted Pope Gregory the Great, converted for a short space the kingdoms of Kent, East Anglia, and Northumbria and laid the foundations of the sees of Canterbury, Rochester and London. Since the results of their work at first depended only upon the conversion of the monarchs of these kingdoms, the succession in each case of a pagan king overthrew all their labour for a time. By the time of the Conference of Whitby, however, in 664, the whole land was at least nominally Christian. Henceforth, the spectacle of the now united Anglo-Saxon Church encouraged the gradual movement towards the political unity of the different kingdoms. Theodore of Tarsus,

the greatest of the early Archbishops of Canterbury, developed the organisation of our parochial system, which has proved one of the most powerful factors in the evangelisation of England.

Anglo-Saxon Christianity, as in all lands at that time, was largely monastic. The monasteries formed oases of peace, education and culture in a turbulent and barbarous age. In them was cultivated a love of art and literature, both sacred and secular. Evidence of this is provided by the Lindisfarne Gospels, a bilingual version in Latin and Anglo-Saxon, written c. A.D. 700; the Codex Amiatinum, a beautiful MS. of the Vulgate, written at Jarrow or Wearmouth, and presented to Pope Gregory in A.D. 716; the Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede; and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

The influence of Christianity on jurisprudence is shown by the laws of King Alfred, which were headed by the Ten Commandments and the negative version of the Golden Rule. Christianity was effective in softening many of the harsh judicial practices of the Anglo-Saxons, replacing Teutonic custom by moral right, and identifying crime with sin. Men like St. Cuthbert and St. Aidan were often effective in checking and disciplining the harshness and licence of their sovereigns, and in inculcating charity, clemency and righteousness.

The bonds that united England with the Universal Church also brought her once again into the stream of European culture and civilisation, from which she had been cut off at the break-up of the Roman Empire. English missionaries, such as Wilfrid, Willibrod, Boniface and many others, were henceforth to play a great part for the next four centuries in evangelising the Northern lands of Europe. The Frisians, Germans, Swedes and Finns, were all won for Christ by the self-sacrificing labours of Englishmen, while the great Alcuin became one of the most trusted councillors of the Emperor Charlemagne. The practice of the later Anglo-Saxon kings in appointing ecclesiastics as their chief ministers, while often disadvantageous to the spiritual work of the Church, brought a certain amount of Christian influence to bear upon political affairs, and in general made for righteous government.

THE NORMAN PERIOD.

In the Norman Period there were three main orders of monks: the older Benedictines, who emphasised the sanctity of learning; the Cluniacs, whose original idea was to stress the supremacy

of Christ over the lawlessness of men ; and the Cistercians, who emphasised the sanctity of labour. To the Benedictines we owe the development of literature and history ; to the Cluniacs the development of jurisprudence and legal practice, through the Church courts and Canon Law ; to the Cistercians, with their great Yorkshire abbeys, owning in the case of Fountains Abbey over 1,000,000 acres, the development of the English wool trade, and to a lesser extent the working of iron and lead. The earlier Cistercian monks cleared forests, drained swamps, and utilised the barren Yorkshire dales for sheep farming, thus becoming largely responsible for constituting the English wool trade the staple of her commerce and taxation during the Middle Ages. The monasteries also acted as places of education, as hostels where travellers could find lodging, especially in lonely districts, as dispensers of rather indiscriminate charity, and as banks and places of safe custody for money and valuables.

In the reign of King John, the national liberties, customs and privileges were menaced, first by the tyranny and autocracy of the king and then by the rapacity of the Pope. The nation then turned for leadership very largely to men of Christian character and upbringing. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the saintly Hugh of Lincoln boldly supported the claims of justice and righteousness against the lustful rapacity of John. To Stephen Langton was due the first clause of Magna Carta, which enunciates the principle of the freedom of the Church, and of all free men, from the tyranny of the Crown. Although the importance of Magna Carta has at times been greatly exaggerated, and although its terms have sometimes been wrongly interpreted in the light of subsequent developments, yet it does enshrine principles which have proved capable of progressive development. In laying this foundation of English liberties Christian influence played an important part.

In the next reign the danger to English liberty lay in the oppression and exaction of the Papal See, which shamelessly exploited the English Church to finance its warlike ambitions in Europe. Against these practices the saintly and scholarly Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste, raised a noble and undaunted protest. He also laid a much-needed emphasis on the need for the clergy to devote time and thought to the study of the Scriptures and to education.

THE RISE OF THE FRIARS.

In the thirteenth century the older monastic orders had already, to some extent, exhausted the high level of usefulness to which they had risen during the previous century, and were being overtaken by the desire for wealth, comfort, and luxury which was always the bane of monastic life. They were largely detached from the national life, particularly from the growth of the towns, and they did little or nothing to evangelise the people. To supply this lack of contact between the religious and secular life of the day arose the friars. The Dominicans sought to safeguard the Catholic Faith against the heresies derived from a study of Greek philosophy and Eastern mysticism, which had been imported into Europe via the Moors of Spain. Later they became the watchdogs of the Inquisition. The Franciscans laid stress on the voluntary poverty, the humanity and the preaching of Jesus Christ. Both orders introduced the idea of popular preaching, and sought to reach the masses of the city dwellers who were almost completely untouched by the parish priests. They were by no means backward in learning, as the great names of Friar Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham testify. Bacon was the pioneer of experimental philosophy, while Duns Scotus and William of Ockham were pioneers of systematic theology and of the appeal to Scripture as against tradition, for which Oxford soon became famous.

Wycliffe is the link between the mediæval Schoolmen, whose systematic theology was a blend of Christianity and Aristotelian philosophy, and the return to experimental Christianity, based upon the direct study of the Bible. His age was one of transition, when the inadequacy of the Mediæval Church to meet the moral, intellectual and social needs of the people was becoming patent to all. Men were demanding something new and more satisfying.

Wycliffe began by attacking, from a scholastic standpoint, the wealth, privileges and corruption of the Church, and in so doing he was supported by political leaders like John of Gaunt. Later, however, he attacked the very foundations of priestly authority, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and sought to provide for humble men a new basis of authority in matters of faith—the Holy Scriptures translated into the vernacular. From his teaching, and from the ministry of his Poor Priests sprang the Lollard movement, which spread rapidly among all classes in the reign of Richard II. In fact, if it had not been for the accession of the House of Lancaster, who gained the throne by

the help of the Church, the Reformation might have broken out in England in the fourteenth instead of the sixteenth century.

As it was, however, the movement was partly crushed, and driven underground by bitter persecution, of which that blot on our Statute Book, the Act "De Heretico Comburendo," is ample evidence. At first multitudes recanted, but many were burned, often for possessing a copy of the New Testament, for which the huge sum of 14 marks 40 pence was then paid. The movement, however, was never wholly stamped out, as the records of martyrdoms in the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII prove. In London, the Eastern counties and in the West, it provided a new religious basis for the forces of revolt against the corruption of the Mediæval Church. Because of the preparation of the ground afforded by the Lollards, the doctrines of Martin Luther found a ready entrance into England, and English universities, in the fifteenth century.

THE REFORMATION AND THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD.

In an old Bohemian psalter, dated 1572, is a representation of Wycliffe striking the spark, John Huss kindling the coals, and Martin Luther brandishing the flaming torch. This represents the truth that all that Europe owes to the great religious awakening known as the Reformation found its ultimate source in England through Wycliffe's return to the Bible as the main authority in matters of faith.

This increasing study of the Bible was that which proved the mainspring of the English Reformation, and that which ultimately rooted it deeply in the character of the nation. This new-found belief in the Bible as the Revelation of the Will of God was strengthened during the Marian persecution by the spectacle of men and women, whose lives were known by their neighbours to be simple, honest and sincere, dying with courage and fortitude for their faith. Their heroic deaths revealed at once the power of their faith and the tyranny and malice of the Roman Church.

This knowledge of the Bible began with the influence of the printed Greek New Testament of Erasmus upon the scholars at Cambridge and Oxford in the reign of Henry VIII, was continued clandestinely by the spread of Tyndale's English translation, and found at last official expression in the Injunctions of 1538 directing a copy of the English Bible to be set up in every church. The smaller Geneva Bible of 1558, and the Bishops' Bible of

1568, being handy in size, found their way into many humble homes, and held for a century the place which the Authorised Version has held since the middle of the seventeenth century. Worship, guided by the Holy Scriptures, became intelligent, and intelligible to all through the stately language of the Book of Common Prayer. As the historian Green so ably said of this period, "England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman: it was read in churches, and it was read at home; and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened, kindled a startling enthusiasm."

These factors brought with them an ever-increasing measure of political freedom, and independence from Continental interference, which manifested itself in growing sea-power, improved coinage, and greater respect in European counsels. It also effected eventual union with Scotland, in place of the continual bickering and spasmodic warfare of centuries.

In internal economy, the Elizabethan poor law administration solved the problem of the hordes of "sturdy beggars" who had menaced the safety of the countryside for many years, and enunciated the principle of the responsibility of the nation for the relief and care of its poorest citizens. This principle was almost certainly learned from the Holy Scriptures.

In literature, the translation of the Bible into English, and particularly into the stately and rhythmic phraseology of Tyndale's English, which still remains the basis of our New Testament, inaugurated a new era of English literature. Leaving behind the somewhat slavish imitation of classicism, which pertained to the earlier Renaissance, the poets, dramatists, and prose writers of Elizabethan literature raised the use of their mother tongue to a level hitherto undreamt of. In their phraseology and in the background of their themes, Spenser, Shakespeare, Bacon and others were greatly indebted to the Bible.

THE PURITANS.

The term "Puritan" covers a very wide difference of viewpoint on the matter of Church government. Many Puritans did not differ greatly from the average orthodox English Churchman of the period, while others were harsh and intolerant Presbyterians, or broadminded Independents, such as Cromwell

himself. Whatever their views on Church government, the Puritans as a whole set great store upon the practical side of Christian life. They yearned to see the principles of the Christian faith manifested in a life which was a direct witness against the open luxuriousness, licence, debauchery and pleasure-seeking which characterised contemporary society.

While the Protestant faith had gained a firm hold of the towns and seaports of the land by the close of the Elizabethan era, the country districts, particularly in the wilder, and more remote northern and western areas, were still sunk in ignorance and semi-Roman superstition. The Puritan yeomen, squires and clergy, by their continual insistence upon family prayer and the reading of the Bible at home, gradually laid in these rural areas the foundations of true religion, which remained unshaken for many a long year. Moreover, the Puritan emphasis upon rest from labour on Sundays, and their stern opposition to the rowdy pleasures and sports practised on that day, laid the foundation of the traditions of the English Sunday, which, in spite of all that has been said against it, was to prove such an inestimable boon to the workers when England became an industrial nation.

It has become the fashion to sneer at the Puritans as hypocritical psalm-singing kill-joys, and many of the arguments brought against them by contemporaries whose vices they sternly rebuked, have been quoted in support of this statement. It is often forgotten that the standards they set up frequently differed but little from those which to-day form the criterion of the average honest and decent gentleman, whether he be religiously minded or not. In spite of the fact that some of them may have carried their war against vices and pleasures to extreme lengths, and manifested insincerity in their attitude, music, art and literature flourished among them. We owe to them much of the strength, the probity, and the seriousness of the English character, and to them is due the fact that the Reformed Faith struck its roots so deeply into the nation that three centuries of change have not seriously disturbed its innate Protestantism.

In politics they were fearless upholders of principles of liberty and justice, and became the founders of English democracy, both in the Homeland and in America. "The history of the leadership of the Commons from 1600-1640 presents, in an era when public life was specially corrupt and unprincipled, the spectacle of prolonged, heroic, unselfish and well-advised action by the representatives of the English country gentleman, such as is

rare in the politics of any age . . . But Eliot, Hampden, Pym, and their colleagues were Puritans." (Trevelyan, *England in the Age of the Stuarts*.)

Cromwell, the greatest of the Puritans, was one of the first leaders of England to advocate and to practise toleration in matters of faith and conscience. Amongst other examples of this, he swept away disabilities attaching to the residence of Jews in this country.

THE METHODIST REVIVAL.

After the Stuart epoch, anything in the nature of religious enthusiasm was frowned upon as dangerous. It was the age of cold logic, and the worship of "Reason"; an age of infidelity and place-seeking. "Let sleeping dogs lie" was the cynical motto of Sir Robert Walpole, who held the premiership for twenty years during the reigns of George I and II by reducing political corruption to a fine art. All Church life, Anglican and Nonconformist, was at a lower ebb than at any time since the Reformation. But God raised up new witnesses to the power of the Christian Gospel. John Wesley, the young clergyman who tried to regulate his life by a methodical rule while at Oxford, "felt strangely warmed" as he listened to the discourse of a Moravian preacher at a meeting-place in Aldersgate Street, and went forth with his brother Charles, and George Whitefield, to take "the world as his parish." Journeying up and down the land, they preached in churches, churchyards, and on the open heaths and commons, to crowds of miners, and the poorest of the people, and stirred England to its depths. Vicars like Fletcher of Madeley, Grimshaw, Toplady, Henry Venn, and John Newton spread the fire in their own parishes. The eighteenth century saw the re-birth of living Christianity in the land, and saved England from the Revolution which overtook a corrupt society in France.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

In the nineteenth century the movement of revival began to touch in a wider and more profound manner the Church of England. By degrees the pulpits of many of the churches were filled with men like Charles Simeon, the younger Venn, and others, who, by word and deed, preached the Gospel of God's grace to

rich and poor alike in spite of bitter opposition. The attention of the laity to whom they ministered was turned to the shepherdless multitudes crowding into the ever-expanding cities as the industrial revolution spread over the North and the Midlands. The horrors of the old-established slave trade, and of the new slavery in mill, and mine, and factory gripped the hearts of men like Wilberforce and Lord Shaftesbury. The Suppression of the Slave Trade, the Factory Acts, and the Reform Bills were all expressions of this new vision of the worth of human life, and of human liberty, which men had gained from the New Testament. The founding of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Church Missionary Society, and the Religious Tract Society expressed the desire that all men should come to know the uplifting power of the Gospel.

The nineteenth century brought forth great Christians to whom we owe much :—Florence Nightingale, the founder of modern nursing ; Faraday and Lord Kelvin, who had time for God amid all their discoveries ; great statesmen, such as W. E. Gladstone ; great colonial administrators, who regarded themselves as humble servants of God, as did General Gordon ; great explorers and missionaries, such as David Livingstone ; soldiers of true nobility and courage, such as General Havelock ; and a host of others. The poets and novelists of this period were also imbued with a reverence for the things of God and a love for their fellow men, as were Sir Walter Scott, Charles Dickens, Louis Stevenson, Charles Kingsley, Tennyson and Browning.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

Our own age is more difficult to assess. We stand, perhaps, too close to the actors on the stage of its history to see them in their true perspective, and we live in an age of tumult and testing, when all the old foundations of society are being uprooted, or passed through the furnace of testing. Some nations have flung away the Christian standards altogether, as being too feeble for an age of iron and steel, of blood and treachery. Many in our own land enjoy the blessings of liberty, security and human kindness, which have been won for them by generations of Christian men and women, without realising or acknowledging the Source from which they have come. There has been a great falling away from outward observance of Christianity. Yet we are still blessed with a Royal Family that loves and honours God,

and with statesmen who are prepared to stand for Liberty, Truth and Justice, and to seek peace and ensue it. There yet remain a multitude whose hearts are right with God, and whose lives maintain that silent but effective witness for Him that keeps the heart of the nation true to Christian ideals.

CONCLUSION.

This brief survey of British history may serve to bring out in some measure the tremendous debt which we, as a nation, owe to Christianity. All that is best and noblest in that history may be traced to its influence. We have entered upon a goodly heritage, but the blessings which we enjoy to-day in comparison with other nations have their corresponding responsibilities. In 1940 we stand once again at the cross-roads of history. The crisis of the moment becomes a challenge to return to the God of our fathers, that in consecrating ourselves once again to His service we may be used by Him to be a means of blessing to all the nations of the world.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote: The story of Christianity in Britain illustrates as vividly as that of its growth in any other land its amazing powers of recuperation. Mr. Scott has concentrated attention on those aspects of British Church History which demonstrate its unspeakable beneficence, and he has proved his point. The case might have been strengthened by greater insistence on the evil which followed in the train of its periodical phases of degeneration. Of these and their effects on our national life there can be no other verdict than the old Latin proverb that the corruption of the best is the worst. Despite, however, these unhappy lapses, the Christian faith has again and again revived in England in greater power and purity than ever before. That is all the more remarkable because the reforming and reviving impulse came from within itself. The change was not due to the introduction of new elements but rather by a return to its first love. Bishop Butler was disposed to regard the Bible as the supreme means whereby Christianity regains what it may have lost awhile in spiritual vision and vigour. Mr. W. E. H. Lecky really

makes the same claim when he declares that the Church of Christ has always found in the unveiling of the Person of its Founder "an enduring principle of regeneration".

There are two outstanding instances in the history of British Christianity. One is associated with the abuse of ritual, and the other with the misuse of reason. It will be seen at once that these are the two enemies which have ever dogged the course of the Christian Church in these islands, and in other lands as well. The earlier is connected with the Reformation. The general trend of religion in England had sunk to a deplorable level in the Dark Ages, as the protests of Wycliffe reveal. In some of his historical essays, James Anthony Froude gives details of the daily life in monasteries and other ecclesiastical institutions, and the picture is a painful one, when it is realised that the leading figures claimed to be ministers of Christ. That makes the recovery of our faith all the more wonderful, for not only was the lost ground regained but wonderful progress was made as soon as the Bible entered Englishmen's hearts and minds to bring light and sweetness where darkness, spiritual and intellectual, had reigned.

The other occasion was the Wesleyan Revival, to which Mr. Scott makes appreciative reference. Its real significance may be tested in this way. The gravity of a disease can be estimated not only by the havoc which it works but also by the nature of the remedies used for its removal. If surgical treatment be indispensable, the trouble must be very serious. Pursuing the same method of reasoning, it may be recalled that John Richard Green, the historian, has said that the Wesleyan Revival saved England from the horrors of the French Revolution. Such a statement shows almost better than anything the greatness of the Methodist movement. It meant as much to England as the Revolution to France, and a great deal more. The Wesleyan Revival was the Divine cure of the dry rot which had spread so extensively in English Christianity during the preceding century owing to the popularity of rationalism, and its baleful consequences on national life. It had paralysed the Church until by the mouths of Wesley and Whitefield its divine Head commanded it to take up its bed and walk.

Such things will happen again for Christianity, British and otherwise, is indestructible even as the truth which endureth for ever.

The conditions of its continuance will be ever these resurgences of spiritual life, these spring-tides of grace. It matters not how low the Church may sink in its influence, or how far it may wander in its teaching, it always possesses the possibility of rejuvenation through the Holy Spirit and the Holy Scripture to which it owes everything.

Dr. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON wrote : I am one of those, and they are not a few, who understand the end of Christianity to have been recorded in the Apocalypse, chapter xvii, verse 16. Ended to make way for something worse. The end of Judaism is recorded in Matthew xxiii, verses 33 and 35.

We read in Romans ii, 14, " When races (ethne), those not having law (*i.e.*, the Creator's written instructions), naturally the things of the Law do, these not having law, unto themselves are law. These show the works of the Law, written in their own hearts ".

In Matthew xxi, 43, we read the words addressed to the Chief Priests and Elders of the Jews, by the Christ, in His Temple, on Palm Monday, April 7th, A.D. 32. The only day upon which He is recorded as having spoken of Himself as the Christ (Matt. xxiii, 10). (*See* Matt. xvi, 20.) He said " For this (verses 39 and 41), the Kingdom of the God will be taken from you and it will be given to a race (ethnei), doing (*i.e.*, then doing) the fruits of it ".

Now if we consider that race, amongst whom the first gentile church was formed, and within two years of Pentecost (as stated by Cardinal Baronius), and, with a government land grant. That race from whose royal house was appointed the first gentile Bishop of Rome. The first race to decree the Scriptures to be of divine authority over itself. The same race that later, about A.D. 306, permanently sent away its armed forces to conquer the then as always heathen Roman Empire, in the hope of imparting its beliefs and its morals to that empire when conquered, and to which it naturally gave a new centre of government.

If we consider all that is known of the facts of the history of that race since that world conquest, and compare them with the known facts of its history from Pentecost back to the reign of its King Brutus, I think we must decide that during this earlier period its social life was more wholesome than it was in that latter period.

Decide that in the pre-Pentecost period there was more liberty for those "who by patient continuance in well-doing sought for glory and honour and immortality", and to whom, in consequence, as stated in Romans ii, 6, "God will give away eternal life".

[For the history of the pre-Pentecost period, see Sir Winstone Churchill's *de divi Britannici*; and R. W. Morgan's *British Kymry*. For post Pentecost, also see Michael Alford's *Fides Regia Britannica*; and relevant parts of Cardinal Baronius' *Annales Ecclesiastici*.]

THE AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am exceedingly grateful to the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr for his helpful remarks, and alternative line of evidence in support of the thesis. In writing the paper, I was certainly not unmindful of the corruptions with which Christianity has been assailed in the course of our national history.

I have, however, endeavoured to point out the positive Christian influences at work in successive periods of our history, which succeeded in making themselves felt in spite of many shortcomings and much corruption.

I have borne in mind that, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon and mediæval periods, the general conception of the Christian faith and of Christian life was often imperfect and inadequate when judged in the light of our fuller knowledge of Holy Scripture, yet even so it exercised a profound influence upon contemporary history.

I am also grateful to the Rev. Principal T. W. Gilbert, D.D., who has read the proofs and has pointed out several necessary corrections which have been embodied in the paper.

I am afraid I find it very difficult to follow the remarks of Dr. J. Barcroft Anderson, particularly in the statements which he makes with regard to early British history. It is impossible to reconcile British Israelite theories, based as they are on such romances as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, with sober historical facts. Admittedly the period in question is necessarily obscure because of the dearth of contemporary evidence; but monastic legends and re-interpreted folk-lore do not help us very much.

833RD ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, on MONDAY, MARCH 4TH, 1940.
AT 4.30 P.M.

LT.-COL. F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 22nd, 1939, were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections :—As Fellow :—Principal S. T. Stamart Martins, F.R.S.A., F.R.G.S. ; as Associates :—The Rev. G. B. Molefe, M.A., the Rev. L. L. Morris, B.Sc., Th.L.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon J. H. Taylor, Esq., B.A., to read Chief Rabbi Hertz's paper entitled "Deuteronomy, its Antiquity and Mosaic Authorship" (being the Dr. A. T. Schofield Memorial Paper, 1940).

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part :—Dr. Barcroft Anderson, Rev. A. W. Payne, Rev. W. A. Wordsworth and Mr. Sidney Collett.

Written communications were received from the Rev. Principal Curr and Colonel A. H. Van Straubenzee.

DEUTERONOMY : ITS ANTIQUITY AND MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

By CHIEF RABBI J. H. HERTZ, Ph.D., D.Litt.

1. DEUTERONOMY AND THE RELIGIOUS REVIVAL UNDER KING JOSIAH (621 B.C. E.).

KING JOSIAH was the grandson of idolatrous King Manasseh, whose reign of fifty-five years was the longest in the annals of the Jewish people, and the darkest. Manasseh was swayed by a fanatical hatred for the Faith of his fathers. He nearly succeeded in uprooting True Religion in Israel, and flooded the land with obscene and gruesome idolatries. The Temple itself did not escape profanation : the sacred Altar was desecrated ; the Ark was removed from out of the Holy of Holies ; and new shrines were erected for

various weird cults. His years were one long reign of terror to the loyal minority who attempted to withstand the tide of religious barbarism.

No wonder that when, two years after the death of Manasseh, Josiah, a child of eight, came to the throne, the sacred books and teachings of Israel's Faith had been all but forgotten. However, in the group of influential persons responsible for the education and policy of the young king, there was a strong revulsion of feeling from the apostasy of the previous two generations, and a sincere yearning for a return to the historical Jewish national worship. It was, no doubt, due to the fact of having grown to manhood under such influences that Josiah decided in the eighteenth year of his reign to repair the Temple, which had been permitted under his predecessors to fall into a shameful state of neglect. In the course of this restoration of the Temple, a discovery was made that was to prove of far-reaching importance for the spiritual revival of Israel. Under the accumulated rubbish and ruins of the decayed Temple walls, Hilki'ah, the High Priest, came upon a scroll which he handed to the King's scribe with the words, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord". Shaphan, the scribe, brought the scroll to King Josiah, saying :

"Hilki'ah, the priest, hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilki'ah, the priest . . . and Shaphan, the scribe . . . saying, Go ye, inquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found ; for great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book to do according unto all that which is written concerning us" (2 Kings xxii, 3-14).

The following questions arise in connection with this narrative.

(a) What is here meant by "the book of the law" ?

Jewish and non-Jewish tradition and opinion hold that the scroll brought to the king was the Book of Deuteronomy. Some interpret Hilki'ah's words ("I have found *the* book of the law !") to mean that he had found the autograph copy of Deuteronomy.

Hence the extraordinary interest of all concerned in the discovery of this Book of the Law, and the effect of such discovery on the conscience of the king.

Neither is it accidental that the rediscovery of Deuteronomy in Josiah's day coincided with the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Sanctuary. Throughout the Ancient East, books of religious law and sacred documents were deposited in temples at their erection, and were often found when the buildings were repaired. Naville, the renowned Egyptologist, instances from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* an exact parallel to the Hilkiyah incident. He further adduces evidence that this custom was known and observed in Palestine at the time of Solomon. In that case, the copy of the Book of Deuteronomy in question would at least date from that reign. It had been immured in a foundation wall when the Temple was first built. In the process of repair at the command of Josiah, either the workmen must have come upon a foundation deposit, or the book must have fallen out from a crevice; and the High Priest picked it up among the rubbish. In view of this general Eastern custom, and especially of the Egyptian parallel, "there is no longer any justification for seeing any mystery or mystification in the incident of the finding of the Book of the Law by Hilkiyah, the High Priest" (Jirku).

(b) How are we to explain the behaviour of the king ?

The behaviour of the king—he is stirred to the depths of his being by the message of the book, and yet that message is new to him—is easy of explanation. Though during the half-century and longer of the royal apostasy the public reading of the Torah had been interrupted, and though the book itself had disappeared or had been destroyed by the idolatrous priests, men still knew of the existence of such a book, and had sufficient idea of its contents to be able to recognise it when the old Temple copy was suddenly brought to light. But so little were its contents *common knowledge* that, on its first reading, the king was struck with terror at its solemn prediction of the evils which would overtake a sinful Israel.

Ancient and mediæval history records several instances of codes of law or sacred documents disappearing, and of their rediscovery generations, and even centuries, later. Such, for example, was the fate that overtook the code of Charlemagne in the ninth century. The general neglect of the Scriptures

in the age before the Reformation also furnishes a partial illustration of the disappearance of Deuteronomy ; even as the recovery, at the time of the Renaissance, of the original Hebrew text of the Bible for the Western peoples is a parallel to its re-emergence under Josiah. In our own day, wherever the extirpation of religion is part of the State policy, as in Soviet Russia, we can quite imagine men and women who may have a superficial knowledge of the observances and beliefs of Judaism, but who had never read, or heard, of Deuteronomy, or any other Scripture.

2. DOUBTS IN REGARD TO THE DISCOVERY OF DEUTERONOMY.

Nothing could be simpler than the above explanation of the finding of the scroll of Deuteronomy during the repair of the Temple. Bible critics think otherwise. For over 150 years, they have declared that Deuteronomy, the Book of the Farewell Orations of Moses, was not the work of the Lawgiver, but was a spurious production written *during the generation of Josiah*. Some of them maintain, further, that this spurious work was hidden in the Temple with the intention that it should be brought to light, reach the king, and influence him in a definite way.

Not a word of all this appears in 2 Kings xxii, which describes the finding of the Book of the Law in the Temple ; and there is nothing in that account that can justifiably serve as a basis for so strange a hypothesis. Hilkiah speaks of "*the book of the law*", *i.e.*, the well-known Torah. He could not have used such a phrase—it would not have been understood—if it were not known that such a book had been in existence before. It is clear that the finding of the book was regarded as the discovery of an old lost Scripture, a book of the Law of Moses. It was this fact alone which gave it authority. The king, when the book had been read to him, rent his garments, and sent to inquire of the Lord what it portended for him and his people, for "great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book". The king was thus convinced of the Divine character of the book, and also of its existence in the time of his forefathers. Not a whisper of doubt as to the Mosaic origin of the book is heard on any side, not from priests whose revenues it seriously interfered with, nor from prophets on many of whom it bore hardly less severely. Moreover, the critics are not agreed on the questions whether the author belonged to the prophetic circle or to the priestly class ;

whether the book was the work of one man, or of a "school"; whether it was produced in the time of Josiah, Manasseh, Hezekiah, or even earlier; whether some portion of the book was Mosaic, or none of it; and whether it even *claimed* to be a work of Moses, or it made no such claim.

It was the English deists of the sixteenth century who first set afloat the theory that Deuteronomy was an essential forgery of the subtle priest, Hilkiah. That theory will not bear serious examination. Surely this crafty ecclesiastic would not have invented laws (Deuteronomy xviii, 6) which seriously infringed the vested privileges of the Jerusalem priesthood—unless we are to attribute to him a height of folly that would be psychologically inexplicable. In our generation, W. Robertson Smith, Dillmann, Driver and many others have repudiated this absurd theory.

Even less convincing, but far more shocking to the moral sense, is the attempt to find the forger among the Prophets. A pioneer of the nineteenth-century Bible criticism in England, Bishop Colenso, thinks it likely that Jeremiah was the falsifier. "What the inner voice ordered him to do," Colenso has the shamelessness to write, "he would do without hesitation, as by direct command of God, and all considerations of morality or immorality would not be entertained". Verily, there are some things that do not deserve to be refuted: they should be exorcised.

It is refreshing to turn to the words of Rudolf Kittel, written in 1925: "There is no real evidence to prove that a pious or impious deceit was practised on Josiah. The assumption of forgery may be one of those hypotheses which, once set up, is so often repeated that finally every one believes it has been proven. Then one seems ultra-conservative and unscientific not to believe it. Who, nowadays, would take upon himself the odium of being behind the times?"

3. INTERNAL EVIDENCE AS TO THE ANTIQUITY OF DEUTERONOMY.

The internal evidence against the late composition of Deuteronomy, and *for* its Mosaic authorship, is overwhelming. The book and the history of Josiah's times do not fit each other. To take a few examples. In the reign of Josiah, or in that of his immediate predecessors, the injunction to exterminate the Canaanites (xx, 16-18) and the Amalekites (xxv, 17-19), who

had long since disappeared, would have been as utterly out of date as a royal proclamation in Great Britain at the present day ordering the expulsion of the Danes (W. H. Green). And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, that, while it provides for the possible selection of a king in the future, nowhere implies an actual monarchical government? It furthermore regulates that the king must not "cause the people to return to Egypt," as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Num. xiv, 4), but which no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan. Again, Israel is treated in its unbroken unity as a nation. *One* Israel is spoken of. There is not the slightest hint of the great secession of the Ten Tribes that had rent Israel in twain. Lastly, in a book assumed to be specially produced to effect reformation in *worship*, how are we to explain the presence of such laws as regulate birds' nests or parapets upon a roof? Or, for that matter, what relevancy is there, for such a purpose, in Moses' historical retrospect? "As part of the work of Moses, all is clear; place it in a later age, all is confusion" (Wiener).

4. CENTRALISATION OF WORSHIP.

How is it that the above considerations have made no impression upon the mass of the critics?

The reason is as follows: the assumption that Deuteronomy is a product of Josiah's age is the basis of the theory on which the critics have built their whole reconstruction of Bible history and religion. That theory—viz., *the Centralisation of Worship in ancient Israel*—they have raised to a *dogma*, which it is in their opinion sheer heresy to question. Till the time of Josiah, they tell us, the ancient Israelite could sacrifice at any place he desired; numberless local shrines, "high places," dotted the land; and, though there was a good deal of pagan revelry, natural piety was a living thing among the people. But with the appearance of Deuteronomy the local cults were uprooted, religion was separated from "life", and worship was centred in Jerusalem. There arose the idea of a Church; religion was now contained in a book; and it became an object of study, a theology. All these things, we are told, flowed from the centralisation of worship: and such centralisation was the result exclusively of the finding of Deuteronomy in the days of Josiah.

What is the truth in regard to centralisation of worship, and these claims of the Wellhausen school of Bible critics ?

Briefly, not a single one of the critical claims in connection with their dogma of centralisation is in agreement with the historical facts. Centralisation of worship did *not* originate in the age of Josiah ; it was *not* the dominant motive of his reformation ; neither was there any freedom of indiscriminate sacrifice before his day.

(a) *Centralisation of worship did not originate in the age of Josiah.* One need not be a great Bible scholar to know that four hundred years before Josiah, the splendid *Temple of Solomon* was built on Mount Zion. That Temple was built by " a levy out of all Israel " (1 Kings v, 13) ; and for its dedication Solomon assembles " the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes " (viii, 1). It is the central shrine of the whole House of Israel. (Wellhausen says, " this view of Solomon's Temple is unhistorical," because no king after Solomon is left uncensured for having tolerated the continuance of " the high places." It is the old familiar argument that the Law could not have existed, because it can be shown that it was broken ! According to such logic, there could never have been any Prohibition Law in America).

And for centuries before Solomon there was the Central Sanctuary at *Shiloh*. We are told of " all the Israelites coming hither " (1 Samuel, ii, 15) ; and that the presiding priest represented " all the tribes of Israel ".

But even centuries before Shiloh, we have the *Sanctuary at Sinai*. Hypercritics have, in obedience to their programme, denied its existence. However, the study of comparative religions and their sacred structures has rendered their position absurd. Kittel's considered opinion is : " It is part of the knowledge which has been confirmed in recent times, that in Moses' day and during the Desert wanderings there was a sacred tent (Tent of Meeting), which was the religious centre of the congregation in the Desert ".

(b) *Centralisation of worship was not the dominant motive in Josiah's reformation.* Josiah's reformation from beginning to end was a crusade against the idolatry which had flooded the land, the Jerusalem sanctuary included ; and the " high places " were put down as part of this stern suppression of all idolatrous practices. Of a movement for centralisation of worship as such,

the narrative gives not a single hint. The whole condition of Jerusalem and Judah, as described in 2 Kings xxiii, was in flagrant violation of far more fundamental statutes than that of the central sanctuary in Deuteronomy. And it cannot be repeated with sufficient emphasis that there *are* far more fundamental laws in Deuteronomy than this law concerning the sanctuary. It has its place in chapter xii, and recurs in the regulations for feasts, tithing, and priestly duty ; but it is quite incorrect to say that this is the one grand idea which inspires the book.

(c) There was *no* freedom of indiscriminate altar-building in early Israel. The alleged legitimacy, before the reformation of Josiah, of sacrificing wherever one desired, is based upon a wrong interpretation of Exodus xx, 21 (in English Bibles, xx, 24). "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen ; in every place where I cause My name to be remembered I will come unto thee and I will bless thee". This law does *not* authorise worship "at the altars of earth and unhewn stone in all corners of the land", as claimed by W. Robertson Smith and those of his school. The law does not speak of "altars," but only of "an altar" ; and that altar was to be erected "in whatever place I record My name" ; *i.e.*, in any place sanctified by a special revelation of God. There is here nothing that conflicts with the command concerning centralisation of worship in Deut. xii. There we have the general rule of worship at the central sanctuary ; but that general rule does not forbid that, under proper Divine authority, exceptional sacrifices might be offered elsewhere. The clearest proof of this is that Deuteronomy itself orders the building of an altar on Mount Ebal, precisely in the manner of Exodus xx, 21. Critics unanimously assign Exodus xx, 21, to what they call "the Book of the Covenant", which they deem to be many centuries older than Josiah. But the "Book of the Covenant" has the same ideal of centralisation as Deuteronomy ! It takes for granted a central shrine, and prescribes that three times in the year all males shall present themselves there before the Lord (Exodus xxiii, 17).

Not all critics have remained blind to the true facts regarding the alleged lateness of the law of centralisation summarised above. From the very first the hollowness of the critical hypothesis was recognised by Sayce (Oxford), Hoffmann (Berlin), Naville

(Geneva), Robertson (Glasgow) and W. H. Green (Princeton). Their protests were disregarded, but new recruits were found in Hommel, Dahse, Wiener, Moeller, Orr, Jacob and many others. In recent years, several outstanding scholars—Max Löhr, Th. Oesterreicher, W. Staerk—have come to realise that especially this fundamental pillar of the Bible critical view has proved a delusion and a snare. In 1924, W. Staerk wrote: “For over 100 years Old Testament studies have been under the spell of this hypothesis (*i.e.*, centralisation of worship), which in its results has been fatal to the proper understanding of Israel’s religion”.

5. THE UNITY AND MOSAICITY OF DEUTERONOMY.

No book of the Bible bears on its face a stronger impress of unity—unity of thought, language, style and spirit—than Deuteronomy. And there is no reason to doubt that the various discourses proceed from one hand, and that the same hand was responsible for the code of laws. The alleged discrepancies between some of its statements and those in the other books of the Pentateuch are largely the result of what Franz Delitzsch called “*hunting for contradictions*”. These alleged differences between the historical accounts in the earlier books and the rhetorical presentation of the same matter in the farewell addresses of the dying Lawgiver, are all of them capable of a natural explanation.

In recent decades, attention has been called to the fact that in some portions of Deuteronomy Israel is addressed in the singular (collectively) and in other portions in the plural; and it is urged that this is evidence of dual authorship. Anyone who is familiar with the Prophetic writings knows that the singular and the plural constantly interchange.

As to the Mosaic authorship, the discoveries, since the beginning of this century, of the ancient Semitic codes confirm the antiquity of Deuteronomy. Thus, when King Amaziah punished his father’s murderers, he refrained from having their families killed with them (2 Kings xiv, 6), because the Law of Moses (Deut. xxiv, 16) forbade such procedure. To-day, we know that the old Hittite law of the fifteenth pre-Christian century—contemporaneous with Moses—contains this same

principle. Furthermore, the law concerning the rape of a betrothed or married woman in Deuteronomy has striking similarities to the law on the subject in the Hammurabi, the Hittite, and the Assyrian Codes. What reason, therefore, is there to assume that these laws of Deuteronomy are later than the Mosaic period? Paul Volz, who—together with Benno Jacob and Umberto Cassuto—has recently dealt a staggering blow to the Documentary Theory by demolishing all proof for the so-called Elohistic source, has once again recorded his conviction that, on the strictly scientific evidence now available, Moses must have been a genius of the first order, a supreme Lawgiver who shaped an inchoate human mass into a great spiritual nation. Can we deny such a genius the ability to deliver his farewell discourses? “When we carefully examine the arguments that have been collected in the work of more than a century of criticism, we find that not a shadow of a case can be made against the authenticity of the Mosaic speeches” (Wiener). The same holds true in reference to the code of laws. Max Löhr and W. Staerk see no valid reason why the Deuteronomic legislation should not be Mosaic. And they are not the only scholars who have come to see the force of Dean Milman’s words: “If there are difficulties in connection with the Mosaic date of Deuteronomy, endeavour to assign Deuteronomy to any other period in the Jewish annals, and judge whether difficulties do not accumulate twentyfold”.

Die-hard adherents of the Wellhausen school of Pentateuch criticism may derive what comfort they may from the following two concluding selections. The first is: “Speaking for all branches of science, we may say that a hypothesis which has stood for half a century has done its duty. Measured by this standard, Wellhausen’s theory is as good as the best. However, there is increasing evidence that it has had its day; and that those scholars who, from the first, expressed serious doubts of it, are right” (Kittel).

The other selection cuts at the root of the whole method of deciding historical questions merely by so-called literary tests. It reads as follows: “Must there not be something essentially illusory in a method which never gives or can give any independent proofs of its conclusions; and which too leads each new set of inquirers to reject what their next predecessors had been thought to have most clearly established?” (Speaker’s Commentary).

DISCUSSION.

The Chairman (Lt.-Col. MOLONY) said that all were extremely sorry that Chief Rabbi Hertz was prevented by ill-health from reading his paper, which his Secretary, Mr. Taylor, had kindly consented to do.

He referred to the fact that, in 1898 and 1899, Dr. Hertz had taken the British side, though he was not British born, or had resided in England. But he had lived in Johannesburg, the centre of the trouble, and was well versed in the rights of the quarrel.

The Chairman remarked that Jews are even more interested in defending the Old Testament than Christians are, and, having concentrated their studies upon it, probably know more about it than we do, and that he was sure that the Chief Rabbi's paper would be listened to with close attention.

At the conclusion of the reading, the Chairman remarked on the wonderful eloquence of the orations in Deuteronomy, a natural eloquence plainly due to the very deep feelings of the speaker, rather than to invention. Thus it is reasonable to attribute them to Moses, who loved his people and dreaded the trouble which he foresaw would fall upon them if they lapsed into idolatry. He concluded by proposing a very hearty vote of thanks to the author, which was passed with acclamation.

Before presenting the Schofield Memorial award to the Chief Rabbi's representative, the Chairman remarked that Dr. Schofield was a very distinguished medical man, specialising on cases with a mental side, that he had contributed not less than nine papers to the Victoria Institute, besides many to religious periodicals. He was lovable and loved, and his relatives had been wise and generous in founding this memorial.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT, acting as Chairman for Col. Molony for the discussion, said: With regard to the two records of the Ten Commandments, the first is recorded in Exodus xx, 1-17. The tables of stone, on which they were written, Moses broke when he saw the golden calf and the people worshipping it. Doubtless he kept an accurate copy. *This version was based on Creation* (cf. Fourth Commandment). The second set of tables which God told Moses to make and on which God Himself again wrote the Ten Com-

mandments (Deut. v, 6-21) are somewhat different, in the fact that, *as will be seen from the Fourth Commandment, the latter was based on the people's redemption from Egypt under the blood of the Pascal Lamb*, and seeing that *God Himself wrote both the accounts with His own finger* (Exodus xxxi, 18, and Exodus xxxiv, 1 and 28), there was evidently a *special design in the changed wording of the Fourth Commandment*, and in this there was probably a dim forecast of the *change of day from the seventh day, which was strictly the Law, to the Eighth Day, or as we call it and as it is called in the New Testament, the First Day of the Week* (Acts xx, 7, and 1 Cor. xvi, 2). It is also interesting to note that in Scripture *eight is the number for Christ*, as six is the number for man. *Whose resurrection completed the work of God's saving grace for man whose Law he had broken.* So that what to the careless eye of the critic is a mistake is in reality in perfect keeping with the beautiful design of the Bible.

Dr. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON said : It is a pleasure to have listened to the condemnation by Dr. Hertz of the modern theologians he has named, men who made it their life-work to reject their Creator's written word. I regret Dr. Hertz did not also find time to criticise the famous originator of our Hebrew dictionaries, Gesenius.

The question Dr. Hertz has raised, as to what was the Torah, is one deserving of our study. I understand my Hebrew Bible to include under that title the continuous record of the books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. This one volume, I understand, to have been the Jasher book named in Joshua x, 13 and 2nd Samuel i. 18. I understand the word Jasher to mean living up over, i.e., over every created thing the Creator has created. It gives us words He spoke before the solid matter of this earth was raised above sea level, words exclusively divine. Later the Adam whom He created was allowed to add to that language the names of animals and of birds. It must have been after he had heard the Creator's sentence upon the Nahash, that Adam gave that word to be the name for snakes.

I understand Moses to have stated to the Levites who carried the ark, that the place of the book of which he was only the amanensis (Ezra. vii, 6) was to be permanently at the side of the ark (Deut. xxxi, 26). We know the care the Creator, the God of Israel,

took of his ark when He allowed the Philistines to have it. We know what happened to Uzziah the king when he entered the Temple without divine permission. The Hebrew words in 2 Kings xxi, 4, 7, which our translators have rendered as meaning within the Temple, are not the words elsewhere used for an unequivocal "within." I understand them to imply only that the heathen image and altars of Manasseh were BY or NEAR the Temple. I find in Scripture a record of but one defilement of the interior of the Creator's dwelling (Daniel xi, 31) in Jerusalem, a crime for which there is no forgiveness. Daniel ix, 27, reads: "Desolator is causing to strengthen covenant to many one seven, and half the seven he is causing to cease sacrifice and gift and down to canopy abominations. And until completion and decreed thing is pouring itself out upon desolating one." Therefore, I would presume, it was beside the ark Hilkiah found the Torah.

I understand Nehemiah viii, 2, to state that this was the book Ezra then read to the Congregation, and am convinced that the original Torah was in the second Temple till shortly before that Temple was swept away by the princely people who came and destroyed the city (Daniel ix, 26).

As to that upon which Moses wrote, I note that the Jews who made the Greek translation of Jeremiah xxxvi describe the roll of a book by words each of which implies papyrus. Bublos is the Greek name for papyrus. We know that the Israelites carried with them into the wilderness the spoils of Egypt, everything they thought worth while carrying away, and must surely have taken some of the best papyrus. In saying this I realise we have not been told of what the book was made, unless I am correct in understanding the Hebrew word translated book, also implies papyrus.

I incline to the opinion that the word, translated roll, implies a source of information rather than the substance upon which the information is recorded.

The Rev. W. A. WORDSWORTH expressed interest in the Chief Rabbi's emphasis on *the* Book of the Law, as he had supposed that in Hebrew it was not possible to distinguish between *the* and *a* Book of the Law. He wished it were possible to hear the Chief Rabbi's explanation of this point in Hebrew. He also suggested that *Lore* represented the meaning of Torah better than *law*.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote : It has been said with considerable truth that the date of Deuteronomy is the key to the date of the Pentateuch. If it can be proved that the centralisation of the cultus, which is specially enjoined in Deuteronomy xii, is no older than the reign of Josiah, then it seems necessary to accept the view of modern critical scholarship that the book, while incorporating a certain amount of very ancient material, which may be as old as Moses himself, is really the work of the prophetic movement which had regained popularity and power in Josiah's reign during the latter part of the seventh century B.C., about eight or nine hundred years after the Exodus. It is not my purpose to traverse again the ground which has been so adequately covered by the learned author of this paper. My purpose is to call attention to an argument which should still further strengthen his case.

I refer to the fact that none of the five books, comprised in the Pentateuch, is so definitely and frequently assigned to Moses as Deuteronomy. It purports to be the record of three addresses given by the great law-giver to the Israelites as they were encamped in the plains of Moab before the passage of the Jordan, and the invasion of Canaan. There is a certain amount of supplementary matter, but, in the main, these speeches form the substance of the book. In passing, a word might be said regarding their literary splendour and profound piety. Indeed, Deuteronomy is often regarded by Christian scholars as bearing the same relation to the Pentateuch as the Fourth Gospel does to the Synoptics. The point on which I wish to insist is that the author or authors, whoever they were, and whenever they put the book together, seemed to be very anxious to impress every reader with its Mosaic origin. So successful have they been in this attempt that, for many centuries, it was universally held that Moses was its actual author.

The question naturally arises as to why the compilers of the book should have been so desirous of associating it in the minds of their readers with Moses. The answer of modern critical scholarship would be that such a step was necessary to gain credence and authority, but such an admission defeats itself. It conclusively proves that, at the date when Deuteronomy was prepared, there

was widespread belief in the fact that Moses was the father and founder of Hebrew legislation. To such an extent was that the case that no novelty stood the slightest chance of acceptance unless it could claim a Mosaic origin. There is always fire where there is smoke and, as one of my professors was accustomed to say, where there is much smoke there must be much fire. It would appear, therefore, that some explanation must be found for the manifest anxiety of the authors of Deuteronomy to create the impression that it was the actual work of the man with whose name it has been so long associated. There must have been a very ancient and authoritative tradition abroad that Moses was the fountain of Israelitish law. On any theory of late date, there must have been something to be gained by connecting this book of law with the name of Moses. The reply of modern scholarship is, of course, that these verses which ascribe the book to Moses are similar to the modern constitutional practice of issuing proclamations in the name of the sovereign instead of the cabinet or parliament, who are really responsible. But that very practice is a reminder of days, long since gone, when legislation was the work of the ruler, since he was an absolute monarch. There is an excellent historical reason for the use of the king's name in legislation. The point of the present argument is that there must also be an excellent historical reason for the use of Moses' name in Deuteronomy (*e.g.*, i, 1 ; v, 1 ; xxvii, 1 ; xxix, 2 ; xxxi, 24-26).

Colonel A. H. VAN STRAUBENZEE wrote: Our Lord often used the book of Deuteronomy when on earth. In the Book of Revelation (xv, 4) we read regarding a section of the Redeemed who were seen in heaven by the writer, and we are told they sing the "song of Moses" the servant of God. This song contains a rehearsal of the history of the whole nation in its relation to God. This hymn is introduced in Deut. xxxi, 19: "Now therefore write ye this song for you and teach it the children of Israel; put it in their mouths 'that this song may be a witness for me' against the children of Israel." All the stages of Israel's history receive the Divine description and verdict, and it would be quite impossible for any forger, at any period of the Old Testament,

or since, to make out such an accurate prophetic chart. The following passages will serve as illustrations :—

The Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii, 1–43).

God's perfect work and righteous ways (verses 1–6).

The Period of the Pentateuch (ver. 7–14).

(1) Israel's Evil Return for God's Goodness.

(Period of Historical Books) ;

Verses 15–19. “ But Jeshurun (put for the ideal Israel) waxed fat and contemned (God). Thou art waxed fat, thou art grown thick, thou art become sleek ; then he forsook God (in respect of worship) who made him and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.

They provoked Him to jealousy
with foreign gods
with abominations (idols)
they provoked Him to anger.

They sacrificed unto demons, which were no God to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came up of late, whom your fathers trembled at ; of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that gave thee birth. And Jehovah saw it and abhorred them, because of the provocation produced by the conduct of His People.”

(2) Period of Minor Prophets, esp. Hosea.

(When Israel are Lo-Ammi (not God's people).)

Verse 20. “ And He said, I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end shall be (xxxii, 17) for they are a very perverse generation, children in whom is no faithfulness.”

(3) God's Provocation of Israel.

(Period of the Acts.)

Verse 21. “ They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God ; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities ; And I will move them to jealousy with those that are not a people ; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.” (Rom. x, 19 and xi, 11.)

(4) The Great Tribulation.

(Destruction of Jerusalem).

Verses 22–25. “ For a fire is kindled in Mine anger, and burneth into the lowest sheol and devoureth the earth with its increase,

and setteth on fire the foundations of the mountains. I will heap mischiefs upon them ; I will spend Mine arrows upon them ; they shall be wasted with hunger, and devoured with fever, and bitter destruction and the teeth of beasts will I send upon them with the poison of crawling things of the dust ; without shall the sword bereave, and in the chambers terror ; it shall destroy both young man and virgin, the suckling with the man of grey hairs."

(5) Israel's Present History.

(a) (God's Reflections on the Scattering.)

Verses 26-33. "I said I would disperse them afar, I would make the remembrance of them to cease from among men ; were it not that I feared the provocation of the enemy, lest their adversaries should judge amiss, lest they should say, our hand is exalted, and Jehovah hath not done all this. For they are a nation void of deliberation, neither is there any understanding in them. O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end ! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight (see Lev. xxvi, 8) except their Rock had sold them, and Jehovah had delivered them up ? For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges. For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah ; their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter, their wine is the poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps."

(b) God's reflections on their evil return for His goodness—
their helpless condition moving Him to pity.

Verses 33-38.

"Is not this laid up in store with Me ?
Sealed up among my treasures ?
Vengeance is Mine and recompense,
At the time when their foot shall slip ;
For the day of their calamity is at hand ;
And the things that are to come upon them shall make haste,
For Jehovah will vindicate His People ;
And repent Himself for His servants ; when He seeth
that their power is gone, and there is none remaining shut up or
left at large.

And He will say, Where are their gods, the rock in which they took refuge ; which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink offering ? Let them rise up and help you, let them be your protection."

(6) Recall of Nation and Destruction of Enemies.

Verses 39-42. " See now that I, even I, am He ; And there is no god with Me ; I kill, and I make alive ; I wound and I heal ; and there is none that can deliver out of My hand. For I swear to Heaven and say, as I live for ever, if I whet my glittering sword, and Mine hand take hold on retribution ; I will render vengeance to Mine adversaries, and will recompense them that hate Me. I will make Mine arrows drunk with blood and My sword shall devour flesh. With the blood of the slain and the captives, with (the flesh) of the Chief leader of the enemy." (See Rev. xix, 17-21.)

(7) Millennial Kingdom.

Verse 43.

" Rejoice O ye Nations with His people
For He will avenge the blood of His servants,
And will render vengeance to His adversaries
And will make expiation for His Land for His people."

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I deeply regret my inability to have read my paper in person, and I take this opportunity of thanking the Victoria Institute for the honour they have done me by awarding me the Schofield Memorial Prize.

I have carefully perused the abstracts of the discussion on my paper, and note with deep satisfaction that there was general agreement with my main thesis.

In regard to the question asked by the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, M.A., I would state that a clear distinction can be made in Hebrew between " a book of the Law " and " *this* Book of the Law."

The argument put forward by the Rev. Principal H. S. Curr is both interesting and noteworthy.

The remainder of the discussion, while of deep interest, did not *directly* deal with the antiquity and Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy ; and, therefore, calls for no comment from me.

834TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, on MONDAY, MARCH 18TH, 1940,
AT 4.30 P.M.

WILSON E. LESLIE, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of March 4th, 1940, were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. L. Wyatt Lang, M.A., to read his paper entitled "A Psychological Approach to Christ's Teaching in the Gospels."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part: the Rev. A. W. Payne, Dr. Barcroft Anderson and the Rev. C. W. Cooper.

Written communications were read from Principal Curr, Colonel A. H. van Straubenzee and Mr. George Brewer.

*A PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO CHRIST'S
TEACHING IN THE GOSPELS.*

By the REV. L. WYATT LANG, M.A.

AT the risk of being "tiresome," I will raise the hackneyed question: What is wrong with the Church? and answer it immediately by saying that it is the existence of doubt where no doubt should be. It is the same weakness, of course, which Christ saw in the faith of the Apostles, and it will always exist in the Church.

The problem is acute in these times; indeed, a question mark against every article of the creeds seems to be regarded by some thinkers as sign of an honest mind. Far be it from me to urge an unreasoning acceptance of religious belief, yet it must be recognised that an attitude of uncertainty, insecurity or hesitation weakens the working capacity of religious faith.

When we remember that a person's energy is regulated by decision to use it we can see that an attitude of indecision or doubt inevitably hinders his conduct.

The importance of a sure foundation on which to build experience is shown by psychological experiments in visual perception ; for it is upon the permanence of the horizontal base line with the vertical arising from it that we organise our perception of the world about us. Also in the use of language and in the ability to recall ideas we depend upon the durability and cohesion of past impressions ; for how could we recognise writing and attach meaning to it if, in our memory, words changed their position and lettering ? In the sphere of behavioural psychology we find that a shock to the sense of habitual security is deeply disturbing, such as comes from ground movements in an earthquake which destroy assurance of secure foothold, or the eruption of a sudden, loud noise.

There can be no doubt that the sense of security is a necessary fundamental factor in life. While, on the one hand, we need a sense of permanence in the process of living, we know, on the other hand, that conditions of life during the last 100 years have been fluctuating widely. There have been frequent wars with disturbances in economic structure and political organisation.

An important change, of course, has been effected by the use of the scientific method in the sphere of education, but most potent of all, as it seems to me, has been the change in the sense of security in home and family from its local environment, maintained by a Christian ethic, to dependence upon an all-embracing State organised as a power-materialistic unit. People have been unable to adjust themselves properly to an ever-widening cultural and geographical environment. We find, therefore, a general feeling of uncertainty in the basis of affairs and an unwillingness to face up to the deeper meanings of life.

These influences are specially acute in the sphere of religious belief. The old sense of permanent security in religion which was upheld by faith in the verbal inspiration of the Bible or in the infallibility of the Church is no longer reliable and, moreover, an attitude of uncertainty has caused widespread doubt in the basis of religion.

To meet this grave situation, Christian scholars have worked unremittingly to re-examine the foundations of belief in the Bible and the Church and to re-establish the sense of reality in the Christian Faith. Unfortunately, as it seems to me, they

have been far from successful. The mass of English people have not recovered confidence in what the great Mr. Gladstone described as "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture."

The main reason for this failure may well be that theologians have been unable to make the Bible and the Person of Jesus profoundly significant in the affairs of life. Here, for instance, is a recent statement of an American theologian. "The religion of Jesus has been offered as a substitute for the Christian faith by men who believed that it could be made to fit into nineteenth-century ideas of evolution and social reform. But to-day we realise that 'The religion of Jesus' is at best a precarious reconstruction from documents which were not primarily interested in the religiousness of Jesus of Nazareth. They were to promote faith in him as Messiah and Lord." ("Current Trends in New Testament Study," by Clarence T. Craig, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LVII, Part IV.) In another article he says, bluntly: "The modern study of the gospels . . . makes clear that Jesus cannot honestly be made into a modern figure." ("Sacrament in the Fourth Gospel," by Clarence T. Craig, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, March, 1939, page 32.) With this conclusion I completely disagree and the quotations show the bankruptcy of this type of theology.

I do not wish to enter into a controversy on theological speculation; the aim of this paper is to show from psychological investigation the trustworthiness of Christ's teaching. This investigation starts from a different point of view. The difference is fundamental. Whereas theologians come to their conclusions by virtue of their personal opinion, the psychologist approaches Christ's teaching from the study of human nature—a study which he shares with Christ himself.

In so far as commentators adopt a subjective attitude, it is inevitable that they should throw into Biblical exegesis their prejudices and systems of thought. Even when they are aware of the danger of private interpretation and wish to conform to the meaning common in the Church, this teaching arises from the ideology acceptable in their time. This interpretation of the Gospels may be true as far as it goes, but it may not be the interpretation which Jesus had in mind. Stress has been laid on one aspect of the evangel in one generation and on another in the next. For instance, the view-point of the Church as the organised Kingdom of God dominates our present age, and it is natural that this aspect should be "read into" present-day

interpretation of the Gospels. The same aspect has asserted itself in past generations. Thus the statement "He that heareth you heareth me" (St. Luke x, 16) has been held to refer only to the ordained ministers of the Church by virtue of their office, as well as the assertion "whose soever sins ye forgive they are forgiven" (St. John xx, 23 (R.V.)). The Roman Church, for instance, holds the opinion that our Lord's commission on the Cross to St. John "Behold thy mother" (St. John xix, 27), was spoken not only to St. John but also to the whole Church. It is not intended here to agree or disagree with these interpretations but only to stress the fact that they are points of view which have no validity except that given them by the authority which supports them. They do not necessarily represent the opinion of Christ.

We find the same prejudices at work when the Kingdom of God is regarded as the Divine Reign in the human heart. Here again, when the Church is impressed with the mystic process of conversion and movements of grace, scholars turn their attention to the conflict of good and evil in the spirit of man and interpret the Gospels from this view-point. At such periods stress is laid on the need of conversion and regeneration, and the doctrine of predestination receives new emphasis. This attitude is well illustrated by John Bunyan in *Grace Abounding*. He is passing through "the dark night of the soul" and longing for conversion. "How lovely now was everyone in my eyes that I thought to be converted men and women! they shone, they walked like a people that carried the broad seal of heaven about them . . . But that which made me sick was that of Christ, in Mark, He went up into a mountain and called to Him whom He would and they came unto Him (St. Mark iii, 13). This scripture made me faint and fear yet it kindled fire in my soul. That which made me fear was this, lest Christ should have no liking to me for He called 'whom He would'." In this passage Bunyan was projecting his own unhappy mental condition into the words "called to Him whom He would" which the words should not bear; he was reading into the text a meaning applicable to himself.

In the sphere of Biblical criticism known as "Higher Criticism," the prejudices of theologians are obviously at work. Frequently negative considerations are given far too much weight. Scholars of this school seem determined to defend their position at all costs. As Schweitzer put it in his *Quest of The Historic Jesus* (Edition 1922, page 310): "Since the 'sixties the critical study of the life of Jesus in Germany has been un-

consciously under the influence of an imposing modern-religious nationalism in art. It has been deflected by it as by an underground magnetic current. It was in vain that a few purely historical investigators uplifted their voices in protest. The process had to work itself out. For historical criticism had become in the hands of those who practised it a secret struggle to reconcile the Germanic religious spirit with the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth. It was concerned with the religious spirit of the present . . . But the historic Jesus and the Germanic spirit cannot be brought together except by an act of historic violence which in the end injures both religion and history . . . Therefore both the theology and its picture of Jesus are poor and weak."

Prof. E. J. Bicknell, in his article on the Function of Literary and Historical Criticism in the *New Commentary*, said: "We must recognise the limitations of pure historical criticism. Strictly speaking, no historical event can ever be proved to have occurred. It is always possible to explain away the evidence and to adduce reasons for maintaining that the alleged witnesses were mistaken. In other words, when the critic is weighing and sifting his data, mental presuppositions derived from elsewhere inevitably come in and influence his judgement."

It is clear that we cannot hope to recover the sense of permanence in Christian belief from the methods of the Higher Critics; it seems that their attitude of critical uncertainty weakens confidence, although critical investigation into the basis of belief may be necessary and should precede reconstruction.

However this may be, what is needed to restore confidence is a basis which is independent of the prejudices of Biblical scholars and by which the teaching of Jesus can be tested and understood. We should then have ground on which a firm foundation of belief can be laid.

Let us consider this important matter further. We cannot hope to recover a sense of security in the exegesis of the Gospels from a subjective point of view, whether in the name of the Church or of an individual or of a group of commentators. What, then, should be our procedure? We should endeavour to be objective, *e.g.*, to discover the system of thought in the mind of Jesus, and to be able to say with the assurance of St. Paul: "We have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. ii, 16). We should not treat the Gospels as records of isolated statements but as a body of co-ordinated teaching. The genuineness or otherwise of a statement should be considered in reference to its cohesion in the

system of ideas incorporated in the Gospels. We are accustomed to do this in the case of philosophers, musicians, scientists and others who share in a common learning. Estimates as to the value of their theories, statement of fact and their ideas in general can be taken in relation to the accepted body of learning of which their work forms a part. The philosophy of Spinoza, for instance, has its place in philosophy as a whole to which it can be related and understood. This is true also, of course, of any person contributing to a recognised system of thought. There seems to be no reason why the teaching of Jesus should not be tested by the same method. He was a student of human nature and his teaching forms part of a psychological system which students to-day can test by their knowledge in the same field.

It seems strange that such an investigation has not been familiar to us long since. The reasons appear to be, in the first place, that Jesus clothed his teaching in pictorial language; it is easy to be content with a superficial interpretation of this pictorial presentation of truth; second, owing to the apparently disconnected ideas which form so large a part of the Gospels, the teaching of Christ has been considered (as Bishop Gore puts it in discussing the Beatitudes) as a string of pearls rather than a coherent system of thought; in the third place, a systematised knowledge of human nature has been slow in developing: it is only recently that attempts have been made to relate the teaching of the Gospels to psychological explanation of experience.

In meeting this somewhat difficult situation, we must first rid our minds of the interpretation which appears obvious. It is, I think, true to say that over familiarity prevents recognition of new interpretation. The need of reticence and a willingness to see Christ's teaching in the light of human experience is very well seen in that cryptic answer about "the eagles" being "gathered together" which our Lord made in reply to the Disciples' question, "Where, Lord?" This question, you will remember, was put to Jesus after the passage explaining when the Kingdom of God should come. "The Kingdom of God," He said, "cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say Lo here or there!" And yet He goes on to describe vivid occurrences in his customary pictorial style—lightning flashing under the heavens, the Deluge, the days of Noah, people occupied with their ordinary affairs, concerned with commerce, building and agriculture, and then intervenes suddenly a revelation of

“ the day of The Son of Man ” ; so suddenly, indeed, that there shall be scarcely time for a man to come down stairs ; yet such discrimination is to take place that “ there shall be two women grinding together ; one shall be taken and the other shall be left.” (St. Luke xvii, 35.)

Taking this passage in its surface meaning, anyone would think it refers to a definite time and place ; indeed, the disciples' question shows that they took the statement in this literal way ; the parallel passage in St. Matthew's Gospel has the same meaning and also this aspect of time and place is accepted by modern commentators. Here is the opinion of a prominent English Biblical scholar : Referring to this and some similar passages in the Gospels, he says, “ The consummation (of the Kingdom) is to be something which will take the world by surprise . . . That being so, it follows that it is not to be thought of as a peaceful reformation of the existing order, but as a drastic revolution by which a new order of things is introduced. The Kingdom of God in its final manifestation does not emerge by some evolutionary process out of the kingdoms of the world ; it displaces them.” (*The Teaching of Jesus*, by T. W. Manson, page 269.)

We must notice that this explanation disregards the assertion of Jesus at the beginning of the passage that the “ Kingdom of God cometh not with observation,” and Dr. Manson assumes here that the Kingdom is a visible community.

You will remember that the answer which Jesus gave to the point-blank question of the disciples, Where, Lord ? was “ Where the body is, thither will the eagles also be gathered together.” Here is the interpretation of Jesus himself and He is referring to the psychological situation arising between a dead body and the eagles or vultures ; the situation is one of desire to satisfy need—the dead body attracts the eagles through desire to satisfy hunger and to maintain life. The picture language which seems so expressive of time and place must be interpreted in the light of this psychological explanation. The place is in human personality and the movements so vividly described are spiritual movements in the process of conversion. The “ Day of The Lord ” is the time of conversion and submission to God. This explanation is not to be taken in isolation from the rest of the Gospel teaching ; this passage we are discussing, “ Where the body is, there will the eagles be gathered together,” is similar in meaning to the statement “ Where your treasure is there will

your heart be also " and has reference to the other " treasure " sayings and parables as well as to the beatitude " Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." Also the same idea is seen in the assertion, " I am the bread of life " in St. John's Gospel (St. John vi, 35), and has reference to the use of bread in the Holy Communion. Jesus is describing movements in personality which can be verified by anyone familiar with them. This, then, is the common ground on which we can approach closely the thought of Jesus and test his teaching, *e.g.*, the science of human experience.

Let us consider the subject in further detail. Dr. Jung, at the Tenth International Conference of Medical Psychologists at Oxford in the summer of 1938, gave a list of conclusions which were accepted by Swiss psychologists of all schools. The most important of these agreed points was the opinion that childhood's experiences were capable of influencing the child's personality throughout life. The deep-seated, positive impulses which inspire creative effort, as well as those which inhibit effort, derive their strength from personal relationships in the early years of life.

It is significant, then, that Jesus " discovered " children and told his disciples to receive them in His name and blessed them as belonging to God's Kingdom and commended childhood as the best age in which to receive the Kingdom, *e.g.*, God's reign in their hearts. Also any psychotherapist would agree with the fierce denunciation of people who put " stumbling blocks " in the receptive minds of children.

It might be said that these references were simply expressions of Our Lord's intuitive sympathy for the young and not derived opinion. This reliance upon intuition does not do the Master justice. It takes his teaching as isolated sayings, arising *ex vacuo* as it were, instead of the product of mature insight and reasoned observation. His mind must have functioned on the human plane and like ours have created a pattern of ideas and style of thought which indicate His personality.

We find that with His insistence on the importance of childhood He also understood the technical process which controls the birth and growth of ideas. He was deeply interested in the development of human personality.

In the parable of the " Sower " Jesus described this process as one existing between the sower—the seed—and the soil. This is in strict accord with the agreed opinion mentioned by Dr. Jung ;

the sower is someone significant in a person's childhood—the seed, some idea or impulse in morality, beauty, justice, art, science, etc.—and the soil is human personality. The process is described in the parable as “hearing the word,” “accepting it” and “bearing fruit,” or in psychological language the recognition of truth, decision-acceptance and creative-activity.

The important factor is the ability of the “seed” to “take root”; this is, in fact, a point of great significance in a person's development; many good impulses do not reach deep enough in personality and so tend to weaken or continue in a less vigorous form; their ability to grow depends upon their grip.

An investigation into the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels would carry us over a wide field in psychology which is beyond the scope of this short paper, but any competent psychologist who is interested in the matter will find a true description in picture language of the processes governing human development. Here, for instance, is a description of the unconscious development of ideas; Christ is not dealing with what Dr. Jung calls “the collective unconscious” but with the “silent” or “dark” elements which enable growth to take place. “And He said, so is the Kingdom of God as if a man should cast seed upon the earth and should sleep and rise night and day and the seed should spring up and grow he knoweth not how. The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.” (St. Mark iv, 26–29.)

Two parables which also show deep psychological insight are “The Precious Pearl” and “Hid Treasure.” They are supplementary and explain two aspects of the process of “the will to act.” You will notice that the parables are described as illustrating the Kingdom of God, and who would dispute the importance of the “will” or “decision-acceptance” in promoting the reign of God in human life? (This point, by-the-by, indicates the source of strength of the Oxford Group Movement.) These are short parables and every word is both significant and indispensable and they show a Master's hand in their composition.

The parable of the Precious Pearl describes the experience of a merchant who in the ordinary course of business buys and sells articles of special value—in this case “goodly pearls”; but they only pass through his hands for purposes of profit until the beauty or value of one unusually perfect pearl captures his appreciation to such an extent that he decides not to barter it but to possess the pearl himself; his decision to make it his own

is so complete that he is content to sell all his goods in order to make up the purchase price. The will to purchase was a process from a point of appreciation of value to the point of possession by overcoming the factor of disinterest. This is a correct description of the process of willing to act.

The parable of the Hid Treasure has the same theme, but the thing of value was found outside the ordinary course of business. It was a new and unexpected find; there was no question of beauty involved but rather financial gain. In the joyful state of mind which is usually inspired by unexpected good fortune the man sold out his goods and bought the field and the treasure with it. (You will notice that the element of joy is not mentioned in the parable of the Precious Pearl; its discovery came through an existing sense of appreciation and was not new, or may be not so unexpected.)

This parable of the Hid Treasure describes the decision-acceptance of the Kingdom of God from less worthy motives and is rather akin to the parable of the Unjust Steward.

We must insist, at the risk of over-emphasis, that exegesis of the Gospels from a subjective point of view should be discontinued and that commentators should equip themselves with psychological knowledge of human experience and so be qualified to approach objectively the thought system of Jesus. They will discover with deepening interest the impressive fact that Jesus has covered the ground before them; He was well aware, for instance, of the problem discussed in this paper—the fundamental need of permanence and security in the conditions of life and in the structure of personality. He roundly asserted in characteristic pictorial style, "Everyone therefore which heareth these words of mine and doeth them shall be likened unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock." (St. Luke vi, 47-49.)

His teaching, standard of conduct and personality form the sure foundation on which, by virtue of its truth, human character can find its noblest development.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: The importance of a purely objective approach to the Biblical writings has only recently been appreciated. It is far from easy to achieve.

Further, the subjective element can hardly be eliminated since the Scriptures require more than merely verbal and grammatical translation—they require transmutation into the thought forms of different ages and cultures. There is in them a saving energy which needs to be introduced into the minds and hearts of all manner of men in forms which they can assimilate.

Delitsch introduced his psychological concepts into his *System of Biblical Psychology*. Mr. Lang interprets in terms of his psychological ideas, which are very different from those of Delitsch. While some of his interpretations may appear forced, as for instance his treatment of the vulture and carcass saying, there is much in the paper that is suggestive, of which the acute observation on the element of joy in the parable of the Hidden Treasure is a good example.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE, in thanking the writer of the paper and referring to remarks of the Chairman, said both were most informative and suggestive. With regard to the opening sentence and the question of doubt, it seems three kinds of faith are needed:—

1. That which *decides* to be saved.
2. That which *depends* to be kept.
3. That which *delights* to be used.

So many in the Church were rather relying on a bottle life instead of being fit for the battle for the truth. Of course, it was not an easy matter to stand out for the full inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, but what Dr. Adolf Saphir, a noted Hebrew Christian, once said, is very true—that Jesus and the Bible are both Jewish and universal.

In congratulating Mr. Lang on the sentence, “But the historic Jesus and the Germanic spirit cannot be brought together except by an act of historic violence, which in the end injures both religion and history”, he said, the Nazi hatred of the Jews led to the rejection of the Bible, as the authority for both the Old and New Testaments came through Jewish channels, as our Lord Himself said, “Salvation is of the Jews”.

With regard to Mr. Leslie’s difficulty of the understanding of the objective view-point of the writers of the Gospels, it was possible only if there was a real study of the Bible, whose history and

geography is absolutely accurate, though, of course, there was the need of the Holy Spirit's help to secure its real value.

In referring to "the eagles gathering to the carcass" it was a question of a religious system with the life gone.

The Bible was opposed by other false writings such as the Jewish Talmud, the Koran, *Das Capital* of Marx, *Mein Kampf* of Hitler, and the Chinese revolutionary literature. Jerusalem was likely to become a centre of corruption with false Christendom, apostate Jewry, the collapse of modern religion, all combining in a psychology fit only to be the prey of vultures devouring a corrupt corpse.

Dr. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON said: To my understanding every portion of this paper is condemned by the words: "The soulish man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of the God, because to him they are senseless; and he is unable to get to know them, because they are discerned spiritually". (1 Cor. ii, 14.)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Col. A. H. VAN STRAUBENZEE wrote: The lecturer intimates that the attitude of uncertainty and doubt in present-day religion is due to lost confidence in the Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, and in its Divine inspiration.

In the opening books of the Old Testament, God gave us four views of the death of Christ in the four offerings; in the New Testament the four gospels give us four views of the life of Christ; there must of necessity be differences in words and expressions used, which really become proofs of accuracy and perfection. We have given to us four inspired accounts of the life on earth of the "Christ of God", and we are further told of this life in Romans xv, 8, that Christ has become a minister of circumcision for the truth of God to *confirm* the promises of the fathers.

Christ's teaching in all four gospels concerns four subjects:—

1. The Kingdom proclaimed: Matt. iv, 12 to vii, 29; Matt. viii, 1 to xvi, 20; Matt. xvi, 21 to xx, 34; Matt. xxi, 1 to xxvi, 35.

2. The King proclaimed: Mark i, 14 to 20; Mark i, 21 to viii, 30; Mark viii, 31 to x, 52; Mark xi, 1 to xiv, 25.

3. King rejected : Luke iv, 14 to v, 11 ; Luke v, 12 to ix, 21 ; Luke ix, 22 to xviii, 43 ; Luke xix, 1 to xxii, 38.

4. Kingdom rejected : John i, 35 to iv, 54 ; John v, 1 to vi, 71 ; John vii, 1 to xi, 54 ; John xi, 55 to xviii, 1.

Out of 89 chapters, 69 are devoted to the above four subjects. The common practice of taking the Kingdom as meaning the Church has been the source of much error and misunderstanding. Each gospel has its special teaching ; this is why certain words and works are peculiar to one gospel and omitted from another.

The leading thought in Matthew is the Lord as Jehovah's King.

The leading thought in Mark is the Lord as Jehovah's Servant.

The leading thought in Luke is the Lord as Jehovah's Man.

The leading thought in John is the Lord as Jehovah Himself.

It was clearly never in God's purpose to give us one gospel or Life of Christ ; the parts are distributed according as they are appropriate to the special design and character of each gospel ; there were certain great events which were never repeated, such as " The Mission of the Twelve " and " The Transfiguration ".

There is a dangerous sentiment abroad that because Christ said a thing when on earth that it must be binding now. The fact is overlooked that Christ lived under the law of Moses and came to found His earthly Kingdom, taught the principles of that (yet) future Kingdom, and at the end of His ministry, and in relation to His cross, He anticipated the teaching of grace. Paul, speaking by the Spirit, warned us not now to know Christ after the flesh (meaning whilst He was on earth) but *now* always as our exalted Lord in the heavens. There are three distinct methods of living revealed in the Scriptures :—

1. Under law from Moses to Calvary. Past.

2. Under Grace, from the Ascension to the removal of the Church Body. Present.

3. Under the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Future.

The mixing up of these three is largely responsible for the present distress. We are now under grace, we see " not yet " all things put under Him ; the Kingdom is in abeyance and will, after Satan and his demons are dealt with on the earth, be set up in Palestine, greatly enlarged, with its headquarters in Jerusalem.

It therefore appears to me the Lecturer is out for the impossible, to approach Christ's teaching from the study of fallen human nature, which we are told in Romans is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

In Luke xvii, our Lord said the Kingdom of God cometh not by hostile watching—said to the Pharisees who were watching Him with hostile intent, and in verse 21, the Kingdom of God is within, means in the midst of or among, *i.e.*, already there in the Person of the King.

In verse 37, the reference to eagles is taken from Job xxxix, 30—“Her young ones also suck up blood; and where the slain are there is she (the eagle)”. Christ, as Son of Man, is speaking of His dominion in the earth and of the judgment which will then be under Him; those slain will be consumed by vultures and eagles.

Frail man in this dispensation of grace can only be saved on “faith-principle”, his security consists in believing God.

MR. GEO. BREWER wrote: In seeking a psychological approach to Christ's teaching, it seems to me that we should ask ourselves: What was His object in coming into this world? I think we shall see that the object was threefold: the first and main object being to glorify God as a man by a life of simple dependence upon Him, and to carry out the will of His Father in every detail of His earthly life. The first man, Adam, had failed by an act of disobedience, but our Lord could say “I always do the things that please my Father”, and in John xii, 49 “I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak”; and at the close of His earthly career could say in His prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, “I have glorified Thee on the earth: I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do”.

The second object following, and being dependent upon the first, was to redeem man from the consequences of the Fall by the sacrifice of a perfect life upon the Cross of Calvary. The third object following, and dependent upon the first and second, being to counteract and destroy the works of the devil. “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had

the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage". (Heb. ii, 14, 15.)

During the three years of our Lord's public ministry He was constantly in contact with fallen man, and having perfect knowledge of what was in the mind of man, His teaching was directed less to outward acts than to the heart from which sprang the motive ; and if He used some of the methods which we use in order to obtain knowledge, it was to bring out confession of what was within, as in the case of our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus and with the woman of Samaria. He always dealt with the source of the evil rather than with the evil itself—a perfect psychological treatment by one who was eminently fitted to provide an effectual remedy.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote : It is impossible to withhold cordial assent from Mr. Wyatt Lang's contention that the paramount need of much modern Christianity is a renewed sense of security. As he reminds us, confidence is the basis of living on every level : physical, economical and intellectual. The difficulty of the modern man is to discover a sure ground for faith that life and labour are not in vain. As the paper shows, that has been due to the undermining of the authority of Holy Scripture. It is no longer regarded as the infallible source of Divine truth. Men's opinions regarding the Bible do not affect its real character. It remains, to borrow Mr. Gladstone's classic phrase, the Impregnable Rock, whether men are prepared to accept that view or otherwise, the reason being that its claims for itself are so stupendous that they must be true. The alternative is that men who put on paper such words, must have taken leave of their senses. Such a hypothesis is so utterly out of accord with the spiritual and intellectual heights and depths, so characteristic of the Bible, that it cannot be considered for a moment. To illustrate the point from the field of research to which Mr. Lang's paper is devoted. The psychology of the Old and New Testaments passeth knowledge in its acuteness and abundance. It is true that it is not stated in scientific language. It is presented in concrete and pictorial form, but that does not affect its value, if indeed it does not enhance it, since the Bible is thus independent of fashionable scientific terminology and jargon which varies from age to age.

If I understand the paper aright, the author does not dispute that the Bible is the supreme and sufficient source of security for living and dying. It would appear, however, that he desires an improved system of interpretation with special reference to the teaching of our Lord in the Synoptic Gospels since he does not seem to have included the Fourth Gospel in his survey. With his contentions that that body of teaching is a unity there cannot but be hearty agreement. I should not, however, be surprised if there is considerable diversity of opinion as to the nature of this unity. Mr. Lang finds the key in the perfect adaptation of our Lord's precepts and parables to the structure of the human mind and heart. The key fits the lock and the door is opened. It is the remedy for all the ills that the flesh is heir to.

It cannot be denied that the psychological insight which characterises the Synoptic Gospels is marvellous. Again and again it reminds the reader of that verse in St. John's Gospel where the evangelist observes, regarding the multitude who believed on our Lord's name because of His mighty miracles, "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man". (John ii, 24-25.) Such behaviour in a time of wonderful popularity is itself a psychological problem. Mr. Lang's arguments on the soundness of New Testament psychology are absolutely valid.

I hesitate to accept the inferences which he appears to draw from them. Is the factor which imparts unity and system to the teaching of our Lord in Matthew, Mark and Luke, not the Person of Christ and His redemptive work? After all has been said and done, Christianity in the last analysis is Christ and Him Crucified. It is not merely a corpus of Divine wisdom. Our religion begins and ends in a Person, being differentiated in that way from all other faiths. Christ is the chief corner-stone of Christianity and His person weaves into wondrous union and unity its diverse elements just as an elaborate symphony is dominated by its keynote, although its variety of sweet sounds be almost infinite in range. As for the psychological approach to our Lord's teaching in the gospels, the teacher Himself is the sum and substance of the teaching, and He is the Eternal Rock of Ages, the refuge of the human spirit in all generations.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF wrote: There can be no question that Mr. Lang is right in stating that the trouble with the Church is the "existence of doubt where no doubt should be". But is he not profoundly wrong in saying that "the old sense of permanent security in religion upheld by faith in the verbal inspiration of the Bible . . . is no longer reliable"? It is just this failure to declare the Bible to be the Word of God that has produced insecurity, undermined the foundations, and paralysed the witness and authority of the Church. There is a certain amount of interest in showing that Christ's teaching is psychologically true, but this is of quite small and subsidiary importance.

The mission of the Church, of every Christian preacher and missionary and individual Christian is to declare and proclaim the grace of God for human need on the authority of the Throne of God, some in a public capacity and others in a more private way, but all as witnesses to the power of the Gospel. The Church of God, if it is to fulfil its mission, cannot afford to be side-tracked by expending energy in pretty psychological discussions. Mr. Lang says we "cannot hope to recover a sense of security in the exigencies of the Gospels from a subjective point of view". But this is exactly what the Church ought to do. This, in substance, is the command of the Risen Christ, "Go . . . preach . . . teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you and lo, I am with you alway."

The lecturer says, "The day of the Lord" is the time of conversion and submission to God. Reference to the New Testament usage of the phrase shows that it is never once used in this sense, but always in defining a prophetic period.

The reference Mr. Lang makes to Christ and children bears little resemblance to what Christ said. Christ did not either bless them as belonging to His Kingdom or commend childhood as the best age in which to receive the kingdom. What Christ did say was this: "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. xviii, 3), which is a very different thing.

It is said in St John's gospel (ii, 24) that Jesus "knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for He knew what was in man". It is also said "He that is of God heareth God's words".

From these two statements (1) we may assume (and it is borne out by the Gospel records) that all His words were psychologically true, and (2) that what He said is to be received as spoken by God, and, therefore, final in authority.

THE AUTHOR'S REPLY.

There must necessarily be, as Mr. Leslie points out, a subjective as well as an objective point of view ; to preserve a proper balance between these two aspects is a major problem of life and one about which Christ was constantly concerned. We see this in His use of parables such as the Good Samaritan and the Unmerciful Servant and also in such sayings as "He that hath ears to hear let him hear", "Whosoever shall lose his soul shall preserve it".

It should be remembered that a good subjective point of view depends upon a true understanding of the objective aspect of experience, they are both intimately related. Before we can draw valid personal or subjective ideas from Christ's teaching we must be as certain as possible that we understand the mind of Christ. Knowing the ideas of Jesus we can make whatever personal deductions we like, but we have no right to throw our ideas into His mind and claim them as His.

I accept the correctness of St. Paul's statement, quoted by Dr. Anderson, but I do not understand how it invalidates my paper. A sense of appreciation is built up by learning and insight, therefore a "soulish" or uninterested or natural man, not having the impulse to learn nor the knowledge from which insight is acquired, is unable to appreciate religious truth.

Principal Curr is, of course, right in stressing the point that Christianity is a personal religion. The mystical union between Christ and His disciple transcends any system of thought ; nevertheless an essential part of this union is an intellectual as well as an emotional nexus. The personality of Christ must be intellectually significant in the life we are living.

In regard to the distinction which Principal Curr mentions between the Synoptic Gospels and St. John's Gospel—psychologically considered the distinction does not seem to hold. The same psychological system runs through the four gospels ; this indicates that they originated from the same mind.

Mr. Ruoff has correctly pointed out a slip on my part in using the term "Day of the Lord". This phrase was never used by Christ. I should have said "the day that the Son of Man is revealed". This is not necessarily a prophetic period, Christ compared it to "the days of Noah".

Mr. Ruoff says that my reference to Christ and children bears little resemblance to what Christ said and then he quotes St. Matt. xviii, 3, which refers to adults cultivating the childlike spirit. He forgets, however, the incident which I had in mind from St. Mark's Gospel (x, 13 ff.) where Christ is indignant with the disciples for repelling the parents of "little children" who wished them to receive Christ's blessing. "Forbid them not," He said, "for of such is the Kingdom of God."

Mr. Ruoff's statements that psychological understanding of Christ's teaching is "of quite small and subsidiary importance" and that "the Church of God if it is to fulfil its mission cannot afford to be side-tracked by expending energy in pretty psychological discussions" represent, as it seems to me, the typical attitude of many English Christians. It is such opinions as these which have diverted Christian truth from the main stream of life to petty personal interpretation. To put aside research and careful thinking about human nature seems a foolish evasion of our duty. How can the Church "fulfil its mission" to win human lives for God without having studied with Christ "what was in man"?

It is doubtful whether the Western religious mind can appreciate properly the point of view of Jesus in His teaching in the four Gospels. Our Western civilised mind deals in "things"; we are urged by an impulse to understand and possess "things" and to get "things" done. So profound is this attitude to life that even in the sphere of education we accept almost without question the method of compulsion; we hope by an enforced attention and compelled curriculum to impress ideas as if they were "things" on to the child's mind. This semi-conscious materialistic attitude is also apparent in the administration of justice; actions are regarded in isolation as if they were self-contained "items"; nor does anyone seem to question the justice of fixing law to a written code which is decided upon from a political angle by a majority vote. Is not this the same problem which Jesus found so troublesome in

regard to morality and the written law ? Moreover, the dominance of material over spiritual considerations is again seen in that the administration of justice in civil life depends upon a person's financial ability ; a poor man often cannot afford to obtain justice.

Christ's teaching is given from a different point of view from this material-power-production ethic.

It seems to me no exaggeration to say that there is one fundamental problem running down the history of the Bible from the Garden of Eden to the Apocalypse ; this problem dominated the mind of Moses and the Prophets and came down to Jesus for solution ; it was how to win the allegiance of man to the will of God. This is a psychological problem and involves knowledge of the character of God and of the spirit of man. The crucial point is the impact of " truth " on the human spirit. The mind and teaching of Christ were dominated by the problems of " truth " in the divine and human aspects. Truth was significance in the realm of morality, beauty and knowledge.

The difference in these two attitudes to life may be seen in the way many people interpret such a statement of Christ as " For he that hath, to him shall be given : and he that hath not from him shall be taken even that which he hath ". (St. Mark iv, 25.) The person with a materialistic attitude would see in the " having " some possession of " things " and question the justice of adding to a man's wealth and depriving a poor man of the little that he hath. The spiritual interpretation is that " having " refers to the ability to appreciate knowledge, beauty and goodness for their own sakes ; people possessing such qualities of mind tend to acquire greater insight and happiness while, on the other hand, the person with an unappreciative and ungenerous disposition tends to lose the little insight and happiness he may have had.

I do not suggest that the study of human mental processes will necessarily solve difficulties in religious experience ; it is one matter to know the path of life and another to take to it.

Christ, with His profound knowledge of human nature, could not prevent the flight of the Apostles from the Garden of Gethsemane nor, in spite of warning, Peter's rejection of Him in the courtyard of the High Priest.

835TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 8TH, 1940.

AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR G. H. LANGLEY, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of March 18th were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. G. F. Cranswick, B.A., and Mrs. M. T. Ingram to read their papers entitled "The Wholesomeness of Christianity as Illustrated by Recent Events in India."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part: Colonel Molony, Mr. G. I. C. Ingram, the Rev. A. W. Payne, Mr. R. Macgregor, Dr. Barcroft Anderson, Mr. Sidney Collett and Colonel Skinner.

A written communication was read from Rev. Principal Curr.

*THE WHOLESOMENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS
ILLUSTRATED BY RECENT EVENTS IN INDIA.*

By THE REV. G. F. CRANSWICK, B.A.

CHRISTIANITY claims to possess the truth about God and man. It asserts that God has spoken to mankind in the life, death and resurrection of a person, Jesus Christ, the Son of God; "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us". This was the faith of the New Testament writers and still is the faith of believers to-day.

While Christianity is uncompromising with regard to its creed, it does not deny that goodness and beauty are to be found in the other faiths and in the cultural heritage of India. But it calls men into a relationship with God and each other that releases a spiritual power that is re-creative and wholesome. The basic ideas in the word wholesomeness are health and com-

pleteness. These two things were demonstrated in Palestine 1,900 years ago by the earthly ministry of the Son of God.

Wherever the Gospel has been truly preached and lived, there has grown up a Church through which the healing power of Christ has been mediated. In India the Church numbers between six and seven millions (Protestant and Roman Catholic). It has taken root in the heart and mind as well as the soil of India. Although divided, it witnesses to one faith that Jesus Christ is God's revealed Word. Moreover that Church, though still dependent on the older Churches for financial help as well as for personnel, has acquired an entity and character which is truly indigenous. Though comparatively small, it is exerting a wholesome effect on Indian life and thought far exceeding its numerical strength.

A special contribution of Christianity as compared with other religions is its insistence on the value of individual personality. "As many as received him," reports the fourth Evangelist, "to them gave he the right to become children of God." To millions of outcasts in India as well as to many other seekers after truth, this has indeed been a gospel of salvation. Thousands of individuals are to-day entering the Church and in fellowship with others are being built up into "a holy temple in the Lord". Thus Christianity is supplying one of India's greatest needs, namely, a unity that transcends the divisions of race, language and caste. In the matter of the reunion of the Churches, it is to India that the whole world is looking with hope and expectation. The South India Union Scheme is being taken as the pattern for union in other lands.

Mrs. Ingram has shown in her paper the wholesomeness of Christianity as exemplified in Mass Movements. Only those who have lived and served in India and have come to love her can appreciate the strangulating effect of much that is unwholesome in Indian life and custom. Much adverse criticism has been levelled at India from outside, but there is no need to add to the shame and ignominy that is felt by enlightened Indian patriots as they contemplate the dire poverty, the abysmal ignorance and widespread disease that are the common lot of the masses.

The wholesome effect of Christianity in a country in which these evils are on such a vast scale can perhaps best be seen by some facts that have been enumerated by such an outstanding and typical Indian as Dr. Azariah, the Bishop of Dornakal.

He has recently pointed out to his fellow-countrymen that the first newspaper, the first public library and the first English school were organised by Christian missionaries. "Christians", he says, "have been pioneers in women's Higher Education". He gives the following remarkable figures about education in general. "There are about 15,000 elementary schools under Christian management, where over half a million pupils are receiving instruction in the three R's. There are also, under Christian auspices, 419 middle schools with 90,000 pupils and 301 secondary schools with 76,000 pupils and 37 colleges of the University and Intermediate grade with 13,180 students scattered throughout the country". Moreover, the bishop points out that "the Christian Church has given a large number of men and women to public service. It has rendered great service to the sick and infirm. The first school for the blind, the first institution for the deaf and dumb, the first (and even now the largest) sanatorium for tuberculosis patients were all begun by Christian organisations. There are in British India about 500 hospitals with 57,700 beds and fully a third of these are in Christian hospitals. These are served by 299 Indian and 306 missionary doctors and by 800 Indian and 290 missionary nurses". The great work being done for that most-to-be-pitied sufferer, the leper, is largely in the hands of Christian agency.

Towards the solution of the problem of illiteracy the Christian Church is taking its share. In British India only ten per cent. of the total population is literate. The total figure for Christians is 18 per cent. Literacy amongst women is 2.9 per cent. while the literacy among Christian women is 20.3. This is what an Indian editor said when asked what difference Christianity had made to women in India: "There is no doubt that Christianity and Christian missions give an impetus to the advance of freedom among Indian women; first to Indian Christians and then spreading through them to the other sections of Indian nationality. Women have been given a wider scope of thought; a freer social atmosphere and a more happy intercourse between men and women; the encouragement of independence among women and a desire to earn their own livelihood".

This is what a member of the anti-Christian Arya Samaj has said: "A degenerate Hinduism has enslaved our women. They were condemned to illiteracy, idolatry, superstition, suffering, drudgery and dullness. The lovely things of life were all kept from them. Through Christian missions the folly and the wrong

of this treatment of our women has been convincingly demonstrated”.

Under the leadership and inspiration of Dr. Laubach, the drive towards literacy amongst Christians has recently made great strides. By use of his reading charts, which he first employed in the Malaya States, simple villagers are not only learning to read themselves but are increasing their own proficiency as well as adding to the number of prospective readers by the slogan, which they put into practice, “Each one, teach one”. More striking still, perhaps, is the fact that Dr. Laubach has been asked to co-operate with the efforts of several Congress Governments by demonstrating his methods and training workers for literacy campaigns.

The importance of Christian institutions for higher education on future leadership in Church and State can be seen from the fact that only two out of the forty-two delegates to the recent World Conference at Madras had not been to a Christian college.

India is moving rapidly in the direction of her political goal. There, as well as in the West, the ill-effects of a purely secular education can be seen. It may well be that the Christian college will form a bulwark against the advance of secularisation.

Towards the solution of the huge problem of poverty the contribution of Christianity is not insignificant. Nearly ninety per cent. of the population of India live in its 750,000 villages. It is there that poverty as well as disease and illiteracy are seen in their most acute form. In some places Christian missions have been pioneers in the matter of Vocational Schools in which training in various kinds of industries or crafts, as well as in agriculture, forms an integral part of the curriculum. It is to be hoped that India will be spared the evils of sudden industrialisation that this and other countries suffered in the past. There is evidence to show that the movement from field to factory has grown alarmingly in recent years. Rural Vocational Schools run by missions are playing their part. Such schools, often run in conjunction with Rural Welfare Centres, fit lads to return to the villages as artisans or farmers. Such lads are themselves pioneers in village uplift and are a great strength to the village church.

At the recent World Conference held at Madras under the auspices of the International Missionary Council, more than half the delegates came from Churches in “missionary lands”. So that it can be justly claimed that in the reports and findings

of that Conference the voice of the younger Churches is heard. The following is a quotation from a section of the findings called "The Place of the Missionary in the Unfinished Task".

"There is a strongly expressed and, we believe, unanimous opinion among the younger Churches that missionaries from the older Churches are still needed. This applies to areas where Churches are organised on a self-supporting and self-controlling basis as well as to the less developed regions".

From this it will be seen that an extensive slackening of the missionary efforts through the war might endanger even the existence of some of the younger Churches. Were they cast adrift to face vast and intricate problems as well as unparalleled opportunities before they were strong enough to stand alone, disaster might ensue.

A policy of devolution has been the practice of most missionary societies for a number of years. To show the good effects of this two examples must suffice. One of the criticisms of the Lindsay Commission against the colleges was that they were segregated not only by distance but by thought from the main stream of the Church which in India is mainly a rural church. Sixteen Christian colleges have lately completed surveys on the economic and other conditions of the rural Church. In addition to this at least one college known to the writer has started a Youth Service Bureau. The students visit certain selected villages for longer or shorter periods in order to demonstrate simple methods of sanitation, hygiene, reading, etc. The Bureau includes Hindu and Moslem members as well as Christians. It is, to say the least, a very wholesome sight to see high-caste Hindu, as well as Moslem and Christian students digging sanitary pits for low-caste villagers! They, too, are having to revise their "old fashioned" notions with regard to college students.

Quite recently the missionary societies have revised their medical policies. In the past it was the foreign missionary who carried on a vast amount of curative medical work in a number of large base hospitals. The importance of Preventive Medicine for a country like India has been realised. So that now from the base hospital to which patients flocked in their hundreds (and will do so still) healing is to be taken to the people. This involves the setting up of small dispensaries where there are none and supervising them by "mobile units"—cars or boats. But more, it involves the training of the village padre, teacher or others in the use of simple remedies and as

instructors in village hygiene. Thus the "unordained" are being called to the Ministry of Healing.

In these and in many other ways the Indian Church is preparing itself to shoulder more responsibility. In Palestine in the days of His flesh the Son of God manifested the Father's love not only by words of love but by deeds of love. "Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" asked the messengers from the bewildered Baptist. "Tell John", said the Master, "what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them". The Christ of Christianity is not dead but alive. He lives and is active still through His Body the Church: and where Christ comes there, too, is health, completeness, wholesomeness.

*THE WHOLESOMENESS OF CHRISTIANITY AS
ILLUSTRATED BY RECENT EVENTS IN INDIA.*

PART II—By MRS. MAY T. INGRAM.

Perhaps amongst no people on the face of the earth has Christianity such an opportunity of proving its "wholesomeness" as amongst the fifty millions of Outcastes in India. To realise the difference that the Gospel of Christ has made, and is making, to India's Untouchables, one needs first to see them without it. Then the contrast appears, to use one of their own similies, "ásmán o zamín ka farq"—"as the difference between heaven and earth".

For centuries unnumbered these unfortunate people have been condemned by the religion of their land—the ancient Hindu law-code of Mánu, to a life of degradation, oppression and suppression, such as is almost impossible for us, who live in a free and Christian country, to imagine. The law of Mánu has decreed that the Outcastes shall never rise, shall never have education, or rights, or be treated as fellow human beings by their Caste masters, and one of the wrongs that has burned in the soul of many an Outcaste parent is the knowledge that he

can never hope for anything better for his children than fate has decreed for him.

On the outskirts of practically every village in India one finds the collection of miserable huts that are their only home, and the Outcastes themselves, who live in them, dirty, illiterate, and desperately poor, living always under the shadow of fear—fear of ill-treatment and bullying at the hands of the Caste masters for whom they work, and still greater fear of evil spirits, and malicious petty gods, who are always on the lookout to do them or their children harm. It is not surprising that centuries of such conditions of life should have produced in the Outcastes certain characteristics that are much to be deplored, sullen resentment that they dare not express, lying, and a perpetually cringing attitude. But all this serves only to show up more clearly the wonder of the miracle of grace that is wrought when an Outcaste family steps out into the freedom with which Christ can make them free.

For a new day is dawning. To the poor the Gospel is being preached, as Christ said that it should be, and many of India's poorest are receiving Him gladly, and are finding in Him One Who can save them from sin and from fear, and can give the peace of forgiveness; One Who is alive and Almighty, and Who yearns that they may know Him as their loving Friend and Brother.

In the area in which my husband and I are working, the Agra district of the United Provinces in North India, there are 440 villages and hamlets. No other European of any sort lives there, and we, with our little band of Indian helpers, are the only Christian workers. In some 80 of these villages there are now groups of Christians from amongst the Outcastes—some large groups, some very small, but most of them shining like stars in a midnight sky, in the midst of the heathen darkness with which they are surrounded.

Let me take you to one village, in which the Christian group is still very small. We visit first the home of a still heathen Outcaste. Darkness, dirt, and squalor characterise it; flies are thick upon the unwashed eyes of the small children, and discontent is written upon the faces of their parents. On the raised mud platform outside the mud hut is the "thán" or shrine, a small mud erection plastered over with cow-dung, supposed to be inhabited by a spirit who must be placated by frequent offerings and attention. Just round the corner is

another home, of people from the same group of Outcastes. The wide mud platform is clean swept, and all trace of a "thán" has disappeared. The hut is much lighter, for windows have been knocked through the mud walls, and there is a general air of happiness and well-being. Girwar and his wife come out with bright smiles to welcome us, and the children gather round. On Sundays the work of the week is reduced to a minimum, and, when it is not the turn of that village to be visited by a worker, Girwar himself will lead a service of worship to the living God, which friends and neighbours will attend, and later in the day, he, with some members of the morning congregation, will probably visit some other village to bear testimony to the Christ Who has done so much for them. This is just one instance from many such that I could quote.

Basil Matthews was greatly struck with this same transformation during his recent tour in India, and, in his book that followed, *The Church takes Root in India*, he wrote of the Christians from the Outcastes, that "their houses became cleaner, their backs lose the cringing stoop, and their eyes the glint of dread . . . The folk who once tremblingly bowed before a stone stained with the blood of a cockerel as they cowered before the small-pox goddess, now, as Christians, become the joint creators of a house of God . . . and daily those once terror-stricken animists make it resound with joyful praises of the God of Love . . . The improvement . . . is economic and æsthetic, hygienic and spiritual, all inextricably interwoven" (pp. 51, 52).

From the above, however, it must not be supposed that the Outcaste usually, or at once, finds that "godliness is a way of gain". When he and his family become Christians, their work is the same, they are just as poor, and they continue to live in the same poor little huts. True, it often means the possibility of education for his children, and, if an Adult Literacy Campaign is in progress in the neighbourhood, he and his wife may find themselves able to read in the amazing time of a few short weeks. But with it all may come fierce persecution. The Caste master is furious that his field labourers should presume to change their religion, and he determines by every means in his power to stamp it out. So he sets a gang of still heathen Outcastes on to the new Christians. They are set upon and beaten with heavy sticks; their goods are stolen; false charges are brought against them and they find themselves in the law

courts; they are prevented from drawing water at the one well open to them; in all these and many other ways they learn that we must "through much tribulation enter into the Kingdom". Very seldom do we find that persecution makes them turn back from their following of Christ. Much more often their faith and courage are an inspiration to us, and in South India, where the Christward movement amongst the Outcastes is of much longer standing than that in the North, we witness another miracle—that the once persecuting Caste masters have themselves been won to faith in Christ through the transformed life and testimony of the Outcastes.

Dr. Waskom Pickett, Bishop in the American Methodist Episcopal Church in India, bears most striking testimony to the effect upon the Caste people in the Telugu area of the transformed life and habits of the Christian Outcastes, in his recent book, *Christ's Way to India's Heart*. I make no apology for quoting at some length from this book, for two reasons. First, that it is in part my own experience, for my husband and I had the privilege of being lent by our Society to help with the first month of the survey that preceded the writing of the book; and secondly, that if I could induce each member of the Victoria Institute to possess and to read this book, I feel that I could do them no greater service. It can be had for 2s. from any missionary society. The book is a thrilling record of the way in which the simple testimony, backed by the transformed lives of the Outcastes, has been the means of winning Caste people of all ranks to Christ. They have seen the power of the Gospel to achieve the miracle that no other power ever could, to make dirty people clean; thieves honest; drunkards sober; hereditary enemies into friends and brothers; to raise downtrodden womanhood, and, as Dr. Pickett puts it, "our evidence affords convincing proof that Christ is freeing His people from a sense of grievance, and giving them instead a creative sense of mission" (p. 64). He continues: "A Lutheran minister, converted as a boy from the Depressed Classes, told us vivid stories of the mistreatment which he suffered from the higher castes before and for several years after his conversion, and of his boyhood dreams of revenge. Then he added: 'I am having my revenge now, and it is sweeter far than in my dreams. More than a score of men and women and nearly three score of children of the higher castes have received baptism at my hand. When I hated my oppressors I felt little and mean. They were my

superiors. But now that I love them and am leading many of them to Christ I have a continuous sense of elation and fulfilment. Now they are my brothers' ”.

Dr. Pickett records a conversation between himself and a still heatlen Caste man, concerning the Christian Outcastes in his village. “Has being Christians made them better?” asked Dr. Pickett. “Certainly”, replied the Kammas. “Before they became Christians they were robbers and murderers—even we Kammas were afraid of them; the difference between them as they were then and as they are now is like that between the earth and the sky, between noon-day and night.” “What other groups have become Christians?” “Two lower Sudra groups” “Are their lives also changing?” “Yes, in just the same way. Some were drunkards, now they don't drink.” “And what of your people? Haven't some of them become Christians?” “Yes.” “Are they also being changed?” “Yes, and more rapidly than the others were. It seems that we Kammas are better material than the Malas “(such is caste pride),” but none of our people would have become Christians if they had not first seen what happens to the Malas.” “You say that you have seen many bad men changed to good men, drunkards to sober men, robbers to honest neighbours. Has that happened only to those who have become Christians? Haven't you seen anyone changed like that in Hinduism?”

“At this the old man seemed surprised that we should ask such a question and revealed how deeply he had been affected by what he had seen. ‘Never! only Christ can change men like that!’ A few months later the old man and his entire family knelt before the altar in the little church in the village, and, after confessing their faith, received the sacred rite of baptism and were admitted to the Church” (pp. 52, 53).

Not at once, on becoming a Christian, does an Outcaste lose the stigma of being an Outcaste. In fact, the great majority never really lose it, though it is often lessened, as their cleaner ways and more self-respecting manner of life become apparent. One cannot blame them for wanting to hide their identity, and some, who are able to get education, and therefore other forms of employment away from their native village, become lost in the crowd in a town, and are known simply as Christians. It is often a real sign of grace when an Outcaste is willing to own up to the identity that he has lost, in order thereby to give glory to God. One of our own workers, handsome and intelligent

beyond most, has said to High Caste fellow-travellers in a railway carriage, "And I was an Outcaste boy. See what Christ has done for me!"—much to the amazement of the other travellers.

From east to west, and north to south, literally from Cape Comorin to the Khyber Pass, and even inside the Pass, are to be found Christians who once were Outcastes. They form the vast majority in the India-wide Christian Church, and mass movements Christwards from amongst the Outcastes are in progress in at least nine large language areas.

And so in India to-day, "to the poor the Gospel is preached", and again "the common people heard Him gladly". And to-day it is being vindicated up to the hilt that the "things which are despised hath God chosen . . . to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence".

DISCUSSION.

Colonel SKINNER said: May I stress the value of these papers on the Wholesomeness of Christianity. The idea originated with Colonel Molony, our Papers Secretary, and in my opinion they offer the best possible challenge to the oft-repeated, thoughtless statement that Christianity is just one religion among many, all of which have their good points. Wholesomeness is the keynote, and healing, healing of soul and body, is the appointed work. "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." The same chapter of St. Matthew's gospel that opens with that gracious message concludes with the wondrous appeal, "Come unto Me all that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy, and My burden is light." What other religion, the world over, can offer such credentials? What voice, save that of the divine Son of God, can speak such healing to sin-scarred, broken hearts and lives? Christianity, in truth, is *the* religion alone that cleans up the havoc of human lives wrought by sin and left untouched by all other religions of mankind, and the evidence

of its wholesomeness we have in abundance in the two beautiful papers we have heard read to-day.

Colonel MOLONY thanked the authors of the three papers read on "The Wholesomeness of Christianity" for their very successful interpretation of the wishes of the Council in the matter.

The Rev. A. W. PAYNE emphasised the fact that the diffusion of Christian influences in India was a preparation for the national acceptance of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The progress made in that mighty enterprise had been elucidated in both papers.

He also drew attention to the fact that in all evangelisation the offence of the Cross must ever be present. It matters not how the preacher endeavours to avoid giving offence to Jew and Gentile (1 Cor., x, 32). The Cross must ever be a stumbling-block to the unbeliever. That makes it all the more desirable that the offence should be reduced to the smallest possible proportions, as C. H. Spurgeon used to advise. The great Baptist preacher remarks that while the soul of the saint may be amongst lions, there is no call to twist their tails. Even in dealing with Romanism, it is necessary and desirable that all due respect and honour be given to doctrines which are believed to be erroneous, even while their fallacies are fully and faithfully exposed.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

The Rev. Principal CURR wrote: Mr. Cranswick has rendered useful service to the student of Christianity by drawing attention in his valuable paper to what may be described as its by-products, which can be discerned wherever it is preached and practised, but which seem to be more clearly discerned in such a vast mission field as India than in lands which are nominally surrendered to its ineffable influence. These by-products may be defined as the healing and humanising effects of the gospel on conditions of life in the lands where it is proclaimed. These should not be minimised, although their value is inestimably lower than that of the unspeakable spiritual blessings which the circulation of the Bible brings in its train. To illustrate the point from manufacture, a firm which

specialises in the manufacture of soap may be able to utilise waste material for the production of other commodities whose sale will produce a substantial profit.

The paper refers to the contribution made by Christianity to the cause of education in India. In that connection, it is impossible to refer too often to the great decree associated with the name of Lord Macaulay, whereby English was made the medium of higher education in a sub-continent where there are many tongues and dialects spoken. The result is that the educated Indian has access to all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge in English literature, headed by the English Bible. Such factors may not amount to very much at present in the conversion of India, but the early history of Christianity furnishes remarkable illustrations of what is known as the *preparatio evangelica*. Roman Law, Greek Philosophy, and Hebrew Religion all prepared the way of the Lord—unconsciously indeed, but none the less surely, for all things are wrought after the counsel of God's holy will both in heaven and in earth.

May it not be feasible to make similar claims for all the beneficent measures for which British administration has been responsible? There are the abolition of horrible customs, and the organisation of improved facilities in a multitude of ways. The philanthropic record of British rule has been above all praise. These things can never be substitutes for the gospel, but they may well be adjuncts to it, since they can be truly described as the fruits of that blessed tree, the Cross of Jesus, which bears twelve manner of fruits, and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The contributions to the discussion, spoken and written, were duly submitted to the authors of the papers, but they did not consider that there were any points calling for comment.

836TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 22ND, 1940,
AT 4.30 P.M.

SIR FREDERIC G. KENYON, K.C.B., D.LITT., LL.D., IN
THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 8th were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. T. W. Fawthrop, D.D., D.Litt., F.R.G.S., to read his paper entitled "The Stones Cry Out: Scriptural Confirmations often Overlooked."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part: Mr. Percy Ruoff, Mr. Sidney Collett, Colonel Skinner, Rev. H. K. Bentley and Dr. Barcroft Anderson.

A written communication was received from the Rev. Principal Curr.

THE STONES CRY OUT: SCRIPTURAL CONFIRMATIONS OFTEN OVERLOOKED.

By REV. T. W. FAWTHROP, D.D., D.LITT., F.R.G.S., F.V.I.

MODERN research has not discredited our Scriptures, but has strongly confirmed them. Alas! These confirmations are by some discarded, by many unknown, and by others overlooked. Dr. Yahuda has said that "it is thought highly scientific to challenge things Biblical." Certainly many prefer to be classed as unscriptural rather than unscientific. Yet many Modernist theories are but ancient doubts in modern attire. Denials of miracle and the supernatural are but Lucian and Celsus up to date. Archæology has changed many Modernist theories. It has shown that *monotheism preceded polytheism*, and was not a progression from animism, totemism and polytheism, but was a direct revelation from God and the original faith of the race. It has shattered the *theory that the Mosaic age was an*

age of illiteracy and ignorance, and that the Pentateuch is of Exilic origin ; it has made untenable the late dates of the Exodus and the Fall of Jericho, and undermined the theories which led to the rejection of the Book of Daniel.

These archæological confirmations of the Bible have been so numerous and so widely diffused that if fictitious they would require many fabricators for the whole topography, and then their agreement would require explanation. Not simply the identification of a few place-names and isolated cases of topography require accounting for, but vast numbers of places, covering large areas ranging from Aswan, in Upper Egypt, to Nineveh, in North Iraq.

A forger may have access to historical documents and correctly name certain kings ; but here are identified obscure persons and things : Phœnician workmen, a king's steward, a Temple placard, or a tax-collector's ostrakon ; and these are contemporaneous with Biblical history. The cumulative value of these numerous corroborations gives us confidence to triumphantly assert that the Scriptures are true. If archæology be rejected or neglected, the student of Scripture is not up to date, however much he may desire to be thought so. The spade digs the grave of sceptical theories, but unearths new proof of scriptural truth.

Let us divide our lecture chronologically into three parts : I.—*The Ancient Dynasties.* II.—*The Period of the Kings of Judah and Israel.* III.—*The Christian Era.* And as our title is *The Stones Cry Out*, we will eliminate all manuscripts and papyri from our survey.

I. THE ANCIENT DYNASTIES.

The Creation Tablets.

Higher Critics contended that the story of the Creation in Genesis was legendary, and when Creation tablets were found in Babylonia they at once concluded that these tablets were the origin of the Biblical story. But comparisons of both Babylonian and Assyrian tablets with the scriptural story show the latter to be the more primitive record, the tablets being marred by later legendary lore. The moral grandeur of the Genesis record is seen in the Creation of Light ; the tablets record a fight between Marduk (light) and Tiamat (darkness) ; but the Bible records the Divine fiat, "Let there be light". "The finger of God agitating the ether", as Sir James Jeans asserts. The

Genesis narrative preserves the monotheism of the early revelation—it reveals not only creation but the Creator. “I believe that the first chapter of Genesis and science are in accord”, wrote Professor Dana.

The Flood of Noah.

The story of the Flood, long considered folk-lore, is now accepted as fact. At Ur, Sir Leonard Woolley found eight feet of clean, water-laid clay, below which were stone implements, flints and pottery of an early type. At Kish, Professor Langdon found the same clay stratum, and agreed with Sir Leonard Woolley that it was the Flood of Noah, exclaiming, “There is no doubt about it”. *Peake's Commentary* says, “The story cannot be accepted as historical” (p. 143), but its recent *Supplement* (1936) states, “Evidence of the Flood has come to light at Ur and Kish” (p. 4). The Nineveh Tablets of the story of Gilgamesh confirm the scriptural account in many details. World-wide traditions further confirm it, while the Weld-Blundell Tablets actually contain a list of Babylonian kings divided by the words, “The Deluge came up”, and a list of “Ten Kings who ruled before the Flood”.

The Hittites.

“Only since 1900,” says Dr. T. R. Glover, “have we known that the Hittites ruled from the Euphrates to the Aegean; prior to that date we had only references in the Bible.” Professor F. W. Newman smiled at the Syrian host being alarmed by so insignificant a tribe (II Kings vii, 6). We now possess their sculptured slabs, inscriptions, and even Code of Laws, from their capitals of Carchemish and Boghaz-Keui. From these the Hittite empire has been reconstructed. It dated from about 2500 B.C., and its conquests extended from Asia Minor to the Euphrates, Palestine and Lower Egypt. Geologists once agreed that no active volcanoes were more than 100 miles from the sea. Then Sir Percy Sykes brought sal ammoniac and sulphur from Kuh-i-Taftan, in Persia, 200 miles from the sea, and the theory collapsed (*R.G. Journal*, Sept., 1938). Similarly burst the balloon of the Hittite myth.

Bashan.

Bishop Colenso ridiculed the Biblical statement that in Bashan were “three-score great cities with walls and brazen bars”

(I Kings iv, 13), but Dr. Porter's *Giant Cities of Bashan* and Dr. Selah Merrill's excavations at Gerash and Rabbath-Ammon, with their almost endless ruins, have dissolved the Bishop's illusion as the rising sun disperses the morning, mountain mists.

The Pentateuch.

Higher Critics denied that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, because *he, and his age, were too illiterate*. But they overlooked the fact that he was selected by God, and, as Dr. Yahuda says, "steeped in the lore of Egypt". Professor Wellhausen held that the five books of Moses were composed by many authors, extending from the days of Josiah to the priests of the Exile (587 B.C.). But the discovery of hundreds of tablets of the Mosaic age, from *Tell el-Amarna*, which probably refer to the Israelite invasion, prove that writing was widespread in Palestine before the days of Moses (*Peake's Supplement*, p. 4).

When the *Pentateuchal Ritual* was said to have followed the Prophets, and was relegated to the days of the Exile, because it was far *too advanced* for the Mosaic age, then the stones of the *Serabit Temple* of Queen Hatshepsut, in Sinai, dating from the days of Moses, revealed a ritual of feasts and sacrifices similar to the Mosaic. Also at *Ras Shamra*, on the Syrian coast, tablets were found of feasts and sacrifices, trespass-offerings, peace and wave-offerings, and whole burnt-offerings, agreeing with the Mosaic, and yet dating back 800 years before the Exile.

When the *Laws of the Pentateuch* were held superior to, and therefore of much more recent date than, any which Moses could have decreed, then *Assyrian, Hittite and Khammurabi's Codes* were discovered, resembling the Mosaic, but antedating them by some 500 years. Thus, as the *Supplement to Peake's Commentary* (p. 3) well says, "The rich material of these codes has upset some of the epoch-making theories of Wellhausen". Dr. Driver declared, from the varieties of style, subject and words, that there were at least twelve authors of the Book of Genesis. Then the Rev. A. H. Finn, using Driver's methods, proved that there were at least twelve Dr. Drivers who produced his work. But, like eleven of the Drivers, J. E. P. H. D. & Co. are phantoms. That the Old Testament was handed down orally until the Exile is now absurd, as Sir Charles Marston stated in his lecture before this Institute. Professor Hommel says, "The more I steep myself in the secrets of the Oriental world, the more I am convinced that the views of Wellhausen

about the late date of the Pentateuch are thoroughly false". With our esteemed President, "We can now say with confidence that the archæological explorations in the Near East in recent times have confirmed in general the truth of much of the Bible history, and disproved some of the confident assertions of the so-called Higher Criticism formerly made".

Babylonia and Egypt.

The topography of the Biblical accounts of early Babylonia and Egypt is strikingly accurate, and, as *Peake's Supplement* says (p. 2), "The excavations tend to corroborate the Biblical narratives, even in matters of local colour and circumstantial detail".

Other Corroborations.

Jebel Musa has been identified as Mount Sinai, whose rock-wall could be touched. The Exodus is no longer disputed. The Apis Bull worship is reflected in the calf-worship of Aaron and Jeroboam. Hebron, which Dean Stanley said was "the earliest seat of civilised life in Palestine", is beyond doubt, and even the *Encyclopædia Britannica* accepts the genuineness of the Cave of Machpelah. "Every town mentioned in the narrative of the patriarchs was in existence in their day", says *Peake's Supplement* (p. 4).

Ur of the Chaldees.

Mugheir has been identified as the site of Ur, and here were found the clay of the Flood, the death-pits of the Kings, cylinders naming Belshazzar, and priceless ornaments in gold and silver. The Sumerians of Ur used the pictorial script, libraries were established, arts cultivated, and the heavens were studied. Here Abraham dwelt, not as an illiterate, but here he was educated to be the father of nations.

Abraham and the Four Kings (Gen. xiv).

In the Assyrian Eponym Canon is the name of Abraham, a man of Abraham's day, and in Abraham's land, if not the same Abraham. Wellhausen declared the battle of Abraham and the four kings incredible; but Professors Sayce and Pinches have identified all four kings. The story assumes the supremacy of Elam in the Euphrates Valley in 2000 B.C., and the spade has proved it. "How could a post-Exilic Jew obtain information of those early kings?" asks Professor Hommel.

II. THE PERIOD OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL.

The Rosetta Stone.

The finding of the Rosetta Stone, in 1799, a decree written in three scripts—Hieroglyphic, Demotic Egyptian and Greek—and the re-discovery of the priestly Hieroglyphic Code therefrom, by Professor Champollion, became the key to the interpretation of the Egyptian monuments.

The Behistun Wall.

The deciphering of the sculptured wall at Behistun, a trilingual memorial of the conquests of Darius Hystaspes, in Babylonian hieroglyphs, Elamite and Persian, by Sir Henry Rawlinson and others, was similarly the origin of modern Assyriology. In the Providence of God the wonderful secrets of archæology largely lay buried until the keys were found, and when the stones cried out the interpreters were ready.

Jericho.

Excavations have fixed the *date of the Exodus and the Fall of Jericho about 200 years earlier* than the Higher Critics. Sir Charles Marston says that the pottery, scarabs and seals all point to about 1400 B.C. for the Fall of Jericho, and 1440 for the Exodus. Rameses II is no longer regarded as the Pharaoh of the oppression. The scarabs of Amenhetep III (1413–1377 B.C.) are the last found in Jericho's ruins. "The theory that the Exodus was about 1445 B.C. has gained ground among archæologists, and a combination of arguments—Biblical, chronological and historical—seem to point to that earlier date" (*Peake's Supplement*, p. 8). Excavations show that the walls fell outward, filling the ditch, and the Israelites walked over the debris into the city, which they burnt; just as the Bible states. Fragments of charred roofs, rooms and ropes abound. The Romans built another city, a mile nearer Jerusalem, in which Herod the Great erected palace, amphitheatre and hippodrome. This explains what critics call an inconsistency in our synoptic Gospels. Matthew and Mark say that Christ healed Bartimæus after leaving Jericho, but Luke says the miracle took place before Christ reached Jericho. Matthew and Mark, writing to Jews, refer to the old Jewish city, through which Christ had passed, but Luke, writing to the Gentile world, refers to the Gentile city which Christ had not yet reached.

Jerusalem.

Jerusalem and the *Temple area* are accepted by all as genuine. Dr. Robinson discovered the *Arch* which linked the area to the Upper City. On the broad area Solomon erected his magnificent Temple. "Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders, and the *Gebalites* did fashion them, and prepared the stones to build the house" (I Kings v, 18, r.v.). Sir Charles Warren found these foundation-stones, bearing the Phœnician marks of the Gebalite masons.

Sion, the City of David, has been located on the *Hill Ophel*, to the south-east of the city, instead of on the Western Hill. Mr. Pott, in Anthony Trollope's *The Bertrams*, remarked, "I always used to catch it for Scripture geography"; and we need to be careful, too. Professor Macalister has located the Jebusite city on the eastern ridge, which David took and fortified, building the Tower of Millo. These fortifications were strengthened by Solomon and by Hezekiah. Sion is spoken of as being on lower ground than the Temple. The ark was brought "up" from the city to Araunah's threshing-floor, the Temple site (II Sam. xxiv, 18). But if Sion were on the Western Hill, from it to the Temple would be going down. "The Stairs that go down from the City of David" (Nehemiah iii, 15) have been identified, and the pottery of the Jebusites has been found, on the Hill Ophel. Boys playing at the *Pool of Siloam*, in 1880, noticed letters cut in the rock. Professor Sayce found that they described the making of Hezekiah's aqueduct to bring water from the Gihon Spring to the Pool of Siloam, on the western side of Sion (II Chron. xxxii, 30; II Kings xx, 20). To do this Sion must have been on the Hill Ophel. The tunnel-makers, working from both ends, failed to meet midway, and a uniting-elbow was necessary. Sir Charles Warren, Sir Charles Wilson and Dr. Robinson crept through the aqueduct and noted the elbow-fault.

Samaria.

Amid the numerous columns of Samaria were found the palaces of Omri and Ahab, the Pool of Samaria, the Ivory House, cosmetic vessels reminding us of Jezebel, ostraka, or potsherds (with beautiful writing), and a list of Ahab's stewards, among whom is Obadiah. All these confirm our scriptural accounts

The Moabite Stone.

At Dibon, east of the Dead Sea, was found a monolith, on which Mesha, King of Moab, records how he threw off the yoke of

Israel, on the death of Ahab (II Kings iii, 4, 5 and 27), and confirming many Scriptural names and sites.

Corroborations of personal names are more convincing than of places, because towns endure for ages, while persons are only of brief duration.

The Stele of Shalmaneser II of Assyria, from Kurkh, records Ahab's furnishing chariots and soldiers for the battle of Karkar.

The Black Obelisk, from Calah, records Shalmaneser's wars, and portrays Jehu, King of Israel, rendering obeisance and tribute to Shalmaneser. Kings Omri, Ahab, Jehu and Hazael of Syria are here corroborated.

The Babylonian Dynastic Tablets, which Dr. Pinches translated, prove that the usurper Pul became Tiglath Pileser III of Assyria, as Bernadotte became Charles XIV of Norway and Sweden. The tablets also confirm Ahaz, King of Judah; Menahem, Pekah and Hoshea of Israel; Rezin of Damascus; Hiram of Tyre; and Merodach Baladan, prince of Babylon.

The Taylor Cylinder tells how Sennacherib "shut up" Hezekiah "like a caged bird in Jerusalem, his royal city". But it fails to add how the cage was broken, and the bird escaped. This silence implies disaster. That Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and made Lachish his headquarters, is recorded both by Scripture and the monuments. The difference in silver talents paid, between the Bible accounts, 300, and the Tablets, 800, may be explained by the currency being increased by palace and Temple treasures (Layard); or by silver in Assyria being three-eighths of its value in Palestine (Kaulen). But why do many college professors prefer the witness of the monuments to that of the Bible, refusing Scripture history unless confirmed by the monuments, preferring a pagan chronicler to a devout historian, choosing an ancient blue book rather than an inspired record? Were not these professors ordained to defend the faith? But maybe some have little faith to defend. Why should miracles be dismissed as incredible? Why must theories of creation and development be refused unless they agree with evolution? The resurrection of our Lord is the miracle of miracles, and, accepting this, others present but little difficulty.

Lachish Letters.

Mr. J. L. Starkey, of the Welcome Expedition, who was murdered by Arabs in 1938, identified Tell el-Duweir as Lachish. The letters are in the early Sinai-Hebrew script, which Dr.

Torczyner thinks dates back to the days of Moses. They relate the flight of the prophet Urijah to Egypt, and his pursuit by Elnathan, the emissary of King Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi, 20-25). The names confirm those of the book of II Kings, I Chron., Ezra and Jeremiah.

Small coincidences occur of the Scriptures and the monuments, the cumulative effects of which provide striking corroborations of Holy Writ. In II Kings xviii, 9, 10, *Shalmaneser IV* besieges Samaria, but "At the end of three years they took it". The change is significant, for during those three years *Sargon* overthrew *Shalmaneser* and took Samaria. *Isaiah's* mention of *Sargon's* conquest of Ashdod (Isa. xx, 1) was the only reference to *Sargon* for twenty-five centuries. Now Professor Sayce has translated *The Annals of Sargon*, which record, "In the beginning of my reign, the city of Samaria I besieged, I captured".

Nebuchadnezzar.

This conqueror of Palestine and Egypt appears in Scripture as a symbol of ambition, who was smitten with *insanity*. Do the excavations support this? History records his conquests and the fall of Jerusalem. A tablet in the British Museum records his *advance into Egypt* against Pharaoh Amasis. An inscription in the Louvre tells of his *reaching Syene*, near the First Cataract of the Nile, and verifying *Ezekiel's* prophecy (xxx, 6, r.v., margin), that he should conquer "from Migdol to Syene". Sir Flinders Petrie discovered at Tell Defenneh, the *Tahpanes* of Scripture, the very pavement on which *Nebuchadnezzar* spread his pavilion, as prophesied by *Jeremiah* (xliii, 8-10). Three cylinders describing *Nebuchadnezzar's buildings* were found under the pavement. *Daniel* quotes his boasting, "Is not this great Babylon which I have built?" (Dan. iv, 30). Nine-tenths of his bricks and cylinders record his proud name and building achievements. But one remarkable cylinder says that for four years his building ceased. It admits his neglect of the altars of *Merodach*, and thanks him for restoration. *Nebuchadnezzar's* lycanthropy is unmentioned; monarchs do not record failures. The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes used to say, "I never dwell upon my failures; I meditate upon my successes".

Belshazzar.

When certain professors were unable to find *Belshazzar* in profane history, they discarded the Book of *Daniel*. Dean Farrar said, "History knows of no such king". But *foundation-*

cylinders from Ur contain prayers of King Nabonidus for Belshazzar his son. Other inscriptions record Belshazzar's business transactions, and his death when the Persians entered Babylon. Professors Sayce and Pinches show that as Solomon was co-king with David, so Belshazzar reigned with Nabonidus, his father; one captained the troops in the field, the other defended the city. So Belshazzar is found. Professor Sayce declared, "The higher-criticism is now bankrupt"; and Professor Pinches writes, "I am glad to think, in the face of archæology, with regard to the Book of Daniel, that the higher-criticism is, in fact, buried". Dr. Orr adds, "So Professor McFadyen's apparent revellings in the inaccuracies of Daniel are all outworn and answered". Daniel's history is authentic. He knew Belshazzar because they both dwelt in Babylon. Herodotus and Xenophon did not know him because they lived far away.

Results.

As the result of these many corroborations our *Old Testament* now commands more respect from Rationalists and Modernists. Even Mr. H. G. Wells says, "On the whole, the Bible story of Hebrew history is evidently a true story, which squares with all that has been learnt in the excavations of Egypt, Assyria and Babylon during the last century". Let us not forget that the Old Testament was the only Bible possessed by St. Paul, St. John and our Lord Himself, and that Christ unequivocally endorses it as the "key of knowledge" (Luke xi, 52), adding, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v, 18). He makes no correction after His resurrection, but enforces "the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms" (Luke xxiv, 44).

Let Modernists be true to their name by accepting the facts of modern excavations. King Charles V of France possessed a clock which had the Roman iv for 4 o'clock. He declared it should not have iv, but four strokes. The maker said that the king was wrong, but Charles thundered, "I am never wrong; correct it". So the error continues still on our clocks. King Charles has many descendants among the critics of to-day.

III. THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

Let us turn to the New Testament. In 1918 Sir C. M. Watson stated that out of 622 places named in Scripture, west of the

Jordan, 434 had been identified. Now many more may be added.

The Lake of Gennesaret is beyond dispute, and the sites have been found of the chief places once on its shores—Taricheae, Tiberias, Magdala, Safed, Cæsarea-Philippi, and Bethsaida-Julias. Recently, Emmaus, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum and Gergesa have been added. We can re-people the ruins and reproduce the incidents and miracles of the marvellous ministry of the Master, of whom His opponents bore witness, "Never man spake like this Man" (John vii, 46). Bethlehem and Nazareth, Joppa and Jerusalem, Hebron and Gaza, Samaria and Jericho, Tyre and Damascus have become household words.

Gergesa and the Miracle of the Swine.

Professor Huxley argued that Gadara was twenty miles from the Galilean Lake, and pictured in ridicule the swine galloping for hours to reach the lake. But research has shown that Ghersa (Khersa), the modern, shortened form of Gergesa, in the region of Gadara is the scene of the miracle, and here is the only cliff on the lake suitable for it.

Tell Hum (Capernaum).

Stones were found at Tell Hum, sculptured with an ark, the pot of manna, Aaron's rod and vine leaves, indicating the ruins of a Jewish synagogue; but Corinthian columns betokened a pillared basilica, unique in a synagogue. St. Luke's Gospel solved the enigma. The Jews at Capernaum besought Christ to heal the servant of the centurion, saying, "He is worthy . . . for he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue" (Luke vii, 5). His architect had built the synagogue in the Roman-Corinthian style. Capernaum was identified by its synagogue.

Sychar's Well, where the Saviour talked with the Samaritan woman, and from which Jacob drank centuries before, may be visited to-day.

Jerusalem.

Sir Charles Warren and Colonel Conder declare, "All agree that the *Mount of Olives* is the chain of mountains to the east of the Temple Hill, and the valley to the west beneath is the *Kedron*, and *Ophel* is to the south of it. The valley west of the Ophel spur is the *Tyropoean*, and the *Pool of Siloam* is undisputed".

A Temple Placard.

A placard which once hung on the balustrade dividing the Court of the Gentiles from the Court of the Jews, was found by M. Clermont-Ganneau. It read, in Greek, "No stranger is to enter within the balustrade round the Temple and enclosure. Whoever is caught will be responsible to himself for his death which will ensue". St. Paul was accused of having taken Trophimus, an Ephesian, beyond this "middle wall of partition" (Eph. ii, 14), which led to the riot recorded in Acts xxi, 26-30.

The Columbaria of Rome.

These substantiate the names of members of Cæsar's household found in the letters of St. Paul to the Romans and to Timothy.

The Catacombs of Rome.

In these are tomb-engravings taken from St. John's Gospel, and yet dating from A.D. 130 or 140, and showing that "the Gospel was written round about A.D. 100" (*Peake's Supplement*, p. 21).

The Temple of Diana, Ephesus.

Mr. J. T. Wood has found the huge drums, capitals and coloured marbles of the great Temple, with its silver shrines of Artemis, magical parchments, and even the name Demetrius. "No error is proved in the historian St. Luke", says Sir William Ramsay; his officials, pro-consul, town-clerk, asiarch, politarch, temple-keeper, are all correct, adds Dr. T. R. Glover.

Individuals, churches and nations need spiritual revival. Does Modernism, casting its shadow of doubt on God's Word, tend in that direction? Is it mere coincidence that since its advent heavy decreases have been registered in churches and Sunday schools?

Let us honour God's Word, accepting its history, believing its promises, assenting to its miracles, preaching its Saviour, crucified, risen and glorified, and claiming the outpouring of the Holy Spirit to save, indwell and purify.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: I am sure the members here present would wish me to thank Dr. Fawthrop in their name for the interesting paper which he has read to us. With the main thesis of his paper, I cordially agree. There are some statements in it which I should

myself be inclined to put less positively ; but I do not think it can be doubted that recent archæological discoveries have done much to confirm the authority of the Scriptures. There is one suggestion which I should like to make first. I deprecate the use of the term "Higher Criticism" as a term of reproach. Higher Criticism is simply the criticism of the substance of a book, as opposed to Lower Criticism, which is the criticism of its text. Dr. Fawthrop is himself just as much a Higher Critic as Prof. Wellhausen or Dr. Driver. The only question is, which criticism is right ?

In some cases, the question at issue is not between what is said in the Bible and what is said by a modern scholar, but between different views taken by modern scholars. Take the question of the date of the Exodus, to which Dr. Fawthrop referred. Not long ago it used to be argued that since the Israelites are said to have built the treasure-city of Raamses (Exod. i, 11), the Pharaoh of the oppression was Rameses II, and the Pharaoh of the Exodus Menephtah (about 1230 B.C.). Recently the excavations of Prof. Garstang at Jericho seem to have shown that that city was destroyed about 1400 B.C., which would place the Exodus about 1440 B.C. These are two alternative conclusions, both legitimate. The authority of the Bible is not in question.

To my mind, the greatest service of archæology has been the proof of the antiquity of writing. Formerly, it could be maintained that writing was not known in the time of Moses, and consequently that not only the Pentateuch could not have been written in his time but also it could not be based on contemporary records. Now it has been established beyond any possibility of doubt that writing was known in Mesopotamia and Egypt long before the time of Abraham, and that it was in common use in Syria and Palestine in the time of Moses. This is of vital importance. But you must not ask of archæology more than it can give. It cannot prove that the books of the Pentateuch, as we have them now, were written in the time of Moses. That is largely a question of literary criticism and analysis. What is of importance is that, whenever they were written, they could have been based on contemporary records ; just as a twentieth-century historian of the reign of Elizabeth uses the records of the sixteenth century, and can produce a better history of the period than an Elizabethan writer could.

Again, as Dr. Fawthrop has pointed out, it is now impossible to say that the Pentateuchal legislation is too elaborate for so early a date. The discovery of the laws of Hammurabi shows that codes quite as elaborate were in existence in Mesopotamia long before Moses. It is still open to critics to argue that particular provisions in Leviticus point to a later date; but they are always liable to refutation by new discoveries.

I must not, however, go over the whole ground again. You have come here to hear Dr. Fawthrop and not me; and I ask you to express your thanks to him for his paper.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: If the stones did not cry out in confirmation of the Holy Scriptures, many people would. After the skilful array of impressive facts engraved in stones presented by the lecturer, many will cry out with an assured ring in their voices. The "crying stones" have also a double mission. (1) They will be heard in quarters where the human voice has called in vain, and (2) they will effectively silence some who have attacked the historicity of the Bible. Bearing in mind the learned Chairman's discriminating and illuminating remarks on the important question of the interpretation of all excavated and discovered materials, there is, in Dr. Fawthrop's paper, most valuable and convincing data dealing with names and places. The citations from the *Supplement to Peake's Commentary* are remarkable, especially the reference which states:—"The rich material of these codes has upset some of the epoch-making theories of Wellhausen". *Peake's Commentary* has been quoted endlessly (especially in Nonconformist pulpits), as though the citations were authoritative and final. The pity is that the *Supplement*, with its damaging confessions, is not known or at least not cited. I knew of a Nonconformist minister who blatantly trumpeted out that Abraham had never lived. It is to be hoped that men who have spoken like this will have the manhood to acknowledge their error now that the stones have raised such an eloquent and indisputable voice.

The evidential value of this excellent paper is considerable. But, of course, for nearly all Christian men who have had first-hand experience of God through the operations of the Holy Spirit, this kind of evidence is not necessary for their faith, because, believing

the Bible to be the Word of God, they accept the position of what is implicit in the words, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv, 4).

Colonel SKINNER said:—The term "Higher Criticism" has unfortunately acquired a bad name, and "give a dog a bad name and hang him". But in reality, as our chairman has so aptly shown, it is a perfectly legitimate term and quite harmless. The real enemy within the gate is "Destructive Criticism". Would it not be well for us to use that term instead? We should then know where we are. How far Higher Critics are themselves to blame for the stigma it is difficult to say; but I fear that too many who should be hunting with the hounds, rather pride themselves in having a run with the hare, and have only themselves to thank if they are hunted.

The Rev. H. K. BENTLEY said: I hesitate, Sir, to take any of the time at your disposal, for I have no archæological contribution to make, but I would like to point out that it is to my mind most significant that the scriptural setting of the phrase which has provided such an apt title for Dr. Fawthrop's excellent book and paper, "The Stones Cry Out", finds its counterpart in present-day conditions. When Our Lord used the expression (St. Luke xix, 40), "If these (disciples) should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out", it was by way of rebuke to the Pharisees who should have recognised His messianic claims, but had not done so. Furthermore, silence on the part of His disciples would have been answered by the stones. To-day, Sir, we see similar conditions prevailing around us. Many who are professedly leaders of Christian thought are denying the full truth of Holy Scripture; denying, too, the full deity of Our Lord, and scoffing at the idea of His personal (second) coming, and so it is that to-day, in this relative silence as to fundamental doctrine, the stones are crying out, as Our Lord suggested they would.

Not only so, Sir, but it is, to my way of thinking, a most remarkable fact that our God has, in His wisdom and providence, kept in concealment these proofs of the historicity of His word for their discovery in these very days in which they are both needed and

decipherable. The modern apostasy finds its refutation in archæology, and within the last century the keys have been discovered which have made possible the understanding of so much that has been found—I speak of the Rosetta Stone and the Behistun Inscription.

May I also add that it seems to me that God has subjected the professing Church to a test. Individuals have been called upon to decide whether they would believe the Bible or discredit it in favour of rationalistic doubts. Many have answered; some correctly, some incorrectly. And now what do we find? God causes the answers to be published, and those in favour of the Bible have proved to be right, whilst those against it are shown to have been wrong.

One more thing, Sir. Would it be possible, through the help of your influence, to have some such paper as this that we have listened to, broadcast by the B.B.C.? Surely it would do immense good if good sound information drawn from archæology could be given to the public in this way.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

Rev. Principal H. S. Curr wrote: The chapters in Genesis which preserve the exquisite story of Joseph, as Principal Skinner calls it, furnish some striking illustrations of the way in which archæological research confirms the historicity of the Bible. Some reference may be made to these as a supplement to the comprehensive summary of a very large subject which Dr. Fawthrop has provided in his admirable paper. The details in question are so slight that they do not attract the attention of the average reader, but they are none the less significant on that account, since Our Lord's saying that he that is faithful in that which is least, will also be found faithful in that which is much, applies to the work of the historian or the biographer. If, then, it be discovered that a high standard of accuracy characterises passing allusions to Egyptian manners and customs in these chapters, may not the presumption be that what is true of the less is equally true of the greater, the story itself as well as its setting?

Modern critical scholarship does not deny that the knowledge of Egyptian life in the narratives of Joseph is remarkable, although

few would go the length of Dr. W. H. Bennett who wrote that the accuracy of the detail was so remarkable as to satisfy the champions of the doctrine that the Bible is inerrant. The admission of the truth of numerous little touches in these chapters by authorities who dispute the full inspiration of Holy Scripture is certainly significant.

Examples of these cases are the following. There is, for instance, the allusion to horses implied in the mention of the second chariot, or the state coach to which it would correspond in modern days (Genesis xii, 43). Excavations have revealed the fact that horses were only used on ceremonial occasions of the greatest importance. Again, there is the description of the arraying of Joseph in the attire proper to his office as Grand Vizier of Egypt. "And Pharaoh took off his signet ring from his hand, and put it on Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen (cotton R.V. margin) and put a gold chain (properly 'collar') about his neck" (Genesis xli, 42). These details are all confirmed by ancient engravings. Reference might also be made to the celebration of Pharaoh's birthday (Genesis xli, 20). Yet again we read that Joseph shaved himself and changed his garments before he appeared in the presence of Pharaoh to interpret his dreams (Genesis xli, 14). Additional evidence is furnished by Genesis xl, 11, where we read the words of Pharaoh's chief butler thus: "And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's hand". The practice of squeezing the fruit of the vine into the cup has been verified by archæological research. One other instance might be mentioned. It is written that Joseph's brethren sat before him (Genesis xliii, 33). That casual statement reveals an intimate knowledge of ancient Egyptian life. At meals they did not recline but sat upright, more like the modern Western custom. This has also been verified by investigation of contemporary remains.

Dr. Fawthrop calls attention to the astonishing accuracy of detail for which the Acts of the Apostles is so justly famous. These chapters in Genesis are on a similar level of trustworthiness. Is it too much to claim that here we have two witnesses to the historical credibility of the Bible drawn from both Testaments, separated by many centuries, and equally eloquent? Surely in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word of God shall be established!

LECTURER'S REPLY.

I readily accept the preference of the Chairman and of Colonel Skinner to the word "Destructive," rather than "Higher" Critic. As the Rev. H. E. Anderson stated, Textual Criticism, the attempt to discover from the comparison of the various manuscripts the original text, we all accept. But Higher Criticism, or Destructive, with its fantastic theories of authorship said to be deduced from style and subject-matter, can only be permitted within certain limits. When such criticism conflicts with the Bible's own statement of inspiration, when it produces theories which archæology proves to be untenable and when the results of its theories prove disastrous to the very churches built for the defence of the truth, it is time to call a halt; the so-called "Higher" has become the "Destructive", denying the miraculous and overlooking the moral.

As to the date of the Fall of Jericho, archæology has caused students of to-day to accept the date of 1400 B.C. rather than the late date of the critics, 1200 B.C.; and even the *Supplement to Peake's Commentary* states that "a combination of arguments, Biblical, chronological and historical, seem to point to the earlier date".

As writing was in common use before the days of Moses, even in Palestine; as the ritual of the Pentateuch is similar to the ritual of the Temple of Serabit, in Sinai, also of the Mosaic age; and as the Laws of Khammurabi of Babylon, 500 years earlier than the Pentateuch, are similar to those of that book; there is little reason for supposing that the Pentateuch was a compilation of a much later age. Literary criticism, based upon style and analysis, cannot outweigh these facts.

I am glad that Mr. Percy Ruoff referred to my emphasis of the concessions mentioned in *Peake's Supplement*. Let us hope that those who so revelled in the criticisms of *Peake's Commentary* will now have the courage to quote these concessions and corrections. If the wireless would broadcast, as the Rev. H. K. Bentley suggests, these confirmations of Bible-history by archæology, it would render great service to the nation. How apt it is that in this decadent age, when only one in twenty of the population attends religious services, the Stones are Crying Out.

I thank Principal Curr for directing our thought to the accuracy

of the Egyptian setting, the manners and customs, of the Joseph story. Dr. Yahuda extends this accuracy even to the very words and phrases. St. Luke, as the Principal points out, is also marvellously accurate; and thus we possess two witnesses, Moses and St. Luke, widely separated, who both declare the truth of the history of our Bible. May we not conclude with him that "every word of God shall be established"?

837TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 6TH, 1940,
AT 4.30 P.M.

DOUGLAS DEWAR, ESQ., B.A., F.Z.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 22nd were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called on R. E. D. Clark, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., to read his paper entitled "New Evidence Relating to the Reliability of Testimony. A Study of the Records of Uncommon Luminous Phenomena."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part: Mr. S. T. E. Dark, Rev. C. W. Cooper, Dr. L. E. Wood, Rev. A. W. Payne, Dr. Barcroft Anderson and Mr. E. L. Ward Petley.

Written communications were received from Brigadier N. M. McLeod, Colonel L. M. Davies, Mr. George Brewer, and the Rev. Principal Curr.

NEW EVIDENCE RELATING TO THE RELIABILITY OF TESTIMONY—A STUDY OF THE RECORDS OF UNCOMMON LUMINOUS PHENOMENA

By R. E. D. CLARK, ESQ., M.A., PH.D.

IN modern times it has been repeatedly asserted that human testimony has proved much less reliable than was formerly supposed. A long series of researches, from that of Hodgson and Davey (*Soc. Psy. Res. Proc.*, 1886, 4, 381) to such modern work as that of Bestermann (*S.P.R. Proc.*, 40, 363) have tended to show that under ordinary conditions, even trained observers will make contradictory reports and that the testimony of ordinary men and women is therefore of little evidential value. On the basis of these experiments it is claimed by many writers (e.g., Professor Broad, *The Present Position of Science and Religion. Philosophy*, 1939, 14, 131) that human testimony in favour of miraculous happenings has lost its evidential value and can no longer be used in support of the Christian creed.

Whether this conclusion be right or wrong, there is one general feature of these modern experiments on the value of testimony which causes them to differ materially from the kind of testimony which Christian apologists have relied upon in the past. In the early disciples of Christ we have the case of men who were so certain of what they had seen that they were prepared to suffer ridicule and if need be death rather than deny what they knew to be true. This being so they had every reason for making as certain of the facts as was humanly possible at the time. In the modern experiments, on the other hand, this feature is entirely missing. We are presented with no evidence that the observers were so sure of their observations that they were prepared to suffer ridicule or persecution rather than deny them. Accordingly, they could have no motive for using their critical and observational powers to the fullest extent when the events which they purported to have witnessed were taking place.

It follows that the recent experiments upon the value of testimony, to which reference has been made, have little valid bearing upon the Christian faith, though they are of undoubted legal importance. In order to assess the evidential value of the kind of testimony upon which the Christian faith is founded, it would seem advisable to adopt an entirely different kind of procedure.

A possible method would be to estimate how far human testimony has proved reliable in parallel instances in the past. Again and again in history we meet instances of men who have witnessed strange events and who have been ridiculed for their testimony either by their own or by a subsequent generation. In many cases it is now possible to say whether the original testimonies are likely to have been true. For example, it had been claimed by many observers that stones sometimes fell from heaven. In the seventeenth century, however, scientists ridiculed the human testimony upon which this belief was founded. They urged that it was ridiculous to suppose that there could be stones in the sky, and that in any case the alleged stones never fell in the presence of those trained in natural philosophy. Today no one doubts that the falling of meteorites is a perfectly genuine phenomenon.

Cases of this kind could be multiplied, but clearly only a proportion of them would support the reliability of human testimony. Moreover, it would be exceedingly difficult to select instances impartially so that, even if hundreds of instances

could be given, no very decisive conclusion could be drawn from them.

The object of this paper is to suggest a way out of the difficulty which will enable cases of this kind to be used as real evidence. Some while back the writer was engaged for a considerable time in searching for early stories of luminous phenomena, with no thought whatever on their possible bearing on the value of testimony. Indeed, the possibility of using the material for this purpose did not dawn upon him until about 75 per cent. of the work had been completed. It is necessary to point this out lest it should be thought that the literature had been hastily scanned in order to prove a particular point of view, and thus much material of an opposing character had been omitted.

It eventually became clear that luminescent phenomena afford a favourable parallel to miracle. The literature abounds with records of the stark terror which the simplest luminous appearance has occasioned in the minds of simple people. Luminous pieces of meat have repeatedly been mistaken for ghosts, St. Elmo's fire was considered to be a divine prodigy, will-o'-the-wisps were once thought to be connected with wandering souls, while swarms of fire-flies possibly gave rise to the amazing discussions of the schoolmen concerning the balls of fire in which evil spirits were supposed to be enveloped. Thus, like religion, luminous appearances have clearly been connected with prejudice and emotion from time immemorial, and it is commonly supposed that under these circumstances human testimony is especially likely to be untrustworthy. Thus it appears that testimony in connection with unusual luminous appearances should afford a close parallel with the kind of testimony on which the Christian faith rests.

The following represent a list of cases which the writer has come across in which persons are alleged to have witnessed some definite and unusual phenomenon connected with luminous appearances, which have nevertheless been doubted by their contemporaries or turned aside as ridiculous and "unscientific" by a subsequent generation. They are classified into three groups as follows: (a) cases in which subsequent investigation makes it highly probable that the original testimonies were substantially correct; (b) cases in which modern knowledge has thrown no new light upon the problem; and (c) cases in which it now appears that the original statements were so far from the truth that scepticism was justified. In assessing

whether a given case should be classified under *a*, *b* or *c* the current opinion will so far as possible be taken, and a classification under (*c*) is not to be taken as implying that the writer necessarily regards the phenomenon as finally disproved. In a few cases (marked “ ? ”) the writer is not aware of having read any definite statement that the phenomenon was ridiculed, but believes nevertheless that such ridicule is or has been widespread.

The list is complete with two exceptions. As the whole object of this paper is to test the truth of *religious* testimony by independent testimony of a non-religious type, it has been deemed best to omit all cases of unexplained lights in connection with religious beliefs or practices. In addition, claims made by “ sensitives ” or psychically “ gifted ” people, have been omitted, since such people do not even claim to see events as any normal person would see them. In any case, examples of both these kinds would have to be classified under (*b*), science having thrown no light upon them as yet. Those who wish to do so may make the following two additions under (*b*) to the list which follows. (1) The appearance of lights at seances. (2) Lights moving through the air which are said to have been a feature of certain religious revivals (A. T. Fryer, *Psychological Aspects of the Welsh Revival*. *S. P. R. Proc.*, 1905, 19, 80-161. B. G. Evans, *Occult Review*, 1905, 1, 113, 179, 289).

(*b* ?) Alice Bailey (*The Consciousness of the Atom*, 3rd ed., 1934, p. 62) alleges that the leading members of the medical profession in a large Middle West City were approached by letter and asked whether they had seen anything strange at the moment of death. Several replied that they had seen a bluish flame at the top of the head, and one or two said that it had been accompanied by noise.

(*a*. In part *a* ?) There are many records of light due to electrical discharges. Pliny mentions stars which appear over land and sea. “ I have seen,” he writes, “ a light in that form on the spears of soldiers.” He also describes them on the rigging of ships, and remarks that such lights “ do sometimes, about the evening, rest on men’s heads and are a great and good omen. But these are among the awful mysteries of nature.” Virgil (*Aenid*, bk. ii, v. 681 ff.) describes such a star on the head of Iulius, and from the context it is clear that the weather was stormy. Again, there are many records of the mysterious ball lightning, but until not very long ago it was

fashionable to deny their truth on the ground that the phenomenon was inexplicable. Today, tongues of flame and globular lightning are well established.

Despite their religious bearing, the stories of phosphorescence connected with Moses are worth mentioning here. The account of the burning bush (Exodus iii, 2) has long seemed incredible to the sceptic, as has the story that on one occasion the face of Moses was luminous without his being aware of the fact (Ex. xxxiv, 29). However, R. L. Ives* (*Jour. Franklin Inst.*, 1938, 226, 745) describes similar phenomena at high altitudes on the American Rockies. "Coronas, halos, and standing arcs have several times been observed by the writer when spending the night at very high altitudes (above 12,000 feet). These phenomena, never twice the same, sometimes attain considerable brilliance . . . often when coronas are present a person will, apparently, be bathed in flames although he himself will be unaware of it. . . . At times the source of a corona will give very severe electric shocks when touched; at other times it seems electrically 'dead' and may be contacted with impunity."

(a) From ancient times (*e.g.*, Tacitus on the earthquake which destroyed the Achaian cities in 373 B.C.), earthquakes have been associated with brilliant lights. In the quake at Mutu, in North Japan, in A.D. 869, "streaming light was seen as if it was daytime": in the Kramakura earthquake of A.D. 1257, bluish flames came from the ground and a fire-ball like a lantern flew across the sky, while in the Tosa earthquake of A.D. 1283 fire-balls appeared in the shape of wheels and flew in all directions. Scores of other similar cases are to be found in old records (see K. Musya and T. Terada, *Earthquake Res. Inst. Bull.*, 1931, 9, 177, 225), and although these are scattered over many centuries, they show considerable uniformity. Nevertheless, seismologists until recently ascribed the records to the imagination of simple people who might easily fancy they saw vivid lights if their houses were falling around them.

Since 1930 this explanation has been generally abandoned. After the Idu earthquake of November 26th, 1930, Mr. Musya, of the Japanese Earthquake Research Institute, circulated all schools within the affected area asking for independent accounts of any lights which had been seen; 1,500 reports were received,

* My warmest thanks are due to Mr. J. K. Stafford for drawing my attention to this article.

which included those from no less than 15 trained scientists. The light appeared in the sky before the earthquake and just above the epicentre. It is computed that it must have had an intensity of at least 100,000,000 candle power. Lights have been seen again in subsequent earthquakes, but still no conceivable explanation has been advanced, though seismologists now regard the phenomenon as genuine.

(c, a) The aurora borealis affords another case in which human testimony has been strongly opposed by scientists. Long ago scientists showed that the streamers were rarely less than one hundred miles from an observer. Despite this, many people have confidently asserted that the streamers often come right down to earth, and that their movements are associated with sound. Such statements were made by reliable witnesses—one or two of whom had actually receiving training in surveying (Beals, *Quart. J. Roy. Met. Soc.*, 1933, 59, 71). Yet the scientific grounds for supposing that such phenomena were impossible seemed so strong, that until recently they were often ascribed to optical and auditory illusions (Simpson, *loc. cit.*, p. 185, etc.). It appears likely, however, that illuminated columns of mist arising from lakes may appear to join the streamers above (c). The noises were explained as due to changes in the electrical condition of the air, until instruments failed to detect the supposed changes, when they were ascribed to imagination. One writer thought he had disposed of the matter by asserting (on medical authority!) that 50 per cent. of people suffered from noises in the head.

The latest development (see *Nature*, 1938, 141, 232, 956) is that Carl Störmer, probably the world's greatest authority on the aurora, has himself been reluctantly convinced of the reality of the sounds as a result of auroral displays in 1938. Several of his assistants stationed at different observatories heard the sound rising and falling as the streamers passed overhead (a). As yet no explanation seems adequate.

(c) Psychically "gifted" people have often claimed to be able to see an "aura" or mist surrounding people. By first looking through a solution of a cyanine dye Dr. Kilner (*The Human Aura*, 1912, etc.) claimed that the mist could be made visible to ordinary people—though even Kilner's own researches were inconsistent with the view that he was really observing an objective aura at all. The subject was re-investigated some

years ago by Dr. D. F. Fraser-Harris (*British Jour. Med. Psy.*, 1932, 12, 174) who reached the conclusion that the phenomenon was caused by the second visual after image—an image which lasts a considerable time.

(a) At about 10 o'clock on the night of October 11th, 1492, about four hours before he had made his landfall, Columbus claimed to see what looked like the flame of a small candle which appeared to rise and fall on the surface of the water. This light has caused much controversy, as it must have been in deep water some 35 miles out to sea. J. B. Murdock, of the U.S. Navy, after a careful review of the subject, concluded that the light was due to the overwrought fancies of the navigators (see R. T. Gould, *Geog. Mag.*, 1927, 69, 403). L. R. Crawshaw (*Nature*, 1935, 136, 559) has pointed out that the light was probably caused by a surface display of the luminous marine annelids of the genus *odontosyllis*. The displays occur for a few moments but once a month—in the last quarter of the moon.

(c) Workmen at the Notodden nitrate factory in Norway confidently claimed that they could see lights over the choking coils used to limit the current to the furnaces. Their statements were disbelieved. S. P. Thompson (*Nature*, 1937, 140, 423) now finds that alternating fields actually stimulate the optic nerve thus giving the appearance of light, so that the testimony of the workmen may have been reliable, though their interpretation was mistaken.

(a) Josephus (*Wars*, 7, vi, 3) mentions a certain plant with a yellow flower ("Its colour is like that of flame") which "toward the evening sends out a ray like lightning." In modern times this identical phenomenon was first observed by the daughter of Linnæus in 1762, while she was still a girl. She declared that a group of yellow nasturtiums had flashed with a "lightning-like phosphorescence" in the evening twilight. For many years she was laughed at and even accused of lying, but she stuck to her story. Subsequent research by Professor Haggern and others showed that many flowers, especially yellow ones, possess the power of emitting flashes of light at dusk (T. L. Phipson, *Phosphorescence or the Emission of Light by Minerals, Plants and Animals*, 1862, p. 79).

(a) In ancient times Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, x, 67) wrote: "In the Hercynian Forest, in Germany, we hear of a singular kind of bird, the feathers of which shine at night like fire." In the

seventeenth century luminous birds were repeatedly observed—Bartholin (*De luce animalium*, 1647), for instance, mentions several luminous cocks brought to market at Montpellier in 1641. Yet in later years the great natural historian Cuvier, unable to see any reason why birds should be luminous, boldly declared that Pliny's statement was a mere poetical exaggeration. In modern times, Mr. R. J. W. Purdy (*Field*, 1908, 3, 70; *Trans. Norfolk and Norwich Naturalists Soc.*, 1908, 8, 547) found to his cost that an account of luminous owls which he had published was merely laughed at by his fellow naturalists, who had not seen such things for themselves. Yet the existence of such owls is now generally conceded (see Count L. de Sibour, *Knowledge*, 1913, 36, 321; H. W. Robinson, *The Field*, 1930, 155, 230, etc.), while the night heron and the blue crane have also been seen in a luminous condition.

(a) A relatively enormous literature has collected round the glow worm. Many early experimenters said that they were able to extract a luminous juice from the insect, but scientists believed that the light was in some way connected with life, and they refused to believe in the luminous juice. "Some have told me that this is very true" writes the learned Moffett (*Natural History of Four-footed Beasts*, etc., 1658, p. 979), "whom, notwithstanding, I will not believe until such time as the experiment be made before my eyes." Sir Thomas Brown also considered the matter in his *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* and roundly declared that the feat was impossible. Yet we know today that the extraction of the luminous material from the organs of an insect is not a difficult matter, and seeing that repeated efforts were made to achieve it, there is no longer need to doubt that attempts were occasionally crowned with success a few centuries ago.

(a) A considerable literature has also cropped up concerning the synchronous flashing of fireflies, of which no less than 36 reports have been collected by J. B. Buck (*Quart. Rev. Biol.*, 1938, 13, 301). Here again, scientists such as Craig (1916) and Ruckmick (1920) denounced the phenomenon as imaginary simply because they could not explain it. Ruckmick went so far as to declare that the observations were always made in an emotional state of mind "bordering on the romantic," and so were necessarily untrustworthy. Today no biologist doubts that the phenomenon is genuine, and it has even proved possible to reproduce it under controlled conditions in the laboratory.

(b) Will-o'-the-wisps, of which there are several distinct kinds, have a long and interesting history about which something must be said here. One variety is apparently caused by the spontaneous ignition of bubbles of marsh gas—though the cause of the ignition is not yet known. The circumstantial and matter of fact accounts of eyewitnesses (see H. Fornaschon, *Archiv. des Vereins in Mecklenberg*, 1899, 53, 34; W. Muller, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 1900, 17, 505) leave little to be desired. Nevertheless, the fact that no explanation was forthcoming, caused many German scientists in the nineteenth century to ridicule the existence of Will-o'-the-Wisps—although one of their own number, the physicist Knorr, had himself seen one at close quarters (*Annalen der Physik*, 1853, 89, 620). Moreover, Dressler related an undoubted case of the spontaneous ignition of putrefactive gases in a pond near Löwenberg in Silesia—showing that spontaneous ignition can occur (compare also the ignition of haystacks). Today, little further information is available, but it is now known that many volatile compounds of metallic elements may be formed as a result of the action of autotrophic bacteria, and as some of these (*e.g.*, with zinc) are known to be spontaneously inflammable, it seems only reasonable to take the stories of the spontaneous ignition of bubbles of gas at their face value. Since the draining of the land in the nineteenth century the phenomenon has, of course, become much rarer. It need hardly be added that there are no grounds for associating will-o'-the-wisps with phosphine, for no observers have been able to smell this gas in the vicinity.

(a) There are numerous eyewitness accounts of luminous human beings (see Clark, *School Sci. Rev.*, 1936, 249). Thus Lord Bacon solemnly declared that he had seen a "woman's belly sparkling with fire," while numerous doctors in later years witnessed and published accounts of the same phenomenon. Despite this wealth of human testimony, experiment seemed to show that luminous bacteria would not live on human flesh, and in 1905 the *British Medical Journal* (2, 346) actually quoted the words of Bacon in order to illustrate the supposed amazing credulity of former generations!

In recent times, however, at least two cases of this extraordinary phenomenon have been observed. One of them, by F. Barton, a detective, led to the conviction of a murderer at Singapore at the end of the last war, but no scientific investiga-

tion was made (see *Wide World Magazine*, 1934, 73, 61).* The other, that of Mrs. Anna Monaro, an ascetic Italian woman, took place in a hospital in the fishing town of Pirano, on the Istrian coast, in 1934. This latter case received full scientific publicity, and it was found that the region of the chest became brightly luminous for 3 to 4 seconds at a time—the flashes being repeated up to 25 times in a night (see *Lancet*, 1934 (2), 227, 1403; *Illustrated London News*, May 19th, 1934; *Nature*, 1934, 133, 860, etc.). The light was successfully recorded on a cinematograph film. As a result of this case, the scientific and medical journals completely altered their attitude of scepticism.

(a) The history of the so-called "spontaneous" combustion of human beings is very similar to the above. The idea that a human being could catch fire and burn away has been ridiculed time and time again in medical works and journals, despite excellent testimony that this has indeed happened. Today the subject is at last taken seriously. In Mann's *Forensic Medicine and Toxicology* (6th ed., 1922, p. 215 ff.), the conclusion is reached that enormous generation of inflammable gases may occasionally take place in the bodies of alcoholics shortly after death. Should these become artificially ignited as a result of a fire in a room, it is pointed out that all the horrible details of the classic cases of "spontaneous" combustion would be explained. Comparatively recently a drayman of intemperate habits was admitted into Guy's Hospital when, shortly after his death, gas was generated under his skin. On ignition a dozen or so pale lambent flames (such as are mentioned in old records) flickered over his body in the post-mortem room. Had he died alone by the fireside the case would have undoubtedly been reported as one of spontaneous combustion. Certainly there is today no need to question the truthfulness of the testimonies to this horrible phenomenon which occurred relatively frequently during the intemperate nineteenth century, though at that time the witnesses were often ridiculed.

With the reservations already mentioned, these are all the relevant instances of the attempt to deny human testimony which the writer has been able to find. Other cases not known to him no doubt exist, but there is no reason to suppose that

* I am not entirely satisfied as to the truth of this remarkable story but mention it for what it is worth.

enough of them would have to be classified under (c) in order to affect the large majority under (a).

Taking the cases as they stand, the figures are as follows :—

| | | | | |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Classified under (a) | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| „ „ (b) | .. | .. | .. | 2 |
| „ „ (c) | .. | .. | .. | 3 |

Thus, in a majority of cases, a sceptical attitude about the value of human testimony has proved unfortunate. In two-thirds of the cases in which human beings have claimed to have witnessed extraordinary and inexplicable events connected with light, they have proved right and their critics wrong.

Even the cases classified under (b) and (c) are of little assistance to the sceptic. The flame at death (b) rests only on the authority of Alice Bailey, who in any case is a lover of marvels, while Will-o'-the-wisps might almost have been placed in category (a) instead of (b). In all three cases classified under (c), viz., lights on electric chokes, auras and low auroras, it would appear that the original observations were more or less accurately recorded, but that the reason for the appearances must be sought in optical illusions. (As it is not claimed that the aura is self-luminous it might fairly have been omitted.)

In any case, these results show that it is irrational to adopt a sceptical attitude towards things which we cannot understand, for such an attitude amounts to a refusal to learn from the past experiences of mankind. The reliability of human testimony is obviously quite unconnected with whether science can or cannot explain a particular alleged phenomenon. Moreover, these results show that when normal human beings are testifying as to the truth of remarkable events which are likely to bring them ridicule, their testimony tends to be remarkably trustworthy.

This conclusion has an important bearing on Christian apologetics. Taken alone, the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus Christ is simple, straightforward and convincing: but for the fact that it is inexplicable to science it would never have been doubted. Now, however, we learn from numerous actual experiences of mankind that inexplicability to science can no longer be regarded as a good reason for doubting human testimony. In short, the scepticism of scientists in the past has undermined the position of the sceptic today.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: As one who as a youth had to pass an examination in Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*—a perfect example of sound reasoning—I believe Dr. Clark to be right in his contention that human testimony, when pecuniary or personal interests are not involved, is far more trustworthy than many people believe. It is probable that every legend is based on some foundation and is not purely a product of the imagination. As a test of the reliability of the evidence of persons having no axe to grind, Dr. Clark has hit upon the happy idea of considering luminous phenomena of a kind that do not readily lend themselves to scientific explanation, which people assert they have witnessed. Most of these are convinced that they have in fact witnessed these phenomena, and it is incredible that all of these people have been the victims of hallucination or of optical illusions.

One of the examples given by Dr. Clark is the synchronous flashing of the members of a gathering of fire-flies. I have myself witnessed this occasionally. I think Col. D. D. Cunningham is right when he says (*Plagues and Pleasures of Life in Bengal*, p. 129) “this phenomenon is by no means peculiar to any particular part of the country, but in most places it occurs rarely and only in a limited degree”. He thus describes a finer display than I ever witnessed: “As the train slowly panted upwards (on the Iggatpur Ghat from Bombay), many of the trees alternately flamed out into dazzling splendour and vanished off in the gathering gloom of an impending storm, whilst the hosts of insects resting in them lit and put out their lamps as though by common consent.”

As to will-o'-the-wisps, one variety seems to be due to the movements of flying insects which are the hosts of luminous bacteria.

When several people independently testify to having seen with their own eyes a phenomenon, the probability that the phenomenon occurred is strong; but the man of science, equally with the Court of Law, should not accept second-hand or hearsay evidence.

There is a widespread belief among the natives of India and those of the Straits Settlements that the weaver bird (*Ploceus baya*) uses fire-flies to light up its nest. I have never seen a nest so lighted and I know of no ornithologist who has. The weaver-bird is so called because it weaves with long grasses a wonderful pendent nest

in shape and size like an inverted champagne bottle, the mouth of the bottle being the entrance to the nest. Every nest I have seen had attached to it two or more pellets of dried mud. In my view these prevent the nest swaying violently in gales; but the natives of India assert that these pellets are used as candlesticks to which the bird attaches fire-flies. I do not believe this, and when in 1904 an Englishman wrote to me from Western India saying that weavers' nests are common there, that he had noticed fire-flies stuck into many of them, and asking if I could explain their presence, I suggested in reply that he was mistaken and asked him to look carefully next nesting season and, if he saw a nest to which fire-flies were stuck, to take it down and send it to me with fire-flies attached at my expense. I have not heard from him since. In two of my books on Indian birds and in a communication to the *Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* (November, 1909) I asked any one who has actually seen a nest lighted up with fire-flies or one in which the mud of the nest had fire-flies attached to write to me. No one has responded to these invitations.

However, I find that in *Nature Notes*, vol. XIII (1902), Major McNair, although admitting that he had never seen an insect attached to the mud in a weaver bird's nest, quoted the following evidence. Mr. Buckley, Assistant Commissioner in the Indian Salt Department, informed him that in Rajputana he had often found fire-flies in the clay of the nests, but he had also found non-phosphorescent insects there, and that although the natives say the insects are placed there by the bird to light the nest, he (Buckley) thinks they were put there to be used as food for the young. Captain Barry de Hamel of the Straits Settlements Police told McNair that as a result of an inquiry he had made he met people who had actually seen fire-flies in the mud of the nest, but some argued that the flies are used to light the nest, others that they are a delicacy for the young birds. Simon Coorozo, a schoolmaster at Singapore, informed McNair that a party of his boys had told him they had found a weaver's nest with three young ones, and they also saw sticking in the mud three fire-flies.

Now notice that none of these witnesses says he saw an illuminated nest; what they saw was dried mud with dead fire-flies attached. How, then, did the fire-fly story arise? I suggest that as the weaver

bird nests in the rainy season when fire-flies are abundant and the mud pellets are often soft and sticky owing to the rain, fire-flies may alight on the nests as they do on branches, etc., and some may have become entangled in the mud and may have been seen thus while still alive ; in other words, people have seen illuminated nests, and jumped to the conclusion that the birds had stuck them to the nest ; and, as this seemed very clever, the story was often repeated.

I deem Dr. Clark's paper valuable as a warning to scientific men against rejecting testimony merely because it is not in accord with their preconceptions. Let me in conclusion tell a story against myself. Many years ago in India a visitor told me that on account of the heavy rainfall the rice plants growing near the margin of a lake in his district grew to a length of several yards to keep their heads above the rising water. As I appeared sceptical, on the following day my visitor again called with some rice stems of great length, one of which measured 24 feet.

I ask you to pass a hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Clark for his most interesting and stimulating paper.

Mr. SIDNEY T. E. DARK, B.Sc., M.R.S.T., F.Z.S., F.R.Met.S., said : that perhaps the chief difficulty in verifying phenomena of this type was their extreme transience in many cases. Though he had been observing Nature for upwards of fifty years, he had never seen a case of ball lightning or of a garden flower emitting light, and he would have been very strongly inclined to doubt the objectivity of the latter phenomenon had it not been for certain experiences that had come his way.

About twenty years ago, his brother, who was living in Streatham only a few streets away, told him that a hollow horse chestnut tree in his garden had suddenly begun to glow brilliantly in the dark. He went round many times, in all kinds of weather conditions, to see the "fox-fire," of which he had read, but which he had never been lucky enough to see for himself, without success.

On another occasion, he was on an all-night ramble, and while the party was sitting on a bank beside a Surrey lane, eating sandwiches at about 2 a.m., a tiny phosphorescent light was seen travelling slowly along in the middle of the path. On investigation, this turned out to be a centipede which a spider was carrying. It was

set free, and at once ceased glowing, and though kept under observation for nearly half an hour, and prodded occasionally with sticks, it could not be induced to emit light again.

He then read a note on luminous snow received only that morning from Mr. W. H. Spreadbury, F.Z.S., a well-known naturalist and nature photographer. "About 7.30 on the night of January 31st last I was passing along the Portsmouth Road below Ockford Ridge, Godalming. There is a steep greensand bank here covered with trees and with much ivy on the ground. The snow was lodged in small patches and after the silver frost and a slight thaw had a stale, sugary appearance. One patch, roughly oval and about the size of a large hand, was brightly luminous—a yellower light than that of the glow-worm. The light was distinctly visible even when I shone my torch on the patch. There was nothing to indicate to the eye that this patch of snow was otherwise any different from the surrounding snow. On my return at 9.30 p.m. the light had gone and I could not identify the particular patch which had been luminous."

Mr. Dark drew the conclusion that one should be very careful not to reject evidence merely because it was difficult to obtain confirmation. He had recently seen a quotation from an American "scientific" journal, stating that ball lightning had no objective existence but was always due to an optical illusion on the part of the observer. His own experience in investigating lightning strokes for the British Thunderstorms Census Organization, indicated that, for some reason rather difficult to understand, untrained observers frequently described an ordinary lightning flash as a "ball of flame". The Census Organization had, however, many records which fully established the objectivity of the phenomenon. Moreover, it had been successfully photographed in America,* and although until quite recently there had been no scientific explanation of it, Neugebauer has shown (*Zeitschrift für Physik*, 106, 1937) that quantum theory indicates the existence of forces between electrons and ions, neglected in classical theory, which do satisfactorily account for all the observed phenomena connected with ball lightning.

* *E.g.* Jensen, *Physics*, 1933, 4, 372. Dr. Clark mentioned that O. Prochnow had also published photographs of ball lightning in Germany.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote : I have read Dr. Clark's paper with much interest and instruction.

It is obviously impossible for anybody who has not given some time and attention to the study of the phenomena described by Dr. Clark to make any comments on them except to quote the proverb that truth is stranger than fiction. The purpose of the paper, however, is not to discuss the question of luminiferous objects but the reliability of human testimony. If I understand Dr. Clark aright, he is arguing that reports by responsible witnesses of all manner of signs and wonders should not be hastily dismissed because they seem to be incredible on the grounds that they are contrary to human experience in general. I am reminded of a remark by Sir Auckland Colvin that, in dealing with the East, the man who regards the incredible as the impossible is likely to be led astray. With Dr. Clark's application of the truth, that human testimony must not be dismissed with contempt, because it runs counter to the preconceived ideas, and the usual tenour of human life, to the miracles recorded in the Bible, especially the Resurrection of Our Lord, there can be nothing but cordial agreement. It furnishes a rejoinder to Hume's famous argument against miracles. He maintained that no amount of human testimony was sufficient to warrant belief in such a happening since miracles are contrary to our experience. The paper proves clearly and convincingly that man's experience is a very wide field indeed, wherein all manner of strange things may be met.

The question which mentally arises is as to how far human testimony is trustworthy. Thus Cardinal Newman believed that certain relics of an Italian Cathedral, purporting to be the blood of Christ, assumed liquid form at specified seasons of the year. Nobody dreams of challenging the strength and subtlety of Newman's intellect, nor his fundamental sincerity. Dr. Clark quotes from Pliny with reference to light due to electrical discharges. There are other stories in Pliny which it would require a good deal of evidence to verify. They are manifestly fables. The inquiry naturally emerges as to whether there be some touchstone of truth whereby the false can be separated from the trustworthy like the sheep from the goats, when the evidence is confined to testimony,

experimental verification being impossible. It may be that every case must be judged on its own merits. Personally, I lay a great deal of stress on the character and record of the witness. If, in general, he is found to be reliable and accurate, then men should be all the more disposed to accept his statement that the incredible has happened. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much. Witness-bearing does not occur in isolation but in a context, subjective and objective. Before a man's witness is accepted, his credentials in the form of his context should be examined. Pliny's observations regarding stars which appear over land and sea were not believed until they were vindicated by scientific observation. The scepticism was as much due to his fondness for the extraordinary as to the actual nature of the information which he professes to give.

Again, there are happenings which are beyond reason, and others which are contrary to reason. In *Gulliver's Travels* adventures are described which are palpably impossible. They are contrary to reason, but in Swift's day the famous reference to the duty of kings and governors in that allegory to the effect that they should strive to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, may have seemed to be equally preposterous. The one was irrational. The other was only beyond the comprehension of men in the great satirist's day. It may be that by the combination of these two tests of rationality, and general credibility, that the golden grain of fact may be separated from the chaff of illusion and delusion.

Mr. G. BREWER wrote: I think that what Dr. Clark has set out to prove—that the testimony of human experience cannot be set aside simply because science has up to the present been unable to explain or account for it—has been clearly shown by his paper, in which he has referred to the testimony of men of ordinary intelligence.

When, however, we consider events regarded as miraculous recorded in the Scriptures, the character of the men who were eye-witnesses, and the manner in which their testimony was given, such as the Apostles Peter, John, James and Paul, it is impossible to imagine that they could have laboured under any delusion, and were actuated by any motive of self-interest or popularity in support of a cause which brought them loss, persecution and even death.

With regard to the testimony of uncommon luminous appearances mentioned by Dr. Clark, some of which at the time were rejected, and have since been accounted for scientifically, as the previously hidden laws of nature became apparent to mankind.

Our natural sight is only capable, even with powerful artificial aids, of observing material objects and is blind to the spiritual forces with which we are surrounded, yet scripture gives instances where human eyes have been opened to discern these spiritual forces.

To mention but few, there is the case of Elisha (2 Kings vi) when he is surrounded by the army of the King of Syria, with horses and chariots, and when his servant cried "Alas, master, what shall we do?" Elisha prayed, "Lord, open his eyes," and he saw the mountains full of horses and chariots round about Elisha. The appearance also to Joshua of the Captain of the Lord's Host with drawn sword in His hand. The several appearances to Daniel of the Angel of the Lord and to John at Patmos, as well as of the Lord Jesus Himself.

To come to recent times, there is the appearance of "The Angels of Mons", recorded by Capt. C. Whightwick Haywood in August, 1914, seen personally by British soldiers as standing between them and the Germans; and the appearance of "The White Cavalry" in the summer of 1918, who appeared advancing in the open ground behind Bethune, all in white uniform on white horses with their Leader in front mounted on a huge white charger.

An officer of the Prussian Guard, who had been taken prisoner, stated that the Germans fled panic-stricken before the White Host who continued to advance, unaffected by the shells bursting among them.

Lt.-Col. L. M. DAVIES wrote: This seems to me an excellent discussion, from a fresh quarter, of the value of Christian evidences. The case is logically stated; and the paper shows the service which a Christian worker can do to his fellow believers by subscribing an argument from his own particular angle. Dr. Clark seems fully to justify the conclusions expressed in his last two paragraphs.

Rev. ARTHUR W. PAYNE, in remembering the object of the Victoria Institute—to show there was no real contradiction between Inspired

Holy Scripture and true science—valued this paper in its suggestion of not neglecting the evidence of the objective as well as the subjective view of facts.

In reference on page 160, paragraph 1, to Moses and the Sinaitic Revelation (Ex. xxxiii, 29), the Jews—though some to-day are sceptical about the “fiery law” and the custom of having in a home a picture of Moses with the Tables of the Law in his hands, and horns of light coming from his forehead—testify to the story of the Illumination mentioned in the paper, when the Law-Giver Moses came down from the Mount after his interview for 40 days with Jehovah.

In the New Testament we have the wonderful light of Epiphany, then the contrast in the eclipse at the time of the Cross of Calvary followed by the lightning character of the angelic beings at the Resurrection Tomb, and we look forward to a marvellous manifestation at the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Brigadier N. M. McLEOD, D.S.O., M.C., late R.A., wrote: I have read with great interest Dr. Clark’s paper. Not only has he presented questions difficult for sceptics to ignore and harder to answer, but he has made a way for the introduction of a very big question, that of the real, though unknown, forces actuating the Solar System and influencing life on our planet.

He has mentioned the electrical manifestations which so often precede and accompany great earthquakes. These, together with the phenomena of animal and bird behaviour during the lull that so often precedes an earthquake—reported by many observers at the time of the great Quetta earthquake—all go to show that there must be some influence, quite apart from faults in the rocks, which produces these catastrophes, and that the unstable strata constitute only the favourable field on which this influence works.

I have for some years worked out the conditions prevailing as regards the position of the members of the Solar System at the time of major earthquakes on the principle discovered by A. J. Cooper, a merchant service skipper, and described in his book *Solelectrics* (6s. from J. D. Potter, 145, Minorities, E.1), and I have had very convincing results; for example:—

(1) I located the “Missing Quake” of November 10th, 1938, at the Aleutian Islands two days before the location was given in *The*

Times, and I was awaiting news of a tidal wave at Honolulu when, on opening *The Times* of November 12th, I found the heading: "Big Earthquake in Pacific", "Seismic Waves in Hawaii".

(2) I located the centre of the *Great Indian Earthquake* of January 14th, 1934, as being at a point on the north border of Napaul, west of Mount Everest, three days before it was discovered to be there. It was first reported as being somewhere in Assam!

(3) *Los Angeles Earthquake*, March 10th, 1933. The question of planetary influence was discussed by correspondnece in the *Morning Post*, but a letter of mine, describing the quite exceptional arrangement of the planets in full confirmation of Cooper's theory, was considered too technical for publication. A copy is appended for reference.

(4) *Mysterious Gasometer Explosion at Neuwirken*, February 10th, 1933, in the Saar Basin, which occurred just at the time that the locality was passing through a concentration of solar and planetary "soelectric potential". I quote this as an example of possible spontaneous combustion.

(5) *The Great Quetta Earthquake*, May 31st, 1935, *North Japan Earthquake*, March 3rd, 1933, *Greenland Earthquake*, November 20th, 1933, and several others also gave clear confirmation of Cooper's theory.

Cooper, in his book, gives over 150 examples of earthquakes and major atmospheric disturbances in confirmation of his "soelectric" theory, an explanation of which would occupy too much space.

He used to work out his weather ("Northers") ahead in the South Pacific by means of the planetary positions, and on one occasion he was able to warn the Chilean Government a day or two in advance that Valparaiso was on a certain day, hour and minute to be visited by a great earthquake.

This was the great Valparaiso Earthquake of 1906, which occurred precisely at the time precasted and, thanks to government preparations, much life was saved.

There seems to be an interplanetary, solar force, which not only drives the dynamo of the solar system, but which binds the whole system together in such a way that not only do the sun, moon and planets affect one another, but every living cell is in touch with nature like a wireless receiver.

Only thus can we account for so many animal phenomena, such as collective bird movements, migrations, etc.

I have brought this question up because it would appear that these light manifestations must be very closely connected, whether they accompany earthquakes, alcoholism, or spontaneous combustion.

If Dr. Clark, with his scientific training and knowledge, would investigate this inter-planetary question and give us his considered opinion we should feel that light had been shed upon a very big, but at present almost untouched, subject.

I append a letter on earthquakes and planetary influence which was sent to the *Morning Post* :—

“ BELLEVUE,
NORTH BERWICK.

SIR,

16th March, 1933.

EARTHQUAKES AND PLANETARY INFLUENCE.

Reference R. D. C. Graham's letter in your paper of 13th instant.

First, to answer his question regarding the positions of Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

A reference to *Whitaker's Almanac* will show that at 2 a.m., 11th March, G.M.T., i.e., 6 p.m., 10th March, Los Angeles time, all the important members of the solar system were grouped as follows :—

| | | | | |
|---------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---------|
| Venus | } | On opposite sides of the Earth | { | Mars |
| Sun | | | | Moon |
| Mercury | | | | Neptune |
| Uranus | | | | Jupiter |
| Saturn | | | | |
| | | | | |

The right ascensions of their zeniths and nadirs were as follows :

| | | hr. mins. | | hr. min. | |
|---|---|----------------|--------|----------|--------|
| A | { | Venus Zenith | 22 44 | Nadir | 10 44 |
| | | Mars Nadir | 22 42 | Zenith | 10 42 |
| | | Moon Nadir | 22 34½ | ,, | 10 34½ |
| | | Neptune Nadir | 22 41 | ,, | 10 41 |
| B | { | Jupiter Nadir | 23 18½ | ,, | 11 18½ |
| | | Sun Zenith | 23 23½ | Nadir | 11 23½ |
| | | Uranus Zenith | 1 20 | ,, | 13 20 |
| | | Saturn Zenith | 20 58 | ,, | 8 58 |
| | | Mercury Zenith | 19 38 | ,, | 7 38 |

Note that the members of Group A are all very close together and those of group B less than $\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ apart as regards R.A.

Working on Alfred J. Cooper's theory of 'Solectrics' (published by J. D. Potter, Admiralty Agent for Charts, 145, Minories, E.1), I have plotted all these positions on a globe set at the appropriate time and I find that at 2 a.m. G.M.T. on 11 3/33 (6 p.m. 10 3/33 local time) solectric arcs struck with radii 88° from centres as follows intersect in the neighbourhood of Los Angeles.

| <i>Centres.</i> | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Sub Nadir of Moon | } | Form a bunch of intersections of arcs over Los Angeles and surrounding district. |
| „ „ Venus | | |
| „ „ Neptune | | |
| „ Zenith of Sun | | |
| „ Nadir of Jupiter | } | Intersect over same district about quarter hour earlier. |
| Nadir of Sun | | |
| Zenith of Jupiter | } | Form a network which passed over Los Angeles and S. California about 1 a.m. 11 3/33 G.M.T. (1 hour before the earthquake). |
| Zenith of Venus | | |
| Nadir of Moon | | |
| „ Neptune | | |
| „ Mars | | |
| „ Venus | | |
| Zenith of Moon | } | |
| „ Mars | | |
| „ Neptune | | |

Mr. Alfred J. Cooper, in his book *Solectrics*, gives 150 examples in support of his theory, and the above would appear to provide yet another example of his theory working out correctly.

Working from data at the time of the recent earthquake in Japan, I obtained several bunches of intersections just to the N.E. of North Island, Japan.

I do not claim any great accuracy for my plotting, which was done with a pair of dividers on an 8-inch diam. globe.

To save space I have not given any explanation of the 'Solectric' theory, which can be studied from Mr. Cooper's book.

Whether Mr. Cooper's system is theoretically sound or not, it appears to give practical results and, with suitable appliances and a staff of experts, it should be possible to give warnings of danger

areas, as was done in the case of the great earthquake at Valparaiso in 1906, which was predicted by means of Mr. Cooper's system.

I should be glad if you would forward my letter to Mr. Graham, or publish it if you think fit.

N. M. McLEOD,
Lt.-Col., R.A.

To the Editor of the *Morning Post*.

Dr. LOUIS WOOD said: I should like to express my thanks to Dr. Clark for his admirable and original paper. It gives much food for thought, and seems to open a new door for Biblical research, and is full of interesting suggestions.

I notice on page 160 his allusion to fire-balls. The books I have read on electrical phenomena either ignore these, or seem doubtful as to whether there are such things in reality. The allusions are vague and sometimes hint that so-called fire-balls are actually either meteorites or an optical effect of lightning.

I once saw what I believe to be a fire-ball, and though it happened so long ago it made a deep and lasting impression, which I will try to describe after the lapse of so many years, during which I have never experienced a repetition of any similar phenomenon.

In July, probably of 1869 or 1870, when I was about 12 or 13 years old, I was staying with a brother two years younger at the tiny Somersetshire village of Poynsington. We had just returned from a drive and the first large drops of rain were making spots on the pavement. The sky was dark and thunder rolling distantly. The house adjoined the churchyard of the little church, perhaps 50 yards away. Suddenly, between us and the church appeared a glowing globe.

It is difficult to convey an accurate impression of size, especially after so many lapsed years. Perhaps about the apparent size of the moon when high in the heavens between the racing clouds. The point is that this fiery ball *hovered* for an appreciable time, moving slowly and rather uncertainly a yard or two from the ground.

I don't think we could have estimated the length of time then, and assuredly not now. After hovering it seemed to strike the

ground, exploding with a terrific crash, and the thunderstorm broke.

My brother survives and corroborates many points of this account.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am very grateful to all who have taken part in this discussion, and especially to the Chairman and Mr. Sidney Dark, who have provided us with so much interesting material.

There is no need for me to make more than two short comments. Mr. Sidney Dark has pointed out that ordinary lightning flashes are sometimes confused with ball lightning. Now modern work on lightning has shown that a lightning flash to earth occurs in a series of steps, each penetrating through the air further than its predecessor, while the tip of every separate stroke is brilliantly luminous. In view of this fact, it is, perhaps, not difficult to understand why ordinary lightning may sometimes be described as a "ball of flame", especially as there must be many occasions when the position of successive tips alters relatively slowly.

It is difficult to make any useful comments on Brig. N. M. McLeod's letter. It is believed that stresses are slowly but constantly being built up in the earth's crust and that when once they have become large enough a small "trigger" action will precipitate an earthquake. It seems likely that tidal forces, due to other members of the Solar System, are sometimes responsible for "pulling the trigger", but I find it hard to connect this with the subject of my paper.

838TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 20TH, 1940,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. C. W. COOPER, F.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 6th were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections: As Member: J. G. S. Thomas, Esq., D.Sc.; as Library Associate: The Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, M.A., to read his paper entitled "The Unity of Isaiah."

The Meeting was then thrown open to discussion, in which the following took part: Colonel Molony, Mr. Sidney Collett, Mr. Cowper Field, Rev. F. W. Pitt, and Dr. Barcroft Anderson.

Written communications were received from Principal Curr, Miss Hodgkin, Colonel Molesworth, Colonel van Straubenzee, and the Rev. A. W. Payne.

THE UNITY OF ISAIAH.

By the Rev. W. A. WORDSWORTH, M.A.

"EVERY schoolboy knows" in these days that there is a second or "Deutero-Isaiah." It is not, however, so widely realised that this "assured result" is not quite so simple as it sounds or that it is the corner stone of a complicated superstructure; for if parts of Isaiah are post exilic, anything which shows traces of that influence must be later still. Great will be the fall when that foundation crumbles, as it surely will, beneath the weight of the absurd complexities in which it is involved.

The modern critical method of study applied to the Scriptures has been salutary. It is great gain that it has restored to us the recognition of the truly human element in the inspired writings, so that once more we see Jesus of Nazareth as the disciples saw

him first, as truly son of man. It is hardly less important that we have learned again to regard the Prophets as men of like passions with our own and like problems, not mere hands which wrote a sort of automatic writing at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, but men who loved justice and mercy and believed in God amidst events which seemed to mock the idea of a Kingdom of God; men who "searched towards whom or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them was pointing when it testified beforehand the sufferings leading towards Christ and the glories after these"; men whose eager hopes constantly misled them as to the nearness of those times and seasons which it is not given to men to know.

Perhaps it may be convenient if I state broadly my position in regard to the Old Testament. I have made no real study of the Pentateuch and historical books, but it seems to me that the critical analysis into documents is firmly established, though the tendency is to underrate the antiquity of these underlying documents. Those books of the Prophets and Poets which I believe to belong to the Eighth Century B.C. I have studied with some care in the Hebrew and I am convinced of the integrity of all those books of the prophets of the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah and usually of their orderly arrangement. Among these I include Nahum and Habakkuk and the last six chapters of Zechariah, the one book which is clearly composite.

The book of Isaiah is not only a unity but arranged almost always in chronological order: only the historical chapters xxxvi-xxxix having been inserted later.

It will be clear from the case of Zechariah that I do not rule out in advance all possibility that the work of two or more prophets might have come down to us in the book of Isaiah; indeed, for many years I accepted it as having been proved that there were two; for what right has an ignoramus to reject the consensus of scholars? But when one begins to look into this apparent unanimity, one finds that it is not a matter of agreement on a simple division, but rather a dispute as to how many are the pieces into which that which has been sawn asunder is to be dissected; and one begins to wonder whether the process of dissolution will not end by leaving only dry bones from which the spirit of life has departed. Indeed, since I was given the clue to the restoration of unity to Isaiah I seem to have witnessed what Ezekiel so vividly describes in his vision of the scattered

bones. Even Professor Torrey has stressed forcibly the danger, though he finds it necessary to get rid of Ezekiel and Ezra to make room for his Deutero-Isaiah in the Persian period.

In many directions the critical process has reached the *reductio ad absurdum*.

It is time to go back to the beginning and try to find where is the fallacy which has led the learned and sincere scholars into such hopelessly complicated Ptolemaic systems.

Before I go further it will be well to mention that in place of the LORD or Jehovah or its modern substitutes I prefer to use the form Yeabe; no one knows how the name should be pronounced, but we do know that the Prophets associated it with the verb "to be". It seems best to coin a form which will represent this significance.

The main arguments for the division of the book of Isaiah are the mention of Cyrus, apparent allusions to the ruined Temple, the fact that the Babylonian captivity is the setting of the message from chapter xl onwards—though by no means always—and differences of style and language.

Arguments from language seem to me always extremely precarious. I would gladly take up the challenge, but cannot afford the time for trifles.

The really important lesson which modern scholars have taught us is that we must read the prophet's message on the background of the history of his own times. It is, I agree, against all analogy and practically incredible that Isaiah, son of Amoz, about 700 B.C. addressed a message to the captives who were in Babylon in the days of Cyrus about 540 B.C.

But the whole problem is changed if we pay attention to what Sennacherib himself has caused to be written for our learning. He tells us that (in 701 B.C.) he captured forty-six fenced cities of Judah, as the book of Kings also records; but to this he adds the all-important fact that he carried away into Assyria at this time the captives, 200,150 in number. A very large proportion therefore of the Jewish people (in addition to the Northern Israelites) was in exile just at the point of time to which, on the face of it, the thirty-fifth and fortieth chapters of Isaiah should apply, if the book is chronologically arranged. Isaiah bids Jerusalem (which alone had survived) to proclaim from a high mountain "to the cities of Judah: behold your God. Behold the Lord comes in a strong one", hazaq, allusion to Hezekiah's name is clear, whatever the underlying thought may be; a

shepherd who is Yeabe himself, is to lead the new exodus of captives.

What the Prophet expected did not happen as and when he expected; that is equally evident whether he was Isaiah or another. Isaiah (who had foretold that Yeabe would intervene to save Jerusalem at the decisive moment and whose prediction had been marvellously fulfilled in 701 B.C.) being human would naturally rise up with wings as an eagle, would naturally soar up into a visionary world, would see that Yeabe, who had bared his arm to save Jerusalem, would go on to finish the work of Salvation by sending a new Moses, yea the Angel of his Presence, to lead a new Exodus of captive Israel. It was illusion, but it was an illusion natural in the circumstances, and one which contained a vision of Eternal truth; rays of Divine Light refracted in passing through the misty atmosphere of earth. But why anyone should have an illusion of this kind in the days of Cyrus I cannot see; nor how anyone can regard the prophetic vision as fulfilled by the pedestrian return of a few Jews led by Zerubbabel or Ezra.

Sennacherib does not tell how he disposed of these 200,000 Jews who were "sent after him to Niniveh"; but as in the campaign immediately preceding his invasion of Judah he had removed 200,000 "Aramaeans" from Babylonia, it is probable that he sent them there. It seems to me more reasonable to take the book of Isaiah as evidence that this was so and that Isaiah was concerned with these Jewish exiles, than to take the words addressed to captives in Babylon as evidence that Isaiah did not write them; unless there is decisive evidence to the contrary. My conclusion after careful study is that the whole course of the prophecy fits consecutively into the little we know of the last days of Hezekiah and the beginning of Manasseh, and into no other period whatever. But this cannot be maintained unless in one or two places we claim the liberty to go behind, not only the other versions, but also the Hebrew text as *pointed by the Jewish scribes*. This can hardly seem an unreasonable claim to a Christian, who recalls that our Master said to those very people "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge", "Ye have made the word of God of none effect by your tradition." There is no need to alter one jot or tittle of the Hebrew text. But it must be understood that the original Hebrew text consisted of consonants only. Not only was there no division into chapters and verses, there was no trace of punctuation, no

vowels and no spacing of the letters into words. To judge from the Lachish letters the dot between words was more often omitted than inserted. It was not until about the Eighth Century A.D. that the vowel points and other guides to reading, which amount to the making of an authorised version, were added by the Scribes. That we should feel bound to follow such a guide, when it leads into the ditch of muddy confusion in which Deutero-Isaiah ends, is preposterous. But the fundamental error is far older than the Scribes; and really amounted to the rejection of the Christ more than 500 years before the Good Shepherd came. Josephus tells us that the book of Isaiah was shown to Cyrus and that he was much impressed by finding himself proclaimed by name as destined to build the temple at Jerusalem, by a Prophet writing more than a century before he was born. It is interesting to recall that Josephus himself brought off a similar success, by persuading Vespasian that he was the Messianic Shiloh who was to come out of Judah, where he was to be proclaimed Emperor. Cyrus in one of his inscriptions appears to be practically quoting the particular passage in Isaiah, which as commonly read, refers to him by name.

Of course, modern scholars will not admit this or the statement of Josephus.

In this inscription Cyrus says that "Merodach . . . sought out an upright prince after his own heart whom he took by the hand, Cyrus king of Anshan; he named his name, to the kingdom of the whole world he called him by name". Isaiah xlv in the Authorised Version reads "Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations before him . . . that thou mayest know that I the LORD, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel. . . . I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee though thou hast not known me". There is not only the taking by the hand in both, but also the peculiar insistence on the calling by the name which points to some connection between the two. But in the inscription Merodach takes the place of Yeabe: and the merit of Cyrus which won the favour of Merodach, the god of Babylon and "king of gods", was that he had restored to their homes the gods (*i.e.*, idols) which Nabonidus had collected in Babylon and which had roused Merodach by their complaints. So far is Cyrus from being a monotheist that he boasts of his reversal of the policy

of Nabonidus which had at least tended in that direction by centralising worship in Babylon.

Now, according to the modern theory, Deutero-Isaiah wrote these chapters at the time of the advance of the power of Cyrus, whose own inscriptions show that he professed himself a worshipper of all the gods of the nations. To this unprincipled schemer, about whose views he could not be ignorant, the Prophet gives the titles of Yeabe's shepherd and anointed: and he does this immediately after the most scathing and contemptuous description of the stupidity of bowing down to the stock of a tree after cooking your dinner on a fire made of its chips and shavings.

It is monstrous. "He feedeth on ashes: a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he can not deliver his soul nor say, 'Is there not a lie in my right hand.'" How can they believe that such sublime poetry, such a sense of the majesty of the Holy One of Israel as fill these chapters of Isaiah, could be combined with such time-serving flattery of an unscrupulous adventurer, even though he were more liberal minded and humane than the Babylonian kings whom he succeeded?

While Cyrus stood as the legendary hero, belief in Isaiah's prediction was rational compared with that. But since his own records have exposed his boasted reverence for idols, some other explanation there must be.

And it is not far to seek if you approach the Hebrew text without regard to the tradition of those scribes who rejected the Shepherd and the Christ when he came to claim his kingdom, which had been given over to thieves and robbers. Jesus himself said to the Chief Priests "Ye have made the house of prayer a den of robbers".

There are at least three possible ways of reading those letters which the scribes have interpreted as meaning "to Cyrus".

I suppose that some Jewish exile, trying to interpret the unfulfilled prophecies of Isaiah and puzzling over the letters which he found written in his unpointed text, believed that he had made a wonderful discovery when he read in it an allusion to the name of Cyrus, the king whose victories filled the minds of all men with mingled hopes and fears and who seemed destined to be the heir to the Empire of Babylon. "But behold the false pen of the scribes hath made falsehood."

What I think Isaiah wrote and intended was "to thee and the crushed one" (or impoverished), "thee" being Jerusalem,

the saved remnant of Israel, and the "crushed one" her anointed king; on the face of it Hezekiah, who had been brought very low, but in reality another mysterious personality, who is elsewhere called the Servant. For it will be immediately evident to anyone who reads the opening verses of Isaiah xlv without the name of Cyrus, that this is one of what they call "the servant songs," which moderns are wont to regard as insertions sprinkled about aimlessly, but which are really parts of the vital cord uniting the whole.

It is impossible to give an adequate explanation in a few words: I can only give a literal version of my reading of what Isaiah wrote, the end of xlv and the beginning of xlvi.

Let me repeat. "Thee" is Jerusalem, the saved remnant of Israel: the crushed one is the Servant, the ideal king who is to be manifested as the glorified head of the redeemed Israel, the new Jerusalem. He is the head, she is the body and the bride; they are ideally two in one. The Servant is always Israel personified but is sometimes an individual, the head on whom are laid the sorrows of all the people: this passage identifies him with the Anointed, the Christ.

"That saith to Jerusalem she shall be established:

And to the cities of Judah they shall be built;

And her wastes I will raise up;

That saith to the deep be dry:

And thy rivers I will shrivel.

That saith to thee—and the Crushed one my shepherd:

And all my delight he shall fulfill;—

Even saying to Jerusalem, She shall be builded:

And a Temple thou (masculine) shalt be founded."

I would call attention to one word in passing, Hephzi (my delight); Hephzibah, you will remember, was Hezekiah's queen. In the next verse in order to point out the allusion to the name of Hezekiah, I substitute "he's secure by my right hand" for "whom I held by his right hand."

Thus hath said Yeabe to his Anointed:

To thee and the Crushed, he's secure by my right hand;

To lay low before him nations:

And the gifts of kings I open;

To open before him double doors:

And the gates shall not be shut.

I myself before thee go :
 And the uplifted I make straight ;
 The doors of brass I break :
 And the bars of iron I cut through ;
 And I give to thee treasures of darkness :
 And trove of hiding places ;
 That thou mayest know that I am Yeabe :
 Who calls by thy name, the God of Israel.
 For the sake of my servant Jacob :
 And Israel my chosen ;
 And I call thee by thy name :
 I entitle thee and thou hast not known me.

You will observe that the run of the sentences implies that the person addressed is to be called Israel—as the Servant often is. Nor will you forget that almost the first sentence of Isaiah's book is "Israel doth not know," and again in xliii, "Who is blind as my servant?" You will also recollect that the Patriarch Jacob was given the name Israel by the Divine Being who wrestled with him but refused to tell his own name: for "I appeared to Jacob by my name of God Almighty: but by my name Yeabe I was not known to him."

Throughout Scripture, Yeabe's anointed is always Israel, usually but not always personified in her king. So here "his anointed" is divided into "thee and the Crushed one", a double reference which is continued in "before him" and "before thee." As soon as Cyrus goes the sense becomes plain: for what sense is there in saying that the name of Cyrus was given to him by Yeabe or given for the sake of Jacob and Israel?

In lxiv the apparent allusion to the burning of the Temple disappears when the true punctuation is given. It is the ornaments of worship of Yeabe which were cast into the fire by Manasseh.

There I must leave it, for it is important at least to mention the earlier chapters.

"The burden of Babylon which Isaiah son of Amoz saw" belongs to the time when Merodach^yBaladan the Chaldean, with Elamite allies, was moving to capture Babylon from the Assyrians: from Isaiah it appears that the Medes were moving at the same time. The date is indicated by the mention of the death of Ahaz at the end of chapter xiv. The king of Babel who

has been slain and dishonoured is therefore Shalmaneser who was also known as Elula of Babylon, who was assassinated before Samaria at the time of Sargon's usurpation.

The remarkable combination of events in the years 722-1 is of great importance to the interpretation of Isaiah and other prophets. Thus the assassination of Shalmaneser and a change of dynasty in Assyria coincided with the loss of Babylon, whose capture had crowned Tiglath Pileser's career only eight years earlier. Within a few months the death of Ahaz set Hezekiah, who had previously been co-regent, free to establish his reforms. At the same time the fall of Samaria brought the great schism to an end. Israel had no possible king as rival to the heir of David.

This combination of events clearly underlies the remarkable series of chapters xxiv-xxvii, which alone are not placed according to chronological sequence.

Chapters xx-xxiii are of vital importance for chronology. Twenty gives us a date which is quite certain, when Sargon sent Tartan to Ashdod, *i.e.* 711. Twenty-one is a remarkable vision of a fall of Babylon by which the Prophet is deeply moved with anxiety for Jerusalem. This unique tone is only possible on the occasion when Merodach Baladan, Hezekiah's friend, was driven out by Sargon, *i.e.*, 710. Twenty-three mentions the only two facts recorded by inscriptions concerning the last two or three years of Sargon, *i.e.*, the submission of Cyprus (Chittim) and the devastation of the land of the Chaldeans, the home of Merodach Baladan.

Thus we get chapter xx 711 B.C., xxi 710 B.C., xxiii about 707 B.C. Manifestly xxii should belong to 709 or 708, *i.e.*, the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. It clearly indicates a miserable surrender of Jerusalem to the Assyrian and the carrying away of hostages and treasure. I cannot explain here, but from thus treating Isaiah as an orderly book and as a trustworthy guide to history, we receive the clue to the chronology of Hezekiah's reign, which has hitherto proved insoluble. The solution comes from a recognition of the fact that Sargon and Sennacherib loved their own glory more than truth, Isaiah loved only truth and the glory of God.

For a fuller treatment of all these matters I can only refer to my translation and commentary recently published by T. T. Clark under the title *En-Roeh*. All that time will now allow is to read a few paragraphs from the Introduction to that book

to indicate how the living gospel of Isaiah is bound up with the unity of the book.

“The conclusion of the whole matter is this : that the interpretation of the Old Testament has not really begun. Modern criticism has cleared away some rubbish ; but the scholars now seem to me, so to speak, to be hurrying round in a vicious circle, ploughing the sand, while close at hand there is a fruitful soil ready to yield a harvest more abundant than we could ask or think, if only they will turn their attention to it.

“And the one essential idea is simply that which Christians were told from the beginning, that the whole of the Scriptures are united by the one purpose of the Spirit which inspired them, the revelation of the things concerning the Christ, whom the Father would send, as God with us, in whose name alone we can be enlightened and saved.

“The Jewish scribes have taken away the key of knowledge ; they are blind guides ; how could it be otherwise if they rejected the Christ, the shepherd, Whom we call Master, but heed not the things he said ; for He declared to us that the purpose of the Scriptures was to reveal the things concerning Himself. Yet we owe to the Jews an unpayable debt, the careful preservation of the oracles of God committed to them ; and they alone perhaps can lead us in the understanding of them, if they will look on Him whom they pierced. It may be that they have preserved also priceless knowledge hidden under a heap of rubbish of tradition and legend. Surely there must have been hidden knowledge among the Rabbis who spoke of the Messiah who was a leper ; of Menahem the son of Hezekiah who was born at Bethlehem and how ‘Israel shall have no more Messiah, for they had him in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah.’ The statements are blind and perverse ; but do they not bear witness to some genuine memories, which were cherished among them that looked for redemption in Israel ? and will not scribes, instructed into the kingdom of God, and called in laughter, bring forth out of their treasures things new and old ?

“That there are mysteries that lie hidden in the writings of the greatest of the prophets is no gratuitous invention, darkening counsel by words without knowledge. He himself declares quite distinctly that he binds up the testimony and seals the lore among his disciples ; that all prophecy was to most of his contemporaries as the words of a book which is sealed ; that he was to speak in such a way that seeing they should see and not

perceive ; and at the end he complains ‘ Who hath believed out report ? ’

“ One thing Isaiah requires, and justly requires of his readers ; that they should credit him with meaning what he says. Prophets did not write history before it happened, but they were men who were spiritually in advance of their times by anything from one to a thousand generations. Some day a mystic poet scholar will take up the task of interpreting him : then men will begin to understand what hitherto seeing they have not perceived. But his writings belong irrevocably, as a peculiar treasure, to his people, to whom are committed the oracles of God, a light to lighten the Gentiles and to be the glory of his people Israel. His heart shall discern ; and turn and be healing to him.

“ It seems to me clear that chapters vii, viii, and xi imply that a child was born about 734 B.C., of Davidic descent, but not of the reigning family, whom Isaiah regarded as the Messiah ; that the description of the servant implies that there was an actual person whom he regards as embodying in himself the hope of Israel ; and that the only possibility of doing justice to the prophet’s words lies in identifying the latter with the former. The whole vision is fulfilled in Jesus Christ, but there must have been someone in Isaiah’s day in whom the whole process of our salvation was foreshadowed, that the prophet might be enabled to see in the visage which was so marred more than any man, the vision of the King in his beauty.”

Perhaps I may be permitted to mention two smaller and earlier publications, *Sawn Asunder* and *The Stone Rejected*, copies of which can be obtained from me at St. Michael’s, Hindhead, price 1s. and 3d. Though there are matters of detail which need modification, they give a simple exposition of the main argument.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Rev. C. W. COOPER) said : The question whether or not the Book of the Prophet Isaiah is a composite book containing the writings of different authors, and edited by another, is one which immensely concerns the Christian religion, and therefore the faith of our nation.

The Victoria Institute has laboured for a number of years, and not without considerable success, to vindicate the Bible as having within its pages, from Genesis to Revelation, all-sufficient evidence

to prove that its writers gave their message as God's truth, meaning what they state and stating what they mean.

It is the opinion of many of us who claim to have a knowledge of what the Bible states that its statements clearly, uniformly and consistently set forth the unfolding purposes of God, which have been, and still are being, worked out in the history of the world.

A type of mind, however, in these latter days has arisen which hesitates to believe that any man could possibly write upon or foretell future events, who also finds it difficult to believe in miracles, such as God's destruction of Sennacherib's army in one night, as stated in Isaiah xxxvii, 36.

The result of such views is that it drives the modernist to deliberately neglect or explain away plain statements in this book in order to make the Bible to agree with their theoretical notions.

The Paper read to us to-day shows once more that wisdom to expound the Scriptures belongs far more to those who understand the message given throughout the entire book, rather than to those scholars who depend mainly upon their superior knowledge of the language in which our Bible was written.

Concerning scholarship itself, I think it worthy of notice to state that scholars of every school of thought commit their views and arguments to paper, with the result that any intelligent student is thereby enabled to weigh the claims, and the pros and cons of each of the differing advocates, so as to judge for himself which of the claims or views set forth are the more likely to be the true exposition.

The determining factor, to my mind, as to the truths of the Bible is not scholarship only, concerning its statements in part, but the understanding of the whole of the message therein contained. Such I consider is the great value of the Paper read to-day, and for which I now propose that a vote of sincere thanks be given to the author and reader.

Colonel MOLONY said : The Council of the Victoria Institute were very sorry to have to ask Mr. Wordsworth to limit his paper to 4,000 words, for that is evidently much too narrow a limit to deal with such a great subject. We are all the more grateful to Mr. Wordsworth for having attempted it ; but, in justice to him, we must mention that he has published two books and two pamphlets

relating to the subject. His book, called *Sawn Asunder*, should certainly be read.

The story is told in Scotland that two ministers were driving in the Highlands when one said, "Do you see that cottage?" "Yes, what about it?" "That is where Isaiah was sawn asunder." He meant that it was where Dr. Sir George Adam Smith was staying when he wrote his well-known book on Isaiah. In that book he mentions Cyrus 22 times in four pages, which shows how much his argument for sub-division turns upon that name. Now Mr. Wordsworth has shown that all this argument is inconclusive. Having compared Dr. Smith's book with Mr. Wordsworth's, it seems to me that most of the latter's counter-arguments are satisfactory. But not quite all. It will not do for it to be thought that we of the Victoria Institute do not go carefully into the matters brought before us. So I must mention the following passages from the latter chapters of the books of Isaiah, in the hope that Mr. Wordsworth may be able to meet them with satisfactory explanations. On the face of it, it does not seem probable that they can have been written by Isaiah the son of Amoz, who died about 700 B.C. Babylon flourished for a further 160 years, yet we read in Isaiah—

xlvi, 5, Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans, for thou shalt *no more* be called the lady of kingdoms.

xlviii, 20, Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans.

xlix, 17 (Of Zion), Thy destroyers, and they that made thee *waste* shall go forth of thee.

li, 19 (Of Jerusalem), These two things are befallen thee who shall bemoan thee? *desolation* and destruction.

lxiii, 18, our adversaries have trodden down Thy sanctuary.

lxiv, 10, Thy holy cities are become a wilderness, Jerusalem a *desolation*.

On page 84 of his book, *Sawn Asunder*, Mr. Wordsworth allows that this verse and the next "present a problem".

Sir G. A. Smith says the same of parts of *his* solution. He writes: "Chapter lix is perhaps the most difficult portion of all, because

it makes the Jews responsible for civic justice in a way they could hardly be conceived to be in exile" (Vol. II, page 21).

Mr. Wordsworth's main contention is surely sound. That the wonderful predictions which we read in the latter part of the book are much more likely to have been written about the great Messiah than about an idolater such as Cyrus is now known to have been.

Mr. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I am glad this question has been raised in to-day's lecture, as the popular view still is that there were two Isaiahs, one who wrote the first 39 chapters, and another who wrote from chapter xl to the end. The usual reason given is the alleged difference in the *tone* between the two sections. But how weak such an argument is! Have *we* never written a letter which first tells the *sad* news of the death of a friend, and then, in the same letter, send the *glad* news of a friend who had just returned from abroad after an absence of many years? How unreasonable it would be to suggest that such a letter *must* have been written by *two different persons*.

Now happily, like many other Bible difficulties, this question is authoritatively settled within the covers of the Bible itself. Let me put it to you like this. Supposing we could find a passage in the New Testament with two quotations from Isaiah, one from the first part—what we may call the earlier Isaiah—and another from the second part—what we may call the later Isaiah. And if, in that passage, *both those quotations are definitely attributed to one man*, ought not that to settle the question for ever?

Now that is exactly what we do find, for in John xii, 38-40, we read: "that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake: Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed". That is a quotation from Isaiah liii, 1 (now according to the critic, that is the later Isaiah). Then immediately follow the words: "Therefore, they could not believe, because that Esaias said again" (*not another Isaiah*, but the *same Isaiah* said again), "he hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart", etc. Now these words are taken from Isaiah vi, 9-10 (which, according to the critics, was the earlier Isaiah). Then in John xii, 41, this clear and definite statement follows *from the lips of Our Lord*: "These things said Esaias when

he saw His glory"—not when *they* saw His glory, as Christ would have said, had there been two Isaiahs !

But more than that, this erroneous idea of a two-fold division of Isaiah's prophecy blinds our minds to the true division, which is three-fold, and a careful study of this prophecy shows that each division commences with a *solemn call* from God, and ends with an *equally solemn warning*.

Chapters i to xlvi constitute the first section. Here is the *call*, Isaiah i-ii, "Hear O Heavens and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken." And the *warning* at the close of that section is found in chapter xlvi, 22 : "There is no peace saith the Lord to the wicked".

The second section is chapters xlvii-lviii. Here is the *call* with which the section opens, chapter xlvii, 1, "Listen O isles unto Me and hearken, ye people from far". And the *warning* is in the last verse of that section (chapter lviii, 21), "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked".

The third section commences with the *call* in chapter lvi, 1, "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up Thy voice like a trumpet, and show My people their transgression, and the House of Jacob their sin". While the *warning* with which this section closes in chapter lvi, 24, "Men that have transgressed against Me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched". Moreover, herein is the plan of the Bible revealed ; for it will be noticed that the first call is to the *Jews*, while the second is directed to the *Gentiles*, because the Jews rejected His call ; but the *third* call is again given to the *Jews*, who will be finally restored in the millennial age.

The Rev. F. W. PITT said : The paper read to us this afternoon is very unlike what is generally heard at the Victoria Institute meetings, and one can but hope that it does not indicate that we are moving toward modernistic theories of inspiration.

There are too many questionable suggestions to deal with in a brief reply, so I must confine my remarks to one statement which I had hoped even higher critics had abandoned in face of historical facts.

The learned lecturer says : "Prophets did not write history before it happened". Considering the detailed predictions concern-

ing Egypt, Tyre, Nineveh, Babylon, and the rest, this is obviously incorrect. "Show the things that are to come hereafter" is the divine challenge to false prophets, which implies that the true prophets wrote history before it happened.

One instance of the supposed method of Isaiah is given in regard to the prediction of the Messiah's Virgin Birth. Our lecturer suggests that "a child was born about 734 B.C. of Davidic descent, but not of the reigning family, whom Isaiah regarded as the Messiah; that the description of the Servant implies that there was an actual person, whom he regards as embodying in himself the hope of Israel".

Are we, then, to believe that there have been two persons born of a Virgin—the child born about 734 B.C., and the Son of God—born in the days of Herod the Great?

It seems to me like a pure invention, for there is no historical record of any such thing as the lecturer's mythical child born about 734 B.C.

The whole paper leads to confusion on the vital question of Divine Inspiration.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., wrote: The theories advanced in this learned paper were also adopted by Dr. J. W. Thirtle, whose name is honoured and loved in the Victoria Institute by all who knew him. In one of his books he defends an interpretation of the second half of Isaiah's prophecies which does not differ very much from that of Mr. Wordsworth. If the arguments do not carry complete conviction, they serve as a protest against the modern view of the book that it consists of a treasury of miscellaneous prophetic oracles, distributed over several centuries, and collected in one book which bears the name of Isaiah. Wesley's collection of hymns is a fair analogy. The book still bears the name of the great evangelist, but it contains a very large number of pieces which are much later than his date. The earlier view of Isaiah was that it consisted in the main of contributions from two supreme prophets who may have both borne the same name. Thus the book becomes the production of two Isaiahs, one living in Jerusalem and the other in Babylonia. That theory gave rise to the facetious observation that the critics had treated the book of Isaiah as

Manasseh's officers treated his body. It is supposed that the prophet met a martyr's death by being sawn asunder when he had fled for hiding in a mulberry tree whose trunk was hollow. The book has been dismembered in the same way.

Towards the close of the paper, Mr. Wordsworth refers to Jewish tradition. It is along that line that the defence of the book's unity of authorship must be sought. The tradition of the Jewish and Christian Churches is unanimously in favour of the theory that Isaiah, the friend and adviser of Hezekiah, was its author. There must be some explanation of that fact. An old proverb reminds us that there is always fire where there is smoke, and such a belief could not have held its ground so long and so widely without some foundation in fact. After all has been said and done, there must have been a period when the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah were put together to form a unit. It seems surprising that two-thirds or more of the book should consist of Non-Isaianic material, especially in view of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve, as the single roll which comprises all the Minor Prophets is called in the Hebrew Bible. Jeremiah's book is almost exclusively from his pen. The same is true of Ezekiel, and in the Minor Prophets so careful were the compilers of authorship that even the twenty-one verses of Obadiah are carefully assigned to him by name. In these circumstances, it is hard to understand how such a *tour de force* of prophetic teaching as Isaiah xl-lxvi should have been amalgamated with the oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem unless he were in deed and in truth their Divinely inspired author. Those who were responsible for the present form of the book must surely have known their business. It seems incredible that they should have lumped together pre-exilic and post-exilic compositions under one revered name. They may have been uncritical according to modern standards, but they were surely not lacking in wisdom and knowledge so badly as the popular modern view of the book's composite character demands. They had the same evidence before them, and they were equally capable of pronouncing judgment upon it.

Miss A. M. HODGKIN wrote: It is because we believe that the question of inspiration is involved in the theory of two Isaiahs that we feel strongly about it.

(1) In the first place, the denial of the unity of Isaiah had its root in an unwillingness to admit the supernatural power of prediction in prophecy.

(2) In the second place, to maintain the denial of its unity sets aside the authority of the New Testament.

At first the supposed difference of language was assigned as the reason for doubting the unity of the book. But great Hebrew scholars, with scarcely an exception, have proved there is no linguistic difficulty.

The denial of its unity lies deeper—in the fact of prediction. That the prophet should predict the fall of Babylon when it had not risen to be a great world power; that he should predict the deliverance from captivity before the people were carried captive; that he should tell that deliverance should come from Medo-Persia when these two nations were still separate and insignificant; that he should call the deliverer by name—Cyrus, more than 100 years before his birth—these matters are stumbling-blocks to those who only see in prophecy the human intuition of a good man. But in the second Isaiah, God Himself appeals to the fulfilment of the earlier predictions as ground for believing that the later predictions will also be fulfilled.*

History uniformly attributes the second part of the book to Isaiah.

The witness of the New Testament is explicit and abundant. Isaiah is mentioned by name as the writer of the prophecy no fewer than 21 times. Of these, 10 are in connection with passages from the first part and 11 from the second part. The whole Book of Isaiah is referred to 210 times. John, in the same breath, ascribes chapter liii and chapter vi to Isaiah by name.

The unity of thought and purpose throughout the book is a final testimony to the unity of its authorship. This is seen most of all in the central figure of the person of the Messiah, in His glorious work of redemption, and in His universal reign of righteousness. This forms the great theme of the prophet Isaiah, flowing through his writings in unbroken connection.

* [In this connection compare the case of "the man of God from Judah" who prophesied of Josiah by name that he should break down the idolatrous altar in Bethel 350 years before the event.]

Colonel F. C. MOLESWORTH wrote : A feature of the book of Isaiah is the knowledge displayed by the writer of botany and forestry. Trees and plants are referred to much more frequently than in any other part of the Old Testament. This is, I consider, an argument for the unity of authorship of the book. It would be strange, indeed, if *both* Isaiah and the alleged deutero-Isaiah, who is stated to have lived at a different time and in a different country, should have displayed a much greater knowledge of plants and trees than any of the other Old Testament writers.

I wish that critics who profess to be able to divide Scripture into portions said to be written by different writers at different times, and then to have been edited and re-edited, would try their hand at a modern work which is known to have been produced in that way—for example, a military text-book—and tell us how much of it is new, and how much the work of the latest revisers. Their statements would be capable of verification, and by their success in taking up the challenge we could judge of their qualifications for separating the Pentateuch into its alleged component parts.

Colonel A. H. VAN STRAUBENZEE wrote : Isaiah means “the salvation of Jehovah”. He lived midway between Moses and Christ. The word salvation occurs oftener in this book than in any other save the Psalms. The earlier editions of the English Bible opened with the words, “Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth, for the Lord hath spoken”. In the earlier portion of his book he sees King Uzziah smitten with leprosy and cut off from the house of the Lord ; but, side by side with the death of the earthly king, is presented the King of Heaven, whose arm (Isaiah lix, 16) was to bring Salvation, this being in the latter portion of the book. For over 2,000 years no one ever questioned that there was more than one Isaiah.

Isaiah liii, 9, reads : “He appointed His grave with the wicked and with the rich in His death”. Who put such a strange idea into the mind of the man who wrote it nearly 700 years before it took place ? It must be verbal inspiration only that kept the writers of the Scriptures from mistakes in the choice of words, and every word, from the lightest to the gravest, is a reflection of the mind of the Heavenly Father.

Criminals were buried at the foot of their crosses, but God intervened in the case of Christ Who died for others. When His death took place, there must be no degradation. Hence the inspired action of Joseph and Nicodemus, and Pilate's consent, both request and consent being remarkable.

The Companion Bible gives the structure of the book as one whole, which shows that it does not lend itself, in any degree, to an arbitrary ending at chapter xxxix.

- A. 1, 2-5, 30 ... Exhortations ; Reprehensory ; Prophetic.
- B. 6, 1-13 ... The Voice from the Temple ; The Scattering.
- C. 7, 1-12, 6 ... Historic ; Events and Prophecies. (Ahaz.)
- D. 13, 1-27, 13 ... Burdens. Alternated with Israel's blessings.
- D. 28, 1-35, 10 ... Woes. Alternated with Jehovah's glories.
- C. 36, 1-39, 8 ... Historic. Events and Prophecies. (Hezekiah.)
- B. 40, 1-11 ... The Voice from the Wilderness. The Gathering.
- A. 40, 12-end ... Exhortations. Promissory. Prophetic.

Dr. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON wrote : This paper states, " We see Jesus of Nazareth . . . as truly son of man". Now, the expression " Jesus of Nazareth " is unknown to the Greek Scriptures. We in them find Nazarene, from Nazaret, and the Nazorite. Matthew ii, 23, states : " He dwelt in a city called Nazaret that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the Prophets, that Nazorite He should be called". Everywhere else the definite article is before this word. When He met Paul on the way to Damascus, He said, " I am Jesus, the Nazorite " (Acts xxii, 8).

Further, " Son of Man " occurs only once in the Greek Gospels, and then to describe the only ultimate Judge of the entire human race (John v, 27). Elsewhere it is " The Son of The Man". The only Hebrew word for man is Adam. So the first Adam, in the Hebrew, is distinguished from all the other Adams by having the definite article before it. So " The Son of The Man " means the son (or builder-up) of the Adam, and is the highest purely human title, and was so used before the High Priest (Matthew xxvi, 64), as

being a higher human title than that of High Priest. Hence the significance of Matthew xxv, 31: "When, indeed, shall come The Son of The Man, in the glory of *himself*, and all the holy angels with *him*, then shall *he* sit down upon the throne of *his own glory*."

This paper reasonably seems to imply that these two errors of translation of all translators were the cause of other views expressed in this paper which appear to be contrary to God's words as written.

This paper also states: "We have learned again to regard the Prophets as . . . not mere hands which wrote a sort of automatic writing at the dictation of the Holy Spirit". As this idea of automatic writing is unsupported by anything in the Scriptures, it would be of scientific interest to know how it was arrived at.

The Hebrew dictionaries unquestionably associate the word Jehovah, or in our alphabet IEFÉ with the verb "to be." But the Prophets associate it only with causation. The letter E in Hebrew carries that meaning. When placed in front of a verb, it makes that verb causal. This word means "He is causing". It is applied to Him Who "is bearing the all things by the spoken word of *his power*" (Hebrews i, 13). Colossians i, 17, states: "The all things by *him* are being held together" (see 1 Kings, xx, 13 and 28).

This paper treats Isaiah as a very human author, in representing him as using in his Hebrew narrative, for purely descriptive purposes, a foreign word, unknown to the Hebrew language. The word we know to have been the Hebrew spelling of the personal name *Cyrus*. But in Daniel x, 1, I understand this paper to leave this same word as the personal name of that Persian king, in whom everything recorded in Isaiah xlv, 1 to 7, was fulfilled to the letter.

This paper states: "Prophets did not write history before it happened". For this misrepresentation of fact I am unable to account.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

In reply to the interesting points raised by Colonel Molony, Mr. Wordsworth pointed out that in chapter xiii Isaiah, son of Amoz, says of Babylon, "Her time is near to come and her days shall not

be prolonged". In regard to xlix,^f17, and li, 19, lxiii, 18, we must remember that we know very little about the history of Manasseh's reign; it is evident that there must have been a revolution in which the adversaries of the prophets forcibly overthrew the faithful and obtained possession of the temple. In lxiv, 10, following a better punctuation, supported by lxx, he would read "Thy holy cities are become a wilderness: Jerusalem is become a sign-post (ziun) of the wilderness; a desolation the house of our holiness. And the ornaments wherewith our fathers praised Thee: are become for burning of fire"; *i.e.*, it is not the Temple, but the symbols of the worship of Yeabe, which Manasseh has caused to be burned.

The general question raised by Mr. Pitt cannot be dealt with in a few words, but in regard to his reference to the Immanuel prophecy, it is sufficient to point out that it is given as a sign to Ahaz in connection with the events of 735-4 B.C., and therefore cannot have been intended *primarily* to refer to what was to happen more than 700 years later. *Cf.* vii, 16, viii, 8, 10.

What Dr. Anderson means by saying that "the only Hebrew word for man is Adam" is difficult to see, or how he would express "the Son of Man" in Greek without using the definite article with man.

The paper certainly treats Isaiah as a very human author, but it does not represent Isaiah as using in xlv, 1, any but ordinary Hebrew words. It was Bishop Butler who said "Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass", but it is manifest that this is a misleading statement. Micah iii, 8, gives a clear statement of the essence of his inspiration. It was the false prophets far more than the true who dealt in detailed predictions of coming events.

The prophets of Yeabe constantly foretold the coming of the Christ as Judge and Saviour, but it was not given to them infallibly to know the times or the seasons.

The Relation of Geology to the Days of Creation in Genesis.

The following collected opinions of HUGH MILLER, JAMES D. DANA and SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, eminent Nineteenth Century Geologists, and HAROLD JEFFRIES, noted Physicist of the Twentieth Century, compiled by WILLIAM BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (Can.), Laureate, Academy of Sciences, Paris, are published at his request, with permission of the Council, for record and reference. These opinions are from men who have themselves contributed largely to the upbuilding of geology and physical geography into sound sciences.

NOTE.—These quotations and summaries will show that Geology is one of the most stable of the sciences. While in others, notably in Physics and Astronomy, there have been very radical changes of view, the general scheme of Geology and the sequence of Formations have remained the same as defined by the pioneers. This sequence on the American side of the Atlantic proved to be in accord with what British and European geologists had determined in their regions. Also, the succession of life in the Formations was well established before Darwin's scheme of Evolution was put forward; and there were geologists who had already discerned the correspondence between this succession and the account of Creation in Genesis before Darwin's day.

*THE RELATION OF GEOLOGY TO CREATION ; IN-
CLUDING THE DAYS OF CREATION AND THE
SABBATH REST.*

From HUGH MILLER, a pioneer geologist. (Abbreviated from *The Testimony of the Rocks*, American edition of 1857; pages 159-163 and 170.)—*Note.* Written before Darwin's first book on Evolution, published in 1859.

THE geologist, in his attempts to correlate the Divine account with the geological record, has only three of the six periods of creation to account for—the period of plants, the period of great sea monsters and creeping things, and the period of cattle and beasts of the earth. All geologists agree in holding that since there was life on the earth, the vast geological sequence naturally divides into *three* great parts.

In the first, or Palæozoic division, we find corals, crustaceans, molluscs, fishes; and, later on, a few reptiles. But none of these organisms gives the leading character to the Palæozoic or its prominent feature; or makes it more remarkable as a scene of life than the periods which follow. What chiefly distinguished the Palæozoic from the other two was its gorgeous flora. It was emphatically the period of plants. In no other age did the world ever witness such a flora; the youth of the earth was peculiarly a time of dusk and tangled forests. Wherever dry land, or shallow lake, or running stream appeared, a rank and luxuriant herbage cumbered the dank and steaming soil. The geological evidence is complete, that the first great period of organised life was, as described in Genesis, peculiarly a period of herbs and trees, "yielding seed after their kind". The vegetation of this period reached its culmination in the Coal formation, when tree ferns, or trees resembling an exaggerated moss, or others reed-like in form, were so profuse in their growth as to accumulate in beds of coal. Of this we are continually reminded by our domestic fires, and other uses of coal.

The middle period or Secondary division (the Mesozoic) also had its herbs and plants, but of a much less luxuriant and conspicuous character. The humble sea creatures also continued; but the grand existences of the age were its enormous monsters of the deep, and its gigantic birds as shown by their footprints stamped upon the rocks. In such creatures, this period excelled every other, earlier or later. They were not mammals but of the reptile class; for this was an age of egg-laying creatures, whether in the waters, on land, or in the air. The second period of the geologist was thus peculiarly and characteristically a period of whale-like reptiles of the sea, of enormous reptiles of the land, some rivalling the elephant in height and greatly more in bulk, and of numerous birds, some of them of gigantic size. Thus the second of the periods in Genesis which come within the range of geology was a time when God created just such creatures as accord with the facts now discovered.

The Tertiary period (or Neozoic) has also its prominent class of existences. Its flora seems to have been no more conspicuous than that of the present time; its reptiles occupy a very subordinate place; but its beasts of the field were by far the most wonderfully developed, both in size and numbers, that ever appeared upon earth. Its mammoths and its mastodons, its enormous dinothereum and colossal megatherium, were of far greater bulk than the largest mammals of the present time, and vastly exceeded them in number. Truly this Tertiary age, the third and last of the great geological periods, was peculiarly the age of great "beasts of the earth after their kind and of cattle after their kind".

May we not then ask the geologist to say whether these explanations, though given in simple outline, are not true to geological fact; and also the commentator on Genesis, to say whether these statements, though from the geological standpoint, are not true to the Scriptural narrative? The wording is no doubt in primitive language, without the scientific terms of botany and zoology; yet we may fairly ask whether this account of creation, as given in Genesis, could be rendered more essentially true to the story of the earth, geologically ascertained, as we find it. The same manner of emphasizing the outstanding is seen in the description of the universe beyond the earth; where the two great lights of the day and night are specially referred to, since these arrest the attention most powerfully; and the stars seem only incidentally mentioned.

If, then, we take the days in the Genesis record as equivalent to lengthened periods, and if we hold that the inspired writer in giving so brief a history seized only on the salient points during these periods, we shall find the harmony of the two records complete.

The Periods and the Sabbath Rest.—The geological facts lead to the belief, as explained above, that the *days* in the account of the creation, were great periods, not natural days. It has been urged, however, that this scheme of periods is irreconcilable with that Divine "reason" for the institution of the Sabbath which God, who in His goodness appointed that day, has vouchsafed to man. We fail to see any force in the objection. God, the Creator, who wrought during six periods, rested during the seventh period; and we have no evidence whatever that He recommenced His work of creation; for, on the contrary, man seems to be the last formed of creatures. Hence God may be resting still; and the presumption is strong that His Sabbath is an extended period, not a natural day, and that the work of Redemption is His Sabbath day's work.* And so we need not suppose that it in the least interferes with the cogency of the reason given with the Fourth Commandment, if stated as follows:—Work during six periods, and rest on the seventh; for in six periods the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh period *He* rested.

The Divine periods may have been very great—the human periods very small; just as a vast continent or the huge earth itself is very great and a map or geographical globe very small. But if in the globe the proportions be faithfully maintained, and the scale, though a minute one, be true, we pronounce the globe a faithful copy. Were man's Sabbaths to be kept as enjoined, it would surely not interfere with the reason annexed to the Fourth Commandment; though in this matter, as in all others in which man can be an imitator of God, the imitation should be a miniature one.

During the Creation, each succeeding elevation in the long upward march had been the result of a creative fiat. And finally, the last creative fiat went forth, and responsible, immortal man came into existence. Yet God's work of elevating,

* This view corresponds with the defense which Christ made for doing works of mercy on the Sabbath day; if God's "rest" has continued on since creation was completed (John v, 17). Also, this seems implied in Hebrews iv, 3-7 and 11.

raising, heightening, still goes on. But man's nature and his God-implanted instincts regarding an eternal future forbid that this work of elevation should be a work of creation. To create would be to supersede. God's work of elevation *now* is to fit and prepare sinning, imperfect man for a perfect, sinless, future state. The seventh day's work of God is the work of Redemption. And, read in this light, His reason vouchsafed to man for the institution of the Sabbath is found to yield a meaning of peculiar breadth and emphasis. God, it seems to say, rests on *His* Sabbath from His creative labours; in order that by His Sabbath day's work He may save and elevate you. Rest ye also on your Sabbaths, that through your co-operation with Him in this great work, ye may be elevated and saved.

REMARKS BY SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON (Principal of McGill University and Prof. of Geology; obiit 1899), on the views of Hugh Miller as above summarised. These remarks follow an extended quotation from Hugh Miller, in his book *The Origin of the World according to Revelation and Science*, sixth edition, pages 135-138.

If God had only rested for a literal day, no good reason could be assigned for the injunction attached to the Fourth Commandment except His thus setting an example. But if God's resting from the work of natural creation is still in progress, this gives forth a ray of light which shines along the whole course of Scripture history. For our short Sabbaths thus become symbolical of that other work for our salvation which God carries on during His great Sabbath; culminating in the final "rest which remaineth for the people of God".

This view occurs also in Lord Bacon's *Confession of Faith*; and Jean Deluc, the Swiss-English geologist, likewise maintains that the Creator's Sabbath must be of long continuance.

It may further be noted that this long Sabbath of the Creator is indirectly a proof that the other six days of creation were likewise long periods, as indicated by geology; for the whole series of "days" in the Genesis record are thus brought into harmony.

THE DAYS OF CREATION according to PROFESSOR JAMES D. DANA, the American geologist and author of foundational works on geology, based on its North American features.

Those who consider the "days of creation" in Genesis to be days of twenty-four hours, have to place geological time *before* the six days, and then to assume a chaos and a re-ordering of creation during the six literal days. There would thus have been a *first* creation that had operated for a long period through secondary causes, and which did not reach to man, and a *second* creation by another method, with man included.

On this point geology is now explicit in its decision, and indeed has long been so. It proves that there was no return to chaos, no great revolution; that creation was beyond doubt one in its progress. We know that some geologists have taken the other view. But it is only in the capacity of theologians and not as geologists; and they did not pretend there was a geological basis for such a hypothesis.

To unsettle confidence in these teachings of geology, it is often asserted that geology is a changing science. In this connection the remark conveys an erroneous impression. Geology is a progressive science, and all its advance tends to establish more firmly the principle that the progress of creation was by periods analogous to the days of Genesis.

EXPLANATIONS BY SIR WILLIAM DAWSON, to meet objections to the evidence given. (*The Origin of the World*, pages 153-155.)

After the somewhat lengthy train of reasoning into which the term "day" in Genesis has led us, it appears that from internal evidence alone in the first chapters of Genesis, it can be rendered probable that the day of creation is neither the natural day from daylight to dark, nor the civil day of twenty-four hours. It also appears that the objections urged against the doctrine that the "days" are long periods, are of no weight when properly scrutinised; and it harmonises with the progressive nature of the work and also with the evidence of geology.

As to the physical nature of the periods, some geologists appear to regard the whole of geological time as a continuous evolution without any breaks. But the facts indicate that there were cycles of repose and of physical activity succeeding each other. There were eras of subsidence and elevation of continental extent, usually occurring gradually; and accompanied with

alternations of climate. These, however, are not equal to the creative days we are considering, for they are greatly more numerous. But beyond and above these, there is a much longer type of geological cycle marked by vast crumplings of the earth's crust and enormous changes of level, with the upheaval of mountain ranges. Such great movements unquestionably closed each of the four leading periods in the geological sequence.

Various physical causes have been suggested to explain why such great disturbances should occur at long intervals of time . . . Whatever the causes, they must have been of a world-wide character, resulting in a collapse of the crust of the earth. (See following explanations by Jeffreys.) These great movements at the close of successive geological ages thus coincide in a general way with the aeons of creation which the ages themselves represent.

CONFIRMATION BY DR. HAROLD JEFFREYS, the eminent physicist; from his exhaustive researches based upon all data now available, and worked out mathematically. (Summarised from *The Earth*, chap. XV; 1928.)

The formation of mountains has not taken place at all periods in the history of the earth; for it is known that there have been long periods of quiescence. On the basis of the actual rigidity of the rocks and the mathematical laws of compression and resulting stress, there has been time since the solidification of the earth for the breaking stress in the earth's crust to be reached about five times. Also, such collapses would occur at fairly equal intervals of time, estimated in millions of years. It is of interest that five times is about the number of the great eras of mountain-building that are geologically known to have occurred.*

The objection that continuous cooling of the earth would give continuous adjustment, and not long, quiet intervals separated by short and great upheavals, has been answered already. The actual alternation is precisely what would be expected from the finite strength of ordinary solids. Nor does the conclusion result from a theory invented specially to explain mountain formation.

* One of these may correspond with the appearing of dry land above the ocean, and another might also be before there was animal life in the world.

For it is the direct outcome of the earth's thermal history, and research undertaken to account for quite other matters.

CONCLUDING REMARK BY SIR WILLIAM DAWSON, on a discussion of the Days of Creation, in thirty-two pages of *The Origin of the World*. (Pp. 123-156.)

We may still ask: Why are God's days so long? He is not like us, a being of yesterday. He is "from Age to Age", and even in human history one day is with Him as a thousand years. We shall know in the endless ages of a future eternity, when even to us these long creative days may at last become but as watches in the night.

THE DAYS OF CREATION.—Remarks by SIR WILLIAM DAWSON on the Scriptural evidence. (Abbreviated from his booklet, *The Day of Rest*, in "Present Day Tracts"; Religious Tract Society London.)

When it is said in the Fourth Commandment that God made all things in six days, and rested on the seventh day, it might seem at first sight that these were natural days, and that God enjoins us to follow His example on the day of rest. But the more we think of this as an explanation, the more unsatisfactory it becomes; for the parallel does not hold good.

In reality, the proper significance of this command is reached only when we bear in mind that the creative days of the first chapter of Genesis are really "days of God"—divine periods or ages, as they are called in the 90th Psalm. In Genesis, there were early days before natural days were instituted; "ineffable days" as Augustine well calls them. The seventh day is not represented as having an evening and morning like the others, and there is no hint that God resumed His work on an eighth day. In the second chapter, the world is said to be produced in one day; the word being evidently used in an indefinite sense.

Further on, in the Old Testament, we have no actual statement that the creative days were natural days or that the world was made in a short period, for the term *olam* or "age" is applied to God's periods of working; and in the 104th Psalm, which is a

poetical narrative of creation, the idea conveyed is lapse of time, without division into days. Later in Scripture, we find the same idea in the teaching of the Lord Jesus and in the apostolic Epistles ; so that it was familiar to the primitive church.

The "Sabbath day rest" is thus in harmony with the view that the other six days were age-long. For we may understand that when God rested on the seventh day, He entered into an age of long duration, intended to be distinguished by the happy rest of man in an Edenic world. But the fall of man broke in upon this rest ; and the Sabbath day became a memorial of an Edenic sabbath ; lost, indeed, but to be restored through a Redeemer. This harmonises with the statement of Christ when discussing the Sabbath ; for He implied that His Father had to resume His labour after creation was finished ; and instead of resting had to undertake the further work of redemption. The Saviour thus justifies Himself for doing likewise, when carrying out works of mercy on the Sabbath day. His words are : "My Father worketh even until now, and I work." (John v, 17, R.V.)

To understand this fully, we would need to consider a view which is common to the Scriptures and to physical science. It is that the world is not merely one of a number of bodies existing in space ; but that this world has gone through a series of stages, differing in character during successive ages of time. The Word of God also points forward to "a new earth" in the future ; a world "wherein dwelleth righteousness" ; and which also in many ways will be physically different. This idea of the present world being one of a series existing in time is a familiar one to the astronomer who thinks of suns and planets passing through different stages ; as well as to the geologist who traces the long history of the earth, with each succeeding age different in its conditions.

The Hebrew word *olam* is used in this sense, as well as the Greek equivalent *aeon* ; though our English translation, which is usually "world", does not bring out the idea of time so clearly. Such expressions as : "Before the world began", "the worlds (*ages*) were framed by the word of God", "the end of the world", "God blessed for ever", are all "ages" or "age" in the original. (See Greek in I Cor. ii, 7 ; Heb. xi, 3 ; Matt. xiii, 40, 49 ; and Rom. i, 25.) The sublime prayer of Moses in the 90th Psalm speaks of God as existing before the mountains were brought forth, and a thousand years being to Him as a watch in the night ; while "from *olam* to *olam*, Thou art God". This

properly means "from age to age" of those long cosmic ages in which He creates and supervises the world in its successive stages, during which it was being gradually prepared and fitted up for man.

What we are thus taught to hope for is life through the unlimited ages of God's working; and this life has been promised before the beginning of creation. We are told accordingly that the redeemed will exemplify the exceeding riches of God's grace in the ages to come. So the whole past, present and future of God's plan has its relation to man; and it is included under this remarkable idea of the ages of the world, and is appropriated by faith and hope as the possession of God's people.

And later:—The order of creation as stated in Genesis is faultless in the light of modern science, and many of the details present the most remarkable agreement with the results of sciences born only in our own day. To a sincere and unsophisticated mind, it must be evident that the grand outlines sketched by Moses are the same as those which modern science enables us to trace.

If we admit that the Mosaic days under consideration correspond with these geological periods, it would be impossible better to characterise their creations in so few words, adapted to popular comprehension.

Montreal, Canada.

August, 1940.

LONDON:

HARRISON AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING,
44 TO 47, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, W.C.2.